36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will please be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Rabbi Mendel Shemtov, who is the Rabbi of Chabad Jewish Center in Elgin. Rabbi Shemtov is the guest of Representative Moeller. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Rabbi."
- Rabbi Shemtov: "Almighty God, look favorably upon the Members of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois. Bless these individuals elected by the people in whom faith and confidence have been placed to legislate laws making decisions that will affect the lives of the citizens of our great state. Let them recognize that this is not only a great honor and civic responsibility but a holy endeavor as well. The Jewish tradition tells us of seven universal laws given to mankind by God through Noah one of which instructs us to create a peaceful and moral society governed by law. Almighty God, grant that those assembled here be aware of Your presence and this holy mission as they labor to enact just laws. Bless them with good health, wisdom and compassion and let us say, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Hammond."
- Hammond et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

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

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Bourne is excused."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. We have 116 Members present, we do have a quorum and prepared to move forward on Wednesday. Mr. Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Butler: "Today is Administrative Assistant's... Administrative Professionals Day. And I would like to say a kind word to someone who's been very helpful to me, getting my office up and going. Candice McCarty, who works for Representative Poe, while I have been getting my office up and going and do not have an administrative professional yet, has been a huge help to me. And I would just like to say thank you to Candice for all her help in getting my office up and going. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

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

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed, Sir."

Tryon: "Thank you. As many of you know, last night was the second annual Illinois Diabetes Caucus Foundation bowling tournament in which many of you actually participated in. And if you didn't participate, I wanted to tell you that it's one of the most fun things I've seen happen in Springfield in a long

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

time. Just if you could have been there, some of the surprises were Team Big Strike Anna Moeller bowled a 189. I'm convinced if she weren't a Legislator she has another career for sure. Patti Bellock's team the Bowling Stones, I'm telling you, you had to watch that to appreciate it. Lou Lang's team Lou's Luau, unbelievable. But one of the most exciting things I saw last night was... was Will Guzzardi's bowling approach. Kind of reminded me of a cross between Fred Flintstone and Barney Rubble. It was a... you had to see it to believe it. But there were three winners. You know, last year I... I was embarrassed 'cause my team didn't do very good. This year I put in two teams and... and one won, the staff team won at 1800 pins and the Bowl Drink Caucus came in second and third was the Sullivan Caucus. And I want you to know that last night we believe we raised about \$25 thousand and Governor Rauner came. And that's a... that's a thank you to everybody in this chamber for working so hard to get sponsors. And Governor Rauner did come and that was a surprise and he became a diamond sponsor. So, next year the challenge is on. And... and I think we'll have even a bigger and better event. So, thank you all."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Fortner: "Last week we took action on House Bill 3194. There was some confusion in our analysis and I voted 'no'. And it was my intent to vote 'yes'. I'd like the Journal to reflect that."

Speaker Lang: "Journal... the Journal will reflect your intention, Sir. Mr. Wehrli."

36th Legislative Day

- Wehrli: "I rise for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Go ahead, Sir."
- Wehrli: "I'd like to welcome my Page for the day, Dylan Koolman.

  He's 13, from Tinley Park and he's in seventh grade at

  Southwest Christian School. He is joined here today by his

  grandparents and mother. If we could welcome them to the

  people's chamber."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Thank you for being here with us.

  Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Nekritz: "In the gallery today, we are joined by individuals from all over the state, the Mobile Home Owners Association of Illinois led by Terry Nelson. I'd like to recognize them over here to my... to my right and give them a warm Springfield welcome. Welcome to Lobby Day."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for being here with us. Mr. Tryon for a second bite at the apple"
- Tryon: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have reviewed the analysis on House Bill 3194 and I'd like the Journal to reflect that my vote was intended to be 'yes'."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. The Journal will so reflect.

  Representative Scherer."
- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."
- Scherer: "Today I'm very, very, very excited because my own high school is here, St. Theresa from Decatur. And we're here to recognize Coach Tom Noonan and the boys from the St. Theresa

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

basketball team that accomplished second place in state, which we have waited about 40 years to have that happen. And Representative Bill Mitchell is also an alumni of that school, so we're very excited to welcome St. Theresa. Let's give them a warm Capitol welcome, please."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the Illinois House of Representatives.

Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Mitchell, B.: "First of all, I'd like to thank Representative Scherer for taking the initiative to bring the St. Theresa young men here to the State Capitol. So, thank you, Representative. Also, again, would you guys stand, again. Today you're going to get a little exercise. We're all proud of you in Macon County. I was a graduate in 1978, so a couple of you guys I went to school with your... your dads. So, Representative Scherer and I are very, very proud of you. The City of Decatur is very proud of you. Macon County is. Thank you for coming and God bless."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris on a point of personal privilege."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And today is Illinois Rehabilitation Facilities Lobby Day. And I'd like to welcome the hundreds of folks who are mental health professionals, direct service workers and persons with disabilities who are down here to talk about their issues today."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. We're happy you're here with us. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 106, Mr. Brady."

Clerk Hollman: "RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

we congratulate the Illinois State University football team, the Redbirds, on its successful 2014-2015 campaign, making their first appearance in the NCAA Division I Football Championship Game, and we wish them great success as they continue to build their football program."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention for just a moment. First off, we are joined in the Speaker's Gallery by Illinois State University head coach Brock Spack, if he would stand; Illinois State University athletics director Larry Lyons and Illinois State University athletic... assistant athletic director Mr. Mike Williams. Give them a... Yes. Give them a round of applause. Thank you. The Illinois State University men's football team, the Redbirds, had an amazing season winning their first conference title in 15 years and making it to the NCAA Division I football championship game. Along the journey, the Redbirds defeated seven nationally ranked opponents and set 16 school records including the most wins 13; most points scored 574; most touchdowns 76 and most rushing yards 3,619. The Redbirds graduated 20 seniors who will leave behind a strong program that helps take sports to new heights, the Illinois State football program. They will have returning starters with goals to build on the 2014-2015 campaign season. And while the Redbirds were setting records and scoring on the football field, they also scored high in the classroom, having similar success in their coursework with the cumulative fall GPA of 2.87 setting an increase in record. The Illinois State University Redbird football team

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

was a model for success setting many team records on the field, showing their strong moral character and excelling in their academics. Therefore, on behalf of the Illinois House of Representatives, please join me in standing and applauding and congratulating the Illinois State University runner-up division NCAA football Redbird team. Thank you, gentlemen."

- Speaker Lang: "Congratulations on a great season. Mr. Anthony on the Resolution. You're not speaking on the Resolution? Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Thank you, Mr. Brady. And now the Chair recognizes Mr. Anthony."
- Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, please join me in welcoming Vivian Van Eck from my home... Minooka which is in my district. She's an eighth grader. She's going to be Paging for me today. I ask that you guys give her a warm welcome to the General Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Happy you're here with us. Thank you.

  Representative Ammons."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Ammons: "Just wanted to let the General Assembly and our audience here in the gallery know that we are, in recognition of Earth Day today, and we have many groups here that are in the community that are going to be doing... lobby today on earth and environmental issues. So, I encourage you all to join us in celebrating Earth Day today here as well as in your own communities. There are many activities going on. And I'll

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

have a quick press conference in the Blue Room at 10:30 for a few minutes on this subject. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "You look marvelous. Point of personal privilege.

I'd like to..."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

- Chapa LaVia: "...introduce my Page for the day. I'm not lying. He looks better than you, Jack. I want to introduce my... my intern today, my Page, Lara Gruninger from Germany. She's down there in the front. So, if we could welcome her from Illinois. Hello."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. That wasn't the German accent you just used. Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to do some work now. Thank you. We'll be starting by doing Bills on Second Reading. Please pay attention. But before we do that, Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 184, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 745, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2635, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2791, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3251, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3766. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Community College Access & Affordability reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2015: adopted is House Joint Resolution 35. recommends be Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 1004, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1876, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4096. Representative Golar, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the 22, following committee action taken on April recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 494, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2781. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2015: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 3910; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1121, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 1531, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2791, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3593, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4006. Representative Cassidy, Chairperson from the Committee on Juvenile Justice & System-Involved Youth reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 172. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 396, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 397, offered by Representative Ford. And House Resolution 398, offered by Representative William Davis. These are referred to the Rules Committee."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "All right, Members, we're going to start with some Bills on the Order of Second Reading. Please pay attention. Be at your seats. Let's try to move through these. First one is House Bill 218, Representative Cassidy. Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 218, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted previously. Floor Amendments 2, 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Cassidy."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy on Amendment 2."
- Cassidy: "If I am not mistaken, Floor Amendment 2 reduces the amount from 30 grams to 15 grams. And I ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Cassidy."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy on Amendment 3."
- Cassidy: "Floor Amendment 3 represents negotiations with the Illinois State's Attorneys Association as well as the individual state's attorneys from Cook and DuPage County. I insert some language around penalties for the manufacturer of butane hash oil, which is a highly dangerous manufacturing process that is gaining in popularity and creates a scientifically based standard for measuring impairment of drivers using marijuana. I ask that it be adopted."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Cassidy."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy on Amendment 4."
- Cassidy: "And floor Amendment 4 is a little bit of cleanup on those DUI standards where we inadvertently left out snowmobiles and jet skis among other things. So, this just adds those in so that the DUI standards are consistent."
- 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. House Bill 421, Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill.
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 421, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is an understanding between the nurses and the State Medical Society. There's no opposition to it. It is... resolves an issue that's been worked on for quite some time."

36th Legislative Day

- 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. House Bill 3944, Mr. Bennett. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3944, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Bennett, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bennett."
- Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is an agreed to Bill by both the Illinois State Police and ABATE. It's hoping to reduce accidents and fatalities with extra... with extra lighting for motorcycles. Basically, this agreement focuses on the idea of not projecting beams of light up; it's just focusing on putting the light down. It does not include any lights. I mean, if you... it only... let me rephrase that. It shall not emit red or blue light. Other lights are okay but not red or blue. It does not allow blinking. It does not allow flashing. It does not allow oscillating. And it does not allow rotating. So, again, this is an agreed to Bill by both the Illinois State Police and ABATE. And I move for an 'aye' vote, if I may, Sir."
- 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."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3523, Mr. Brown. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3523, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Brown, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Floor Amendment #2 which is cleanup language between the wind industry and the Farm Bureau regarding the Ag impact mitigation agreement."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment 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. House Bill 1790, Mr. Cavaletto.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1790, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cavaletto, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."
- Cavaletto: "Wish to adopt Floor Amendment become... that will... #1 becomes the Bill. It will make it easier for vocational teachers that were issued a career in technical education endorsement or a provisional career and technical educator license before January 1, 2015, to renew their license."

36th Legislative Day

- 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. House Bill 3121, Mr. Demmer. Out of the record. House Bill 306, Mr. Guzzardi. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 306, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Guzzardi, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."
- Guzzardi: "Floor Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. It contains the same opt out provisions as the original Bill while also adding strict standards by which parents, teachers and school employees must abide."
- 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. But a balanced budget, fiscal note, and state mandates note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 1402, Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones. Out of the record. House Bill 1455, Representative McAsey. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1455, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

36th Legislative Day

- Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative McAsey, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey."
- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1455, I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. That Amendment becomes the Bill. It is agreed language that provides a short-term solution to the challenges facing the electronic waste recycling in the State of Illinois. It includes many components that I would prefer to debate on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 178, Mr. McSweeney.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 178, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3840, Mr. Sims. Mr. Sims. Out of the ... out of the record. House Bill 2933, Mr. Stewart. Mr. Stewart. Out of the record. House Bill 3674, Mr. Sullivan. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3674, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Third Reading Roll Calls, Ladies and Gentlemen. The first Bill is House Bill 3323, Mr. Acevedo.

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Mr. Acevedo. Out of the record. House Bill 217, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. House Bill 4029, Representative Conroy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4029, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill simply requires shelters to scan for microchips in dogs when they are brought to the shelter so that they can be returned to their owners quickly."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Deb, this is eminently reasonable and makes sense. Do we need to have a law to do it, though?"

Conroy: "This is the way that when the dogs are brought to the pound they have to do this now. So, we're just requiring the shelters to do the same thing."

Sandack: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mayfield, Phelps, Stewart, Verschoore. Phelps, Stewart, Verschoore. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3704, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3704, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Crespo: "Well, thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 34... last Session, by the way, we passed a Bill which became law that will remove people that are totally and permanently disabled from the jury duty list. House Bill 3704 basically allows in addition to a doctor's note, an IEP or a court order for guardianship as a credit of proof for total and permanent disabilities. Happy to answer any questions. And ask for your 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourself, Members. Burke. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2658, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, out of the record. House Bill 806, Representative Golar. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 806, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 806 is a progressive Bill. It is a Bill that would allow seventh-and eighth-graders to actually take courses in their elementary school based on the education of the certify... certification of the teacher at a school and that could be done in their school. At one time they had to transfer to other places and go to the high school or others, but this would allow students to have that. This is not a mandate. It

36th Legislative Day

- is a 'shall'. It is an initiative of gifted schools. And I would ask for your '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? Brady, Crespo, Flowers, Tabares. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Ford for a point of personal privilege."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise for an order of personal privilege. I want the Body to recognize Lee Crawford's son who is a dental student at Southern Illinois University. He's here today and he's in the gallery. If we could just give him a round of applause. And I think that Lee will be happy when his son becomes an official dentist because he will no longer be in his pocket. So, congratulations, Lee and your family."
- Speaker Lang: "Congratulations and welcome. House Bill 1493, Representative Lilly. Out of the record. House Bill 3933, Representative McAsey. Representative McAsey. Out of the record. House Bill 3983, Representative McDermed. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3983, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, please, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 173, Mr. McSweeney. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 173, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 173 would ban red-light cameras in non-Home Rule units of government here in the State of Illinois. It's very, very clear and we all hear it from our constituents all the time that this is not about safety. This is about additional revenue for local governments. These red-light cameras, according to studies, actually increase the number of rear-end collisions. We need to ban these cameras in the State of Illinois. A good start is to ban them in non-Home Rule units of government. I am asking for your support. I'm available to ask any questions. But this is something that the people of the State of Illinois are fed up with. We need to ban these red-light cameras and this legislation will do just that."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

DeLuca: "Representative McSweeney, your Bill focuses on non-Home Rule communities only. Is that correct?"

McSweeney: "It is, but this is all about red-light cameras. This is about the powers of the 1970 Constitution that allows..."

DeLuca: "Hold on, hold on. We'll get to that."

McSweeney: "...additional powers to Home Rule."

DeLuca: "We'll get to that."

McSweeney: "Okay. All right. All right."

DeLuca: "You'll have a chance to get to all that. Are most of the complaints coming out of the City of Chicago?"

McSweeney: "They're coming from all over the place. They're coming from... the red-light cameras in my district that are unfair,

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

that can't be appealed, that are very expensive to people. So, I'm hearing it in my district. And I'm hearing it from all over the state."

DeLuca: "Let's... this will go much quicker if we can just get question, answer, question, answer."

McSweeney: "I'm with you, Sir."

DeLuca: "Are most of the complaints regarding red-light cameras coming out of the City of Chicago? Would you agree with that?"

McSweeney: "The complaints are coming in my district and that's where... that's why I'm sponsoring this legislation."

DeLuca: "Okay."

McSweeney: "They're from all over the place. It's clear... Mr. Chairman, it's clear that this program is broken in the City of Chicago. But Chicago, with Home Rule powers, will have the ability to decide what they're going to do with this program."

DeLuca: "Okay. Representative, this will..."

McSweeney: "I'm hearing about this in my district."

DeLuca: "Give me a chance, give me a chance, give me a chance here. The City of Chicago is exempt in this Bill. Is that correct?"

McSweeney: "The City of Chicago is a Home Rule unit of government that will, under the State Constitution, be able to make their own decision. My view is I hope the City of Chicago eliminates red-light cameras. My Bill eliminates the red-light cameras for non-Home Rule units of government."

DeLuca: "Okay. Representative McSweeney..."

McSweeney: "Yes."

DeLuca: "...would you say yes or no? Is the City of Chicago exempt from this legislation?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

McSweeney: "The City of Chicago is not covered by this legislation because it is a Home Rule..."

DeLuca: "Okay. Since it was a..."

McSweeney: "...unit of government. This is not about Home Rule.

This is about eliminating red-light cameras in here."

DeLuca: "The City of Chicago became a big issue in the last election where the politicians really... making it a big issue. They were making it a big issue. Creating a perception that the cameras are negative."

McSweeney: "Yes. Right."

DeLuca: "Would you agree that the perception out there in the last election was to make the red-light cameras have a negative perception? Would you agree with that?"

McSweeney: "Mayor Rahm Emanuel actually, after the first election, decided he was going to cut out 50 of these cameras because they're so unpopular. They don't work."

DeLuca: "Okay. You're not going to answer that question."

McSweeney: "So, yes, yes. Yes, that's what happened."

DeLuca: "Let's move on. Let's move on."

McSweeney: "The red-light cameras in the City of Chicago were actually... 50 of them are gone. Fifty of them are gone because they're so unpopular."

DeLuca: "Would you agree that the State of Illinois greatly restricts the way non-Home Rule municipalities have an ability to generate revenue?"

McSweeney: "This is all about..."

DeLuca: "Representative McSweeney..."

McSweeney: "...red-light cameras. This is all about red-light cameras."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

DeLuca: "...we can get through this a lot guicker."

McSweeney: "This is about red-light cameras."

DeLuca: "Would you agree that the State of Illinois restricts the abilities of non-Home Rule municipalities to generate revenue?"

McSweeney: "Well, at least you're admitting now that it's about revenue. This is a not about safety. That's what the issue.

This is about red-light cameras, not about safety. It's an issue of revenue."

DeLuca: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, can we have the Sponsor of the Bill answer questions? It's pretty simple."

McSweeney: "I may... I'm answering every question."

DeLuca: "It's pretty simple."

McSweeney: "I'll stand here all day. Ask all your questions."

Speaker Lang: "The... the Chair is not going to tell Members how to debate, but I would ask that you not talk over each other.

One at a time would be nice."

McSweeney: "Absolutely."

DeLuca: "Okay. So, you're not going to answer that question?"

McSweeney: "I am going to answer all the questions that this is about eliminating red-light cameras in the State of Illinois.

That's what this is all about."

DeLuca: "Okay. Would you agree or disagree that the State of Illinois restricts how non-Home Rule municipalities have an ability to generate revenue in their community?"

McSweeney: "You're the chairman of the Cities & Villages Committee and a very clever Representative."

DeLuca: "Okay. You're not going to answer that question."

McSweeney: "And you know that there are Home Rule powers..."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

DeLuca: "Are you aware that Governor Rauner has proposed to reduce non-Home Rule's share of the local government income tax by 50 percent?"

McSweeney: "I am very aware of what the Governor's budget proposal is."

DeLuca: "Okay. So, you're answering that question. That's a yes.

Okay."

McSweeney: "I've answered every question that you've asked, Mr. Chairman."

DeLuca: "Okay."

McSweeney: "Every question you've asked. This is about red-light cameras."

DeLuca: "Do you think it's bad policy..."

McSweeney: "This is about revenue."

DeLuca: "...do you think it's bad public policy to, all at the same time, impose further restrictions on non-Home Rule units...

Home Rule... non-Home Rule units of local government while cutting their share of state funding?"

McSweeney: "I..."

DeLuca: "Would you agree that that's bad policy to do that at the same time?"

McSweeney: "At least, Mr. Chairman, you're admitting this is about revenue not about safety. My view is that these cameras should be eliminated. We have a transition period; January 1, 2017 is the date. That's what this issue is all about."

DeLuca: "Okay. Let me ask you a few pointed questions."

McSweeney: "Yes."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

DeLuca: "Do red-light cameras ticket law-abiding citizens who follow the rules of the road and are then forced to pay the fine?"

McSweeney: "In many cases..."

DeLuca: "Yes or no?"

McSweeney: "...yes. In many cases yes."

DeLuca: "Yes."

McSweeney: "People were just going over the line."

DeLuca: "So, in your..."

McSweeney: "It's very hard to appeal those cases..."

DeLuca: "Okay."

McSweeney: "...because you have to go to court. You have to hire a lawyer. So, yes, I think these systems are broken..."

DeLuca: "So, you're in the..."

McSweeney: "...just like in New York."

DeLuca: "...in your experience, there are many cases where lawabiding citizens are being issued tickets by red-light cameras and forced to pay, in many situations, you're saying?"

McSweeney: "Anecdotally, that's correct. Anecdotally correct."

DeLuca: "Do red-light cameras ticket minorities based on their race?"

McSweeney: "No, absolutely not. I don't think that's true."

DeLuca: "Do red-light cameras discriminate based on race, religion, sexual orientation, social economic status or even simply your appearance or your mood that day?"

McSweeney: "No, they don't, but they're unfair because what they do is don't improve safety, but they do try to increase revenue."

DeLuca: "Okay. They don't. Then answer no."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

McSweeney: "So, that's because..."

DeLuca: "Do red-light cameras only ticket those breaking the rules of the road?"

McSweeney: "I don't believe so because I believe anecdotally and after the studies, that many people are being ticketed who actually aren't violating the traffic violations, were increasing the rear-end collisions by 22 percent in this state. So, that's why I would eliminate red-light cameras."

DeLuca: "As far as you know, Representative McSweeney, has a redlight ticket violation ever escalated to where you'd have an arrest or an unjustified shooting?"

McSweeney: "I'm not sure of that case. I can't give you an example of that case, but I can give you examples."

DeLuca: "Well, your experience here has not then?"

McSweeney: "Don't... don't continue. Is your point about police? Is that your point that you'd rather have red-light cameras..."

DeLuca: "I'll get to the point. I'll get to the point."

McSweeney: "...then send a police officer in this state who are out there fighting for their life's every day."

Deluca: "I'll get to the point."

McSweeney: "Is that what you're saying?

DeLuca: "Mr. Speaker..."

McSweeney: "I believe in our police."

DeLuca: "...and Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. This has been a very complicated question and answer session. It shouldn't have been, pretty simple direct forward questions. But this technology, red-light camera technology, has become available and allowed police officers, especially in our smallest communities in the State of Illinois in non-Home Rule

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

communities, it has allowed them to focus on more crimefighting type of activities. Instead of taking a police officer... it's very expensive for a municipality to have a police officer go and write a ticket for a right turn on red, for a simple traffic violation. And in a lot of cases, and we've heard these complaints, and what we're seeing across the nation today, especially in minority communities, is a simple traffic stop can be escalated into something much more severe, into something much more substantial. This camera is only going to ticket you if you break the law. If you turn on red when you're not supposed to, if you run through a red light when you're not supposed to be running through the red light. It doesn't matter what your background is, what you look like. On a traffic stop, it could be a totally different situation, a totally different situation. You could even make the argument that these cameras are protecting people in certain situations. Ladies and Gentlemen, the green button's right in front of you. If you want a Bill that takes us back to the old days before we utilized technology, all you have to do is reach out and touch that green button because this Bill is for you. We need to utilize technology to move forward, to help policing, to help our police officers and law enforcement do a better job, give them more resources. I ask you to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just going to speak to the Bill. I voted for the original Bill that allowed red-light cameras and I regret that vote. I was duped. I was lied to. I was told that it was for safety. What we found it has

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

nothing to do with safety. And after we passed that original Bill, Chicago then wanted the opportunity to have these cameras. And I argued at that time that we would rue the day that we'd... that we offered that. And I believe everyone in this chamber who voted for that I'm sure had second thoughts because we've heard from our constituents of the... the problems. Well, forget the problems with the contract. I mean, this is Illinois. I mean, we got to ... we got to figure that. But what have we found out? We've found out that many of the municipalities have shortened their yellow lights. And what has this done? Two things. It's gotten them more revenue because that's all this is about, Ladies and Gentlemen. It's all about the money. And it's also caused more accidents when they shortened those lights. In many intersections even when the lights weren't changed the time, there's been an increase in accidents. There is no empirical evidence whatsoever that this provides any safety measures at all to our citizens, not one iota, not one shred of evidence. I would argue just the opposite. That it makes our roads less safe because people are more skittish. They stop and go. I tried to pass a Bill a few years ago... and I appreciate the Sponsor getting this one this far... because what I have seen is oftentimes people would get tickets when they've inch up past the white line. So, let's assume you have an intersection and it's four lanes going one way and four lanes going the other, so there's eight lanes and you're in the far right lane. It's hard to see what the other guys are doing seven lanes over. What do you do, what everybody does, you pull up past the white line before you turn right. That would trigger the camera. These are

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

tickets that no police officer would ever give. Yet, what we're going to hear today is going to be speaker after speaker defending these things, not on safety, but on money, on revenue, on what may happen should the Governor cut the funds to our municipalities. Ladies and Gentlemen, that is a totally separate issue. We have no idea what the Governor may or may not do. I've heard him tell folks that he won't cut their LGDF depending on certain things happening. So, we don't know. But what we do know is that this is not for safety and it is only affecting the people who we have all vowed to protect. We should not be preying on our citizens and seeing them as a piggybank to pay for these infractions that in many, many, many instances no police officer using discretion would ever give. It just wouldn't happen. So, folks, understand the arguments are all about money and not about safety. So, as a result we have an obligation to our citizens to level the playing field. The only legitimate vote is to vote 'no' and to take these things away, to push the reset button, to start over, to protect our citizens, to stop preying on our citizens and do the right thing. Please vote 'no' on these red lights."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Zalewski: "David, I have a great deal of respect for you, but I have trouble with the concept that we're only doing this for non-Home Rule units of government. Can you explain that rationale?"

McSweeney: "Absolutely. Under the 1970 Constitution, as you know, the Home Rule units of government have the ability to make

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

certain rules. I hope all levels of government including the City of Chicago eliminate these red-light cameras, but this is the power that we have to eliminate them for non-Home Rule units of government. This is about additional revenue. I hope that every city, every village eliminates these red-light cameras. They are nothing but trouble. The people of this state are fed up with it, but what we have the power to do is, under the 1970 Constitution, is do it for non-Home Rule units of government. And that's what I'm trying to do today."

Zalewski: "Yeah, but I have Home Rule units of governments in my district and I don't know how I could, in good faith, go back to their communities, who are just as angry about these units... these cameras and say, the General Assembly has spoken, but we've only spoken for the non-Home Rule units of government."

McSweeney: "I think..."

Zalewski: "What do I... what do I tell them when I say, I can't support your Bill, but how do the Members of the General Assembly who go back to their communities and have voted 'yes' for this who have Home Rule units in their districts say, I picked and choose who got relief from these cameras?"

McSweeney: "I would tell them I'm going support the Zalewski Bill the next Session to eliminate all red-light cameras. That's what I'm going to tell them."

Zalewski: "But... so, then, take this Bill out of the record..."

McSweeney: "Absolutely not."

Zalewski: "...and let's come back last Session..."

McSweeney: "I'm putting... the people are fed up in this state. We need to vote today."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Zalewski: "I, David, respectfully... I think it's a poor precedent and it continues to be a poor precedent when we need to pick winners and losers to choose to get out from onerous government inaction. I think your idea is good in concept, but it's bad in practicality. I appreciate what you're doing. I know you're a zealous advocate for your constituents, but we shouldn't be picking winners and losers of this. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "There are still 8 speakers, 9 speakers waiting to speak on this Bill, 11, 12. Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Thank you. Two points that I want to make. Number 1, this is not about the distinction between Home Rule and non-Home Rule communities. Understand, the present law only authorizes red-light cameras in eight counties. So, there are presently communities in the southern part of Illinois that are Home Rule, I think we're standing in one of them, that does not have this power right now. And there are many communities in... that are non-Home Rule in this area that also lack that power. So, the distinction regarding non-Home Rule versus the Home Rule is not relevant to this discussion. Point... point number 2 is I have been a local prosecutor for 20 years. I have prosecuted a great many violations of this nature, but no prosecutions for red-light cameras. Why? Because red-light cameras are not prosecuted the way any other normal violation is prosecuted. The... the problem here and one of the speakers referenced said that if you... if you're driving a car and violate a red-light camera, you will get a ticket.

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

That is not true. What will happen is the owner of the vehicle will receive a traffic ticket and the only way to fight against that is to prove one of two things. One, that you didn't own the car at the time and the paperwork just didn't catch up from the Secretary of State or number 2, that your car was stolen and you filed a police report. Other than that, the fact that you were driving or not driving the car you own isn't a defense. So, theoretically, standing here today speaking to you I could be getting a red-light ticket from some other member of my family driving my car. This is fundamentally an unfair... unfair law. It's been an experiment. It's been a limited experiment. And it has failed. I urge a 'yes' vote on the... on the Sponsor's Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the prior speakers have noted, red-light cameras are unsafe, unfair and unnecessary. These cameras were brought to our state on a late night vote on a last minute Bill that was not intended to do this. It was not done based on any desire of the people of the State of Illinois to bring red-light cameras to their communities and it was not undertaken with due consideration by this Body. And so, this Bill is a very good first step in getting rid of these items. We can do this for non-Home Rules today. We can work on the Home Rules later. I'm proud to represent several non-Home Rule communities including my hometown of Lombard where we had red-light cameras and through extensive community organizing and activism we got rid of them. This Bill will help that... to make sure that all of my constituents are not plaqued by these devices at least not in my district.

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

You know, when you look at a ticket, as my colleague mentioned, these tickets are issued without due process. You don't get due process in terms of fighting them. These tickets are issued for violations that an officer on the scene would not ticket if he were present. And in that sense, red-light cameras reduce the respect for rule of law. They encourage ticky-tack law enforcement which causes people to, again, reduce their respect for our officers and for our systems of laws and government. As well, we've seen evidence and continued mounting evidence that these are unsafe as they absolutely increase the number of rear-end collisions at the intersections where they are deployed. And so, from that standpoint, again, they are unsafe, unfair, unnecessary. An 'aye' vote is the correct vote on this measure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I may and I have the greatest respect for the Sponsor of this Bill. But let me tell you something. The Gentleman from McHenry County is 100 percent wrong, 100 percent wrong. Sure, there's a... there's a revenue element to this Bill. There's no question about it, there's a revenue element to this Bill. Bill, but there is also a safety element to this Bill. Hey, I've been caught twice by a red-light camera in Des Plaines. Guess what? When I come up to that intersection now, I respect the law and I don't go through it the way I'm not supposed to go through it. I don't float it. Sure, there are problems with the red-light cameras, but where have those problems taken place? They have taken place in the City of Chicago, in the City of

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Chicago. You want to talk about... you want to talk about accelerated orange lights. In the City of Chicago, nowhere else. If you want to solve the red-light problem, you've got to address the City of Chicago. This Bill doesn't address the City of Chicago. It's non-Home Rule. I have a non-Home Rule community in my district in the county of Cook and guess what, you take 50 percent away from them, as the Governor has proposed in the Local Government Distributive Fund, you take the little bit of money that they get perhaps from those folks who are running the red lights and they get a little bit of revenue from the red-light cameras and you're going to cut the legs out from underneath that non-Home Rule community. As my seatmate said, there's only eight counties in the State of Illinois that red lights can be put in. If you're not in one of those counties, if you're downstate, you want to vote 'no' on this Bill. You want to protect those non-Home Rule. It is a factor of Home Rule versus non-Home Rule. You want to solve the red-light problem, you do it in the City of Chicago. That's where it's been abused. You want to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

Wehrli: "To the Bill. I respectfully disagree with my colleague here and Representative Franks is 100 percent correct. As a councilman in the City of Naperville, I voted to put redlight cameras in. I am an odd bird in Illinois. I'm a politician that can admit when he makes a mistake. I also voted to remove red-light cameras from the City of Naperville. Red-light cameras are bad for Home Rule, non-Home Rule and Chicago. Would I love to see all of that incorporated into

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

this Bill, absolutely. Is this a good Bill? Is this an improvement? Absolutely. Please vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. McSweeney, could you tell me what counties does that cover? 'Cause I've got a little bit of the suburbs..."

McSweeney: "Sure."

Arroyo: "...and I want to know are you telling me what are those suburbs that it covers, if I'm going to vote for the Bill or not?"

McSweeney: "Absolutely."

Arroyo: "Maybe I could help you pass the Bill or maybe I could help everybody here kill the Bill. So, could you tell me what counties it helps?"

McSweeney: "Absolutely. There are eight counties that red-light cameras are allowed in in the State of Illinois. That's Lake, McHenry, Cook County, Will County, DuPage County, Madison and St. Clair and that is what the law allows. The law is already saying this is only allowed in certain areas. What my Bill will do... and that's why I look forward to your support... is it's going to ban the red-light cameras in non-Home Rule units of government. That's what my legislation does. That's why it's a good Bill."

Arroyo: "You say it's a good Bill."

McSweeney: "Yes, Sir."

Arroyo: "Okay. Does it affect the City of Chicago 'cause I don't want nobody from downstate or from your district coming and telling the people of Chicago what we need to do with our

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

camera? Whether it's good or not, we want the City of Chicago to determine what they're going to do with their cameras."

McSweeney: "Chicago is a Home Rule unit of government. So, they would not be impacted by this legislation. I would hope that Chicago makes the right decision and eliminates it. Mayor Emanuel has decided to eliminate 50 of the cameras, but this would only be for non-Home Rule units of government."

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Acevedo."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, 19... 19 Acevedo: and a half years ago when I first came down here, that was one of my first Bills, was putting a red light at the most dangerous street corners. It was all about safety. It wasn't about financial gain. It wasn't about ticketing people and trying to get some money from them. It was all about safety. Yet people laughed at us. People laughed at that idea, 19... 19 and a half years ago. Come today, all over the City of Chicago you have some... the cameras at the red lights. Folks, I keep hearing different people talk about a policeman wouldn't do this, a policeman wouldn't do that. Don't tell me what a policeman's going to be able to do whether he's going to give someone a ticket or not unless you walk in our shoes. Unless you go out and protect people and honor the badge that you're supposed to. I, for one, if I see someone making a traffic tic... a traffic violation that is going to endanger the public safety, I'm going to stop that person because that's my job. But I keep people hear today... keep hearing them say a policeman wouldn't do this. You cannot be prosecuted for this. Okay. The red light's an issue in the City of Chicago. Yes,

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

there are flaws. Are they trying to make it right? Yes. I heard also about the yellow... the timing of the yellow lights. Are they trying to make it right? Yes. The project is not perfect; we all know that. Maybe some can be eliminated, but I will tell you this. There are some intersections... and I'm going back to the 19 and a half years when I talked about if before... there are intersections that are very dangerous in the City of Chicago where there were car accidents, hit-andruns, people being hurt physically crossing the street. And we could never have enough evidence because no one wanted to speak up. When you have cameras, you have it on tape. When you have it on tape, that's a perfect proof for a prosecutor to prosecute. Now, if you want to fight the fines, you're eligible to fight the fines. So, I don't know who's coming up with this idea that say you're not allowed to appeal this process. Yes, you are. But please don't tell me... and I was listening to Representative DeLuca and he's absolutely right. Sometimes people complain about not enough policemen patrolling the streets. Well, you know what, sometimes there's more important things maybe than stopping somebody for a traffic violation when the camera's taking the picture. Maybe it's better for me to go stop a person from breaking into somebody's house. Maybe it's more important for me to go and stop somebody from snatching some old lady's purse. Maybe it's... maybe it's more important for me to go to try to stop a drive-by shooting and grab a gun off of some gangbanger driving down the street. Yes, policemen don't always have time to make traffic stops, but there are people making violations. I'm not saying this is a perfect... the perfect

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

setup for a red-light camera. It can be fixed. We can work on it some more, but I don't think we should take these away, folks, because I'll tell you again. This is all about safety."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Rita: "Representative, you know, I'm sitting here listening, especially with the first speaker, you failed to answer some of these questions and I... we need to clarify. Why is the City of Chicago exempt from this Bill?"

McSweeney: "Because the City of Chicago is Home Rule."

Rita: "Well, why..."

McSweeney: "And Mr. Chairman, the City of Chicago. So, I'm willing to sponsor the Zalewski-Rita Bill to include the City of Chicago in this Bill. If you want to sponsor that, then you have that ability to do it because the red-light camera should be eliminated throughout the state. But my Bill, because of the way the 1970 Constitution is set up, only allows us to do it for non-Home Rule units of government. That's the answer."

Rita: "We hear about there's no due process. We're hearing that it's not about safety. We're hearing that it's about safety. But what... what I don't understand if this is not about safety, we could make this Bill, if you pull it out of the record, and eliminate all red-light cameras in the state."

McSweeney: "This is about revenue. That's what red-light cameras are all about. And that's why this Bill..."

Rita: "Then why..."

McSweeney: "...this legislation will take the step of eliminating these cameras for non-Home Rule units of government. That's

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

what the issue is. The issue is red-light cameras. Again, are you willing to sponsor a Bill..."

Rita: "Why..."

McSweeney: "...that would ban red-light cameras in the City of Chicago?"

Rita: "Why wouldn't you include..."

McSweeney: "Are you willing to sponsor that Bill?"

Rita: "...all red-light cameras?"

McSweeney: "I believe that under the 1970 Constitution that we only have the ability to do this for non-Home Rule units of government for the purposes of what we're doing here today. I would like to see all units of government eliminate redlight cameras. So, if your point, Mr. Chairman, if your point is you're going to sponsor legislation to take away red-light cameras for the City of Chicago, sign me on."

Rita: "My point is to be fair. Ladies and Gentlemen, let's look at what we're going to do. We're going to limit the non-Home... we're pitting non-Home Rule communities against Home Rule communities. We're talking about this Bill isn't about safety. They're talking about... back and forth that there's not a due process. There is a due process. If he's truly wants to eliminate red-light cameras, he would make this Bill effective to all red-light cameras. I'm asking people to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. To the Bill. This has been an interesting and enlightening level of discussion. I think the last speaker actually put his finger on it. It's about the revenue; it's not about the revenue. And then there's been some discussion

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

about, well, if we're going to do this, let's go the whole way. Let's not do a half measure. Look, there are a bevy of reasons to vote against this Bill, if you are for red-light cameras, if you're for the system as it exists. Do you think it's good? Vote 'no'. If you think it's working, vote 'no'. But the fact is, it has not promoted health, welfare, safety of our citizenry. It's been abused; it has been ... it's set up as a revenue mechanism solely. It is a pretext. In Downers Grove, I'm proud to say, we were sought to bring red-light cameras to my town. We summarily said no because it wasn't about safety. We knew then that while the T-bone accidents may be reduced, the fact of the matter is rear-end accidents were going to increase and we've seen that now in the... the research. So, safety has not been promoted, but revenue's up. Yeah, it's up because it's a nice way to tax in an unresponsible, in an unknown way. An earlier speaker talked about the inherent unfairness of them and they are inherently unfair. But last point, Ladies and Gentlemen. People hate them. They hate them for a reason and they're right. This law was slipped in in a surreptitious way and it's failed. Let's start the process of undoing the harm we've caused. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A lot... to the Bill. A lot's been said about this legislation. But what I do know and I'm sure my colleague highlighted this in his opening remarks, a lot of research a lot of studying has occurred in places like Texas, places like Ohio on the other places... on the East Coast. This is a real serious issue. It's an issue that

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

involves real safety. Most of those studies highlighted the level... the high level of accidents, near death accidents, but serious injury accidents alongside it. And there's a reason that this legislation has really taken off and why that there were three to four Bills introduced at the beginning of this year trying to eliminate red-light cameras and in some cases, speed cameras. There has been research on this over the last several years. There's a group called Coalition to Abolish the Red-Light Cameras, you should look that up on your website. Very diverse group all across the State of Illinois with this one perspective, to abolish the red-light cameras because they cause... they've been found to cause more accidents as was articulated and a major revenue grab has been highlighted as well. Certainly there's an argument to say... to say it if you have cameras in the work zone. This Bill doesn't allow that, so it's good in that regard. But the overwhelming evidence supports and proves that this primarily has been a revenue grab. And if you look at the City of Chicago, the mayor and the other aldermen have finally realized that, some areas simply don't need red-light cameras or speed cameras. And so, you can argue it both ways, but I think this is a great step in the right direction. I also wish that Chicago was included with this here because we've seen or the empirical data has proven that there has been a distinct, clear evidence of revenue attempt primarily. And so, I would encourage all of my colleagues to do the right thing and help set the tone for the City of Chicago, which is next, to abolish the red-light cameras. Thank you, Sponsor, for your legislation."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, my name was used in debate. Feel free? Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, back to... I keep... some arguments have come forth afterwards. This... this is not about the revenue component of this. We all agree that there's wide discussion amongst us about what these cameras are for versus what they... purpose they actually serve. I think the core principle, your... your feeling here is that you're forcing Members to take a difficult vote based on a disparate treatment of their constituents. Some constituents will not reap the benefit of this Bill and these are unpopular cameras. They're unpopular policy decisions. So, why would you string out your colleagues on a difficult vote if you can come back or think of a more comprehensive way to do this?"

McSweeney: "I'm not stringing anybody out. What I want to do is to eliminate red-light cameras in this state. I believe that the City of Chicago should eliminate red-light cameras in the state. Mayor Rahm Emmanuel is realizing that these cameras aren't working, in fact, he just had a tough fight and eliminated 50 of them. How the 1970 Constitution is written, as you know, is that we only can impact these non-Home Rule entities. However, as I said, I am willing to cosponsor any legislation that you'd be..."

Zalewski: "You'd think..."

McSweeney: "...willing to bring forward to affect these Home Rule units. That is what I'm trying to do is I'm trying to show that this is about revenue."

Zalewski: "Why do you think that the Constitution doesn't allow the General Assembly to affect Home Rule units of government?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

McSweeney: "Because Home Rule has certain powers based on population and based on... bent over backwards from property taxes all the way through... if you just like the traffic safety."

Zalewski: "Yeah but doesn't the Constitution... doesn't ..."

McSweeney: "So... so, Mike, hold on. My view is I do not support red-light cameras. I hope red-light cameras are banned everywhere. It's not about safety; it's about revenue. The Bill here today, which we have the power, will eliminate the red-light cameras in non-Home Rule units of government. This will put pressure on the Home Rule governments in my view to eliminate these cameras. Let's stand up for the people."

Zalewski: "No, it won't. No, it won't, David."

McSweeney: "I believe it will. Let's stand... let's stand up for the people. Let's stand up for our constituents. Let's eliminate these red-light cameras."

Zalewski: "David, you know as well as I do Home Rule units of governments are a different species compared to non-Home Rule units of government and all you will do, if this Bill were to become law, would create pressure on Legislators to follow up and do this again except this time the opposition would be from the Home Rule units of government and would be much more difficult to pass. That you just proved a point. This is a difficult, difficult vote for Members who have Home Rule units of government in their district. And it's very difficult for some of us to reconcile how they're going to have to vote on this. It puts us in a difficult position."

McSweeney: "And I understand that. Again, it..."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Zalewski: "So, from colleague to colleague, I know your mind is made up, I would just say to you going forward please, please think about the repercussions of these types of Bills in the future because they... they... we have big problems here to solve. And if we're going to do this in this fashion, it's going to make life very, very difficult going forward. I, again, I appreciate your zealous advocacy and I remain a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm not going to belabor all the... all the issues that we talked about. I rise in support of this legislation. I just want to mention a trucking company that received a red-light camera picture and a ticket and it was for a license plate that they hadn't owned for five years. There was a space between the numbers. If you have a police officer pulling somebody over looking at the license plate, I think you have somebody who has taken the time to do this. If it's from a red-light camera, you have somebody inputting data. I think there's... it's ripe with opportunity for people to be charged with something that they ... they didn't own and didn't do. I think when you have a real person doing this it makes more sense. And people who are charged that are innocent have to spend a lot of time going through the channels. They have to go to the Secretary of State to prove that they didn't have that driver's... that license plate and that they haven't had it for five years. I think it's ridiculous that these cameras can make that decision for us. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

DeLuca: "My name was used in debate."

Speaker Lang: "I thought I heard it. Go ahead, Sir."

DeLuca: "It was. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative McSweeney, can you help us out by giving an us idea... giving us an idea of which non-Home Rule communities that currently have cameras will lose them if this becomes law?"

McSweeney: "There are 35 villages and I can list them, I'll give you a copy right now. There are 35. Do you want me to read all 35? I'll read all 35. That is what is covered by the non-Home Rule units of governments in this state so."

DeLuca: "Okay."

McSweeney: "I believe that this is a first good step to eliminate the red-light cameras for across the state."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you. So, there's 35?"

McSweeney: "Yes."

DeLuca: "And do we have an idea of how many non-Home Rules are taking the red-light cameras under consideration for the future that may not have them now that this won't take it away from them but will prevent them in the future?"

McSweeney: "I'm not any... aware of any. In this environment, I would be shocked if anybody's considering putting red-light cameras. They're a failed experiment in this state. So, I do not know of any non-Home Rule units. As a matter of fact, I don't know of any units of government that are considering putting additional red-light cameras in."

DeLuca: "Okay. And are you able to tell us, explain to the Body, that if drivers are not violating the rules of the road where there's a red-light camera posted, how much revenue would be generated in those situations?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

McSweeney: "My view is this shouldn't be about revenue. It should be about safety. That's the problem with the red-light cameras is that it really has become about revenue, which shouldn't be the case. That's the problem in my view. It's not about safety. Again, look at the rear-end collisions, 22 percent increase. This is not improving safety for the citizens of the State of Illinois."

DeLuca: "Well, exactly. That's why I'm asking the question because I'm taking your point..."

McSweeney: "Right."

DeLuca: "...that if these are about revenue, many people have made the argument it's about revenue not safety..."

McSweeney: "Mmm mmm."

DeLuca: "...if the violators... if the drivers are not violating the rules of the road, where those red-light cameras are posted, how much revenue would be generated?"

McSweeney: "The revenue, in this case, is only generated because these red-light cameras which I believe are not improving safety. So, I don't understand your point. The point is very clear that's what's happening right now is this is not improving safety. What this is doing..."

DeLuca: "Okay. I'll try to ask it a different way, okay. I'll include..."

McSweeney: "...is actually increasing revenue. This is all about revenue. That's what it's all about."

DeLuca: "Okay. I'm glad you're saying that."

McSweeney: "It is."

DeLuca: "I'm glad you're saying that because..."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

McSweeney: "So, I'm kind of glad that you're acknowledging this is not about safety."

DeLuca: "I'll ask the question a different way. Is a tick you... is a ticket issued if there's no violation?"

McSweeney: "There have been many anecdotal cases we talked about. About people who have inched across the line, people who can't afford to take off work, people can't afford to challenge these tickets. We have a situation that you are guilty in this state under red-light cameras the way that things are set up unless you want to go ahead and challenge it and spend a day challenging \$100. That is why we should rely on the great police officers. They do such an outstanding job for us. That is their job and they do... and I praise the efforts of the chairman and all you've done for the City of Chicago with your police work."

DeLuca: "Okay. But this is what you're saying."

McSweeney: "But this should be... this should be about the police business. This should be about red-light camera..."

DeLuca: "Are you saying that it's your opinion... are you saying that it's your opinion that this is happin... happening pretty regularly?"

McSweeney: "Absolutely. Anecdotally, absolutely."

DeLuca: "So, you can re..."

McSweeney: "I... I believe that these red-light cameras are unreliable. I believe that..."

DeLuca: "Okay."

McSweeney: "...people feel that they are pro... are guilty even though they aren't because they don't want to take a day off from work to go to court and hire a lawyer. That's what the problem

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

is. If a police officer issues a ticket, I tra… I trust the police officers of this… this state."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. McSweeney...

Representative McSweeney. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I think the point was made even though the question wasn't answered. There is no violation... if there's no violation, there's no revenue. If there's no violation, there's no revenue because a violation takes place. So, if people weren't driving through a red light, if they weren't making a right turn on red when they're not supposed to, there would be no revenue. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Well, we had no lights and now we have four more.

Mr. Riley is recognized."

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

Riley: "Representative McSweeney, I'm sorry I didn't hear all of the debate because I've been off the floor. But let's sort of establish something. You know, we... we typically, you know, have our little mantras and our little chivalrous that we say. In this case, it's all about revenue. And I would say that's somewhat of a broad brush to paint against all the municipalities. Many of us, and I know you have experience in municipal government, saw when red-light cameras first came in and it was something I definitely was not enamored with myself, but in many jurisdictions, some of my own, some of these thoroughfares are like dragstrips. And for many jurisdictions, it was a method to try to control the speed of cars and that was a public safety issue. Now, of course, what happened over time was municipalities began to gain revenue.

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

And in a situation where they're about to lose that revenue, to the extent that they would have to make up whatever that amount of money is, I think that's the extent that it is a revenue issue. But beyond that it started out as and really is a safety issue. Now, these cameras just... these cameras do not issue the ticket. There is a police officer that looks at the video and makes the determination whether that was a... a violation or not. Would you... don't you agree with that?"

McSweeney: "What I trust and what'll answer your question is I trust police officers to be there on the spot, to make the determination and that is what the issue is."

Riley: "But that's not... that's not always the case."

McSweeney: "And the issue is... no and it will and it gets to your point, Leader, about dangerous intersections. Police officers and I have the complete faith and trust in the police officers of this state. I believe that if they are going to issue a ticket and they're there and they see it, it's part of their responsibility, that that is what they should be able to do. I don't think that red-light cameras are doing the job. That's... that's my concern."

Riley: "Well, let's... let's say this because we've got a lot of...
there's been a lot of conversation about them. As I say, I
was not enamored over them when they first came in. But one
of the things that many of us are prone to say and my own
little chivalrous, you know, something that I'm known for,
when someone says there's been a study... I've seen a study, I
say show it. Show me the study. You know, I've got a research
background. Show me the study; let's take a look at it.
Wouldn't you say that this is something that we really need

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

to do, that we need to study this whole use of red-light cameras, the technology, whether or not there's some arbitrary and capricious issuance of tickets? I mean, I think that there's a lot of things that we need to study rather than having a law that, to be honest with you, we talked about this in committee, sort of sets up a bipartheid system of municipalities. If you're of this type, you're okay, but if you're of this type, essentially not Home Rule, you're not. What would you say to... to a study being done of red-light cameras?"

McSweeney: "Well, I respectfully believe that there have been enough studies that have been done. I think it's time for action and that's why I'm pass... try to pass this Bill today.

And I'd appreciate your support."

Riley: "Well, unfortunately, you're not going to get it on this one. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Again, you've heard all of the debate. I think what happens is on these very visceral issues a lot of things are... are said, you know, it's revenue issue. I really don't think that it is. And I think that, again, we're setting up, you know, two classes of municipalities. We're pitting non-Home Rule and Home Rule communities against each other. I would ask you to join me in voting 'no' against this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We all know... we all have seen red-light cameras. We know about red-light cameras. We've been listening for about an hour to the debates about whether it's revenue or whether it's not revenue. I think another thing that we need to focus on that no one's really

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

been looking at is the administrative process. It was said by one of our colleagues that if there's no violation there's no revenue. I respectfully disagree with this because the way this legislation is set up it is completely stacked against the consumer. It's stacked against the citizen because it works like this. You may or may not violate any traffic law when the camera goes off. You receive a notice in the mail that says you have to show up at your town hall to fight against it. If you have the time to do that, you go up to your town hall. And what has happened is a bunch of kangaroo courts have been set up, they're not real judges and when you try to challenge these tickets, if you do anything, they say this isn't ... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, what I was saying is when you show up to your town hall to try to challenge these tickets, this is the process. There is a person who is not a judge who is over... preceding or presiding over proceeding. When you ask any questions, if the questions get too long, you are told this and I've seen this when I've been at these proceedings. Sir, Madam, this isn't a court of law. You're not here to cross examine the police officer. If you have a real issue, pay the fine here and take it to court. So, you do that. But this is why this legislation is needed. This is why the original legislation is faulty. To take it to court costs more money than the fine. Let me say it again. To take this to court costs more money to file the case than the actual fine you have to pay. There was some legislation yesterday talking about increasing court fees and the colleague said, you know, it's so expensive courts are prohibitively expensive for the everyday citizen. We have set

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

up a system that forces someone to pay... to pay a fine for something that they may think they didn't do. They have no real recourse in these kangaroo courts and if they want any real recourse, they have to pay more money than the fine. Who is going to do that? It's irrational. And it is not fair to the citizenry of Illinois. That is why this legislation is needed. Is it perfect? It is absolutely not perfect. It doesn't include Home Rule units. I have a Home Rule unit in my town that makes a lot of money off these cameras. I wish they would go away. Is this a start? It absolutely is a start. Is it the right thing to do? Absolutely. Is it good policy? Absolutely. Is it going to benefit the citizens of our state? Absolutely. Everybody should be voting 'yes' on this legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sosnowski: "I don't know if you have the answer to this, but I want to ask it. There was in previous debate a question of officer oversight. And this is the first I've heard of this. Do you know how that process actually works where the tickets are generated before they're sent out? Do some communities actually have an officer review every single ticket and then send them?"

McSweeney: "My understanding is that it's a different process.

There's no set standard process in the State of Illinois.

That's my understanding."

Sosnowski: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. My understanding and from many communities, though there may be some communities,

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

as the previous debater mentioned, that do that, but in the experiences that I've had or that I've overseen and witnessed, these tickets are automatically generated. automatically mailed. And there's no review of that before the person, the violator, actually receives that ticket. So, no officer views that. That may be a rare community that does that, but I don't believe that is the rule. And the biggest problem with the ticketing is, you know, I used to be a supporter of these many years ago and I thought they were great because it would reduce serious head-on collisions where deaths could occur or serious injury where a turn is made... a car is making a left hand turn. The problem is the vast majority of tickets are small, incidental things: going over the line, a slow roll to a right turn. Actually, you know, making a right turn without stopping. You know, all things that are nonviolent, you know, they don't cause accidents. They're not... they don't cause death, incidents of any sort. The vast majority of the tickets are those minor indiscretions which are revenue generating which is not the original intent of this... these cameras. They originally were intended and sold to prevent dangerous, deadly head-on collisions and this is the last thing they've done. The accidents, in many cases, are higher at these intersections 'cause you have more rear-end, small collisions that are happen 'cause people are slamming on the brakes to avoid getting a ticket and while one or two accidents may be less at that intersection, they're adding on these collisions. And it's just... the idea is bad. As the speaker mentioned, it's a failed experiment in Illinois. It doesn't make any sense and

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

we shouldn't be putting these up just to generate revenue. I please ask the whole Assembly to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney to close."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, please stand up for your constituents. Let's eliminate this failed experiment. Please vote 'yes' on this Bill."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Andrade, Arroyo, Feigenholtz, Golar, Kifowit, Lilly, Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And if you would be so kind as to indulge me, I have a number of groups that are here in the gallery with us today that have come to spend their day in Springfield and see the legislative process at its best. May I first introduce a group of women from McDonough County Republican Women led by their President Chris Myers, the wife of Representative Rich Myers and also, McDonough County Chair Mary Brookhart. Ladies, if you would stand to be recognized."

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

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Davidsmeyer: "I, too, have a group joining us today from Meredosia-Chambersburg High School. If you're in the gallery, I know you're spread out, would you please give us a wave. And I'd like a warm Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Thank you for joining us. Representative Hammond, I... it appears I cut you off too quickly. I apologize."
- Hammond: "That's quite all right, Mr. Speaker. I also have a group of fourth-grade students from Beardstown Grade School up in the gallery that have come to join us today. If we would welcome Beardstown's fourth grade."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome."

- Hammond: "And also, from Virginia High School... we are joined by some students from Virginia High School along with Jeff Bennett. Welcome to Springfield. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Happy you are here with us. Have you completed your announcements, Representative? Thank you. Mr. Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

- Davis, W.: "Certainly, Ladies and Gentlemen, as we work through our budgetary process and we understand that there are going to be some difficult times ahead, but to advocate for no cuts to higher education, I would like to welcome the students from Governor's State University, where I am an alumni, who are visiting with us today. Please welcome them to Springfield."
- Speaker Lang: "Happy you're here with us. Mr. Brady is recognized."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, too, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would like to acknowledge a couple groups that are here. And they are here today in the gallery. Students representing several Illinois universities including the university I represent, Illinois State University, who are down to participate in a Student Lobby Day. They should be commended for their participation of the public policy process and please join me in welcoming them to Springfield as well as the Illinois Board of Higher Education Student Government Association Board is here as well. So, please stand and be recognized for these students doing a great job in their efforts of lobbying. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to thank everyone for their help and participation at our Illinois Sportsman's Caucus event last night. It was absolutely amazing, couldn't have done it without your help. So, thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 75, Mr. Breen. Please read a portion of the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we recognize and show our support for the future National Desert Storm War Memorial in Washington, D.C.; and be it further

RESOLVED, That we designate the date of February 28, 2015 as Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm Day in the State of

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Illinois and urge the citizens of this State to honor those Illinois veterans who gave their lives serving their country during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to recognize that we had adopted this Resolution in a timely manner at the time designating that date of February 28 as Operation Desert Storm/Desert Shield Day. And two of the men who are integral in that... getting that Resolution going and helping to support the Desert Storm War Memorial in Washington, D.C., Anthony Bellin and Steve Fixler, who are retired Air Force and Army respectively, are up in the gallery. So, we just want to thank them for their efforts."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, gentlemen. Thank you. And this Resolution has already been adopted. Continuing down the Calendar, the next Bill will be House Bill 3217, Mr. Phelps. Out of the record. House Bill 3973, Mr. Phillips. Mr. Phillips. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3973, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phillips."

Phillips: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Basically, this is a Bill to prohibit universities from using state funds for commencement speakers and also, junior colleges in the State of Illinois. So, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on this. And I am ready for guestions. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Franks: "Representative, what's the genesis of this Bill?"

Phillips: "Well, under the current conditions of the State of Illinois and the fact that we're dropping 30 or proposing to drop 31 and a half percent of the appropriations for funding of universities and looking at some of the commencement speakers that are being paid 30 and 40 thousand dollars by the State of Illinois, I brought it upon myself to see if we couldn't figure a way to have private individuals pay for these commencement speakers like we're doing at Bushnell University. And that way we have more funding for other things."

Franks: "Well, how much does it cost?"

Phillips: "There is no cost."

Franks: "No. I mean, how much did we spend last year on this? I'd like to know."

Phillips: "Oh, I... you know..."

Franks: "I'd like to know how much you're claiming we're going to saving?"

Phillips: "Well, I have some ex... examples here. Some of these people that spoke were paid, at the University of Illinois, like 40... 40 thousand, some 50 thousand dollars."

Franks: "Who were these people?"

Phillips: "Okay. I don't know who these folks are, but I'll just give you some of the names. Is that all right?"

Franks: "Yeah. Give us the names and how much they were paid and when and which school."

Phillips: "Cokie Roberts at the University of Illinois, 2012, \$55 thousand. Do you know who she is?"

Franks: "Yes."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Phillips: "Okay. Very good. Mayor and I don't know how to pronounce it... Ange... Angelo, 2002, nearly \$100 thousand."

Franks: "In 2002?"

Phillips: "Yeah. That was 2002."

Franks: "Oh, Maya Angelou."

Phillips: "Maya Angelou, yes."

Franks: "Not a mayor? Maya Angelou?"

Phillips: "Maya Angelou."

Franks: "Okay."

Phillips: "Suze Orman in '09, \$40 thousand and up. And they go on and on, but you know, it's... it's a small way of biting into an elephant, you know. If you've got a better solution, I'm open to it."

Franks: "I'm just not sure this is a real big problem. I'm just wondering... Are we... are we paying the transportation and the lodging for these speakers? I mean, one of the things that's nice is we're able to bring in national folks. It brings the prestige of the universities up, which makes more people want to come which, you know, hopefully will put kids in the seats which will bring more revenue in. So, one of the things you do is you want to have big name speakers at schools. I mean, some people really expect that."

Phillips: "Well, you know, it'd seem to me that if it was a big deal, why wouldn't the universities be opponent... opposition to it? So, I don't... I don't know if what you're saying actually does work, but I guess, you can have that opinion."

Franks: "Well, I'm just wondering. I was wondering what the real numbers are because you've given up a couple of anecdotal things, I mean, three or four. Do you have any..."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Phillips: "Well, there's others at Southern. All of them are doing it so. And I understand it's a small amount of money..."

Franks: "Well, it's not just that."

Phillips: "...concerning to the millions and millions."

Franks: "I'm just won... I'm just wondering sometimes you spend money to make money. And if you're able to bring in a Maya Angelou, that's pretty big stuff."

Phillips: "Really? Has that been working for our universities?"

Franks: "Well, I think... I'm... I'm not here to defend the universities. I'm just trying to see how the best use of our tax dollars. Now, I'm just wondering if we bring somebody in, are we able to pay their travel fees? I'm not sure what this costs 'cause..."

Phillips: "Well, I'm not opposed to paying their travel fees.

That bill doesn't..."

Franks: "What does your Bill say though?"

Phillips: "It specifically says that... and we weren't able to complete the... but my Bill says that provides that the state university may only use private funding to pay an individual to deliver the commencement address."

Franks: "How do you define the commencement address?"

Phillips: "Well, you know, that's... that's going to be up to, you know, we're not going to micromanage them all to the point where they pay for their expenses."

Franks: "I know, but they might bring..."

Phillips: "I'm just talking about their commencement speech."

Franks: "...they might bring somebody else in the week before at some convocation instead of calling it commencement and pay them the same thing. I'm just not sure what you're trying to

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

achieve and whether this Bill will do it because another option that you say they... they can do it from private endowment funds, right?"

Phillips: "Well, yeah, exactly. And I... I would rather instead of working on this particular Bill there's other ways to try to save money for the universities and one of them would be the unfunded mandates that would come out of this Legislature."

Franks: "Oh, I couldn't agree more."

Phillips: "Yeah. I'm not going to... I'm not here to debate that.

This is just a simple way to start and if you're not for it,

I would suggest you vote 'no'."

Franks: "Well, I'm trying to get some answers though. I want to know what the real numbers are and I want to know if you... if there'd been any studies on whether there is any return on the investment if you have these type of speakers. I don't know. That's why I'm asking you 'cause I know it's your idea. I asked what the genesis was and I understand it's your idea and it's great to have new people in 'cause we get new... new ideas. But I want to make sure that the new ideas, they might sound good, but is there an unforeseen, unintended consequence here?"

Phillips: "Well..."

Franks: "So, what's the real cost? What did it cost us over the last five years?"

Phillips: "Well, what was the university that you graduated, Sir, if I may ask?"

Franks: "I graduated from the London School of Economics."

Phillips: "School of Economics. And I graduated from Eastern Illinois University. And you know, I guess what I'm saying is

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

there's so many individuals and we have several in this House that graduated and wants a full pool of private money to pay for the commencement speaker. So, it doesn't come out of appropriation fund so that we can have more money going to their athletics to... and used for the university."

Franks: "Sir, I'm not questioning that. I'm just... I've asked a very simple question. How much did it cost us over the last few years at each university?"

Phillips: "Well, I'm going to have to apologize. I don't have that right now, but I can get that to you."

Franks: "Well, it's your Bill. We need you to get that to us."

Phillips: "Okay."

Franks: "I mean, you're asking us to vote on an informed basis. You've given us a few anecdotes, but we don't have the information. I'll be happy... we have 'til Friday. You may wish to take it out of the record. Spend the day getting the information. I want to know who, what, where, when, why, how much each school... how much it was, whether there are any studies. I mean, you have a day or two to get that to us. If you'd be willing to take it out of the record, perhaps you'd be able to answer those questions and I presume most of my colleagues are going to have the same questions. And I'm not trying to defend any of the universities. I just want to know when I'm voting on things what I'm voting on."

Phillips: "I understand. And I'm not sure I could have all that information to you by Friday, but I'll be happy to pull it out of the record and at least try."

Franks: "I appreciate that. Thank you."

Phillips: "All right. Thanks."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman removes the Bill from the record. House Bill 3122, Mr. Pritchard. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3122, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Have we adopted the Amendment?"

Amendment 2?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 was adopted previously."

Pritchard: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill was brought to me by the Department of Defense because a number of our veterans, as they are discharged, whether they've served active duty or in the Guard, are having difficulty finding jobs. We, in State Government, have passed laws saying that agencies can have a preference for veterans. What this Bill does is extend that opportunity for private employers. This Bill is one that is of a concern across the country. Some 15 states have already passed laws allowing this, another 10 or so are considering it. And it's an area that's of concern because according to a study in 2012 some 64 percent of the veterans that are discharged are having difficulty finding jobs. So, I brought this Bill forward and quickly found that there was some concerns in the language that the Department of Defense had given us. So, I've worked with all of the known Sponsors in the interim which is the results that we have two Amendments on this Bill. The last one was brought to me and the heart of this language is the language that the Department of Human Rights have crafted to make very clear that there are protections against bias by public employees. This Bill clearly states that the veteran preference employment must be

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

a policy in writing that the veteran preference employment policy is publicly posted by the private employer at the place of employment or at any website managed by that private private employer's employer. Further, that the application forms indicate that the veterans' preference is a policy and that policy may be obtained from the company. And finally, that the private employer applies the veterans' preference uniformly to all employment decisions regarding the hiring or the promotion of the veterans. And it further states that the private employer must maintain this record and it has some protection about the veterans that have been discharged that they have been... appropriately served our country. I know there are concerns about bias that employers might have. We've tightened this as much as anyone has suggested. And if there are further suggestions, I would be happy to ask the Senate Sponsor to make those Amendments in the Senate. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "Representative, would you agree that part of the challenge with individuals who are having trouble finding jobs is because they don't have the appropriate skill sets? They lack skills to do so?"

Pritchard: "That's true and that's why we, as a state, support education, continuing education and many programs in our community colleges."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, when it comes to veterans, do you think that they lack skills when they leave the military?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Pritchard: "Depends on the kind of job they're looking at. I mean, that's why public employers and private employers want them because of their skill, their knowledge, their experience and their leadership."

Davis, W.: "Exactly. They leave the military with all of those qualities."

Pritchard: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "And there are still people in a lot of communities that are unable to get those types of skills and training opportunities if they don't go into the military."

Pritchard: "Well..."

Davis, W.: "So, that being said, then... then why do we create a veterans' preference when someone that comes out of a community that I serve doesn't have that sets of those skills and that training opportunity, but someone in the military they receive skills. They receive training when they come out, but we feel that they need help. When it comes to people in communities, be they African American or any other race or nationality, you try to say, well, is there a preference availability for them? You know, that's looked... that's frowned upon. But they lack what often people in the military have when they exit the military. So, why do we need a veterans preference when they leave with a skill, something marketable to employers? I mean, there's a lot of effort, you know... what was the last one... helmets to hardhats, recognizing that military personnel receive skills and training in a lot of different areas so when they leave the military they're already marketable. They already have skills. So, why do we

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

need to have a preference for someone that already has a skillset?"

Pritchard: "'Cause as I stated, 64 percent, in a recent survey, are unemployed. They can't find a job. So, we need to try to help someone who has served their country, risked their lives, uprooted their family situation and it is a duty that we feel as Americans for our veterans. I feel for your citizens who can't get a job, who have problems with skills and leadership experiences, that's why we have state programs. That's why I support the kind of training you're talking about in our community colleges."

Davis, W.: "What's... what's happening to these programs under the current budgetary conversations? What's happening to a lot of these training programs that you're referring to?"

Pritchard: "I haven't looked up each one of them, but I would imagine everything is taking cuts."

Davis, W.: "Yeah. If..."

Pritchard: "And that will be a discussion that we have in a Appropriations Committees..."

Davis, W.: "Taking cuts."

Pritchard: "...and the vote here on the floor."

Davis, W.: "They're taking cuts or they're being zeroed out. So, again, those programs that you make reference to either will be severely limited or not even in existence coming with this particular budget. That is a strong possibility unless we're taking about revenue, which I know sometimes is a bad conversation, but that notwithstanding. So, again, are you... again, when you say they're unemployed, unemployment is rampant in a lot of communities. Are we creating preferences

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

for those individuals with employers? We're not because people will say, well, you know, they need to go figure out... figure it out on their own. Again, with military personnel, they already leave with a skill, something that makes them marketable to an employer. Now, I can't speak to why the private sector has decided not to employ them. You know, that's a question I really would like to ask them, whether it's military personnel or you know, just the average individual who is seeking a job. You know, we hear a lot of stories about the manufacturing community. Their... their workforce is aging out, but I can't ... I have trouble getting them to recognize high school students that are graduating from high school, students who have aptitude with their hands will be great in manufacturing community, someplace where they can work for a very long time, earn a good career, good salary and support a family, but getting them to look at this sector of individuals is tough. So, sometimes I wonder, you know, from the employment side as much as they talk about the need for more people, you know, whether or not they really want people. Again, that notwithstanding, but if we're talking about a group of people that are unemployed, there are a lot of sectors that are unemployed. And so, I struggle with this particular one because, again, we're talking about a group of individuals that have a skill set when they leave. But yet, we're going to give them, just because they're out of the military, an extra bump above someone else who may even have the same skill set, but because they're out of the military, I struggle with that. So, I'm just really trying to understand why do we need to do something like this?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Pritchard: "Because the employees that have... or excuse me... the veterans that have these skills aren't able to be singled out by the employer because that would be discrimination. So, these kinds of State Laws have been put in place to allow the employer to prefer a veteran with those skills. And this could be all nationalities and races and sex."
- Davis, W.: "So... so, this is to circumvent discrimination?"
- Pritchard: "With a very defined description."
- Davis, W.: "Well, but the only difference is honorable discharge from the military versus everything else."
- Pritchard: "No. No, no, no, no. It's a public policy that the company has adopted and advertised very broadly and is applying very consistently..."
- Davis, W.: "But... but you..."
- Pritchard: "...to all kinds of employment and promotions throughout their company."
- Davis, W.: "But it... it sounded like you said that they need to be kind of separated out and that anything other than that would be discrimination."
- Pritchard: "Correct."
- Davis, W.: "So, you're... so, you're saying we need to separate them from everyone else?"
- Pritchard: "In this particular case."
- Davis, W.: "Is that... and that you're not... it sounds like you're circumventing what would other... why it would be a discriminatory act and you're saying that..."
- Pritchard: "That's why we have relied very heavily on the language that was supplied by the Department of Human Rights."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Davis, W.: "Okay, Representative. Very briefly to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I know that this is a touchy subject because to the extent in which people who have come out of the military, many of which are in this chamber, you know, we appreciate everything they did. I did not go to the military, you know, that was not a choice that I decided to make, but we appreciate those that make that choice and went and sacrificed themselves, their lives, their families to give me the freedom to stand here as a Representative. And I appreciate that and applaud that, but sometimes I think to the extent in which we use that as a way to promote someone above someone else is a little ... is a little bit challenging. Now, I don't always advocate for a 'no' vote on a Bill and I'm not saying you should vote 'no', but certainly I'm just challenged with the idea that this is a way I think... and this is my interpretation of what the Sponsor says... a way to circumvent discrimination. So, instead of being discriminatory, then we'll just say here's a veterans' preference and identify a separate... separate group of people. I would just encourage us not to... not to pass this kind of legislation. Again, we're further separating and creating designations of different categories of people probably at a time that we don't need to do that where we all need to be together. We need to coalesce; we need to give everybody an equal opportunity at a job for those employers that are willing to hire and this creates an unequal situation in my opinion. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I do... I support veterans and I believe all of us in this room respect and admire and hold in reverence those who have served in any branch of our government... or our government service. But I don't think it's wise to tell a businessman that you have to hire the veteran over perhaps the more qualified individual. I think, as we talk about business suffering in the State of Illinois, we need to allow that businessman to make the choice that is the very best for his business. I've heard from other entities, in fact, entities in our... in our place right here, CMS. There were certain things they could not do because of veteran preference. I heard from universities that their budgets are really suffering because of free tuition to veterans. And some of them are saying it is really harming their budget. I do believe that veterans should be honored. I believe we should give them their just due, but I don't think we should exclude other people because, for whatever reason, they didn't serve in the Army or the Navy. Some people didn't serve because of their vision problem. Some people didn't serve because of their family situation, but they would have served had they had an opportunity. Should we give a preference to those who've been police officers? Should we give a preference to those who have perhaps had major server ... surgery and re... you know, recuperated? I just think that we should allow private business to expand, to promote their hiring practices to the best of that company's ability. I agree wholeheartedly with my colleague, Representative Will Davis, who gave this point very much more eloquently than I could ever do. But I do think you are ... your attempt is good,

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

but I don't think that you're solving a problem. I think you're creating a problem for business owners that they really don't deserve. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Just to be clear about this Bill. This Bill is a voluntary measure for certain employers. Is that correct?"

Pritchard: "It's a voluntary Bill for any private sector employer."

Ives: "Okay. And this Bill in no way says that these... these newly
identified individuals get any veterans job credit. Is that
correct?"

Pritchard: "Correct."

Ives: "Okay. 'Cause we already have that in place for veterans that they receive a veterans job credit. We also have that in place for ex-felons. We also have job credits for all sorts of other reasons. So, that doesn't have anything to do with this Bill, right?"

Pritchard: "Correct. And what you're speaking of with credits is more for the public sector rather than the private sector."

Ives: "Okay."

Pritchard: "So, what we want to do is extend the policy decisions that we've made for public sector employers to the private sector."

Ives: "Okay. And it's pretty common these days to see a businesses that have... they call themselves veteran-owned businesses and I believe we even look to that in terms of awarding contracts. Is that correct?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Pritchard: "I believe so, yes."

Ives: "I believe that's true too."

Pritchard: "Yeah."

Ives: "So, we're very good with our veterans in the State of Illinois, but what we fail to realize, and this really goes to the heart of the Bill, we fail to realize that when you're a veteran, when you've served in the military, and especially if you are a wounded or a disabled veteran, it's your family that has taken on that entire responsibility of also protecting and defending our nation. It's your family. It's your spouse who has to move tour after tour after tour who could not establish herself in a solid profession, who then now finds herself with a disabled veteran soldier who served so that we could be here and do the peoples' business. And it is that that we are asking or allowing private employers to set up a nondiscriminatory policy that simply says we are also going to recognize the sacrifices of that military family that served our country. Is that correct? Representative Pritchard, would you say that that sums up this Bill?"

Pritchard: "Yes. And this is to the point that was mentioned earlier that we honor and respect what a veteran has done. Well, let's put that into action and that's what we're trying to do with this Bill. Words can sometimes be hollow. So, we're trying to allow employers to voluntarily show a preference, but again, under very confined and restricted conditions."

Ives: "This is a great Bill. I highly encourage everybody, everybody who has a member in the military should be supporting this, everybody who respects military families and

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

the sacrifices they make should support this Bill. I highly urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. I think there's something that we're all missing here and that is there are a higher percentage of minorities in the military than the percentage they represent in our country. I'll say that again. There's a higher percentage of minorities in the military than the percentage they represent in our country. This, in fact, is a pro veteran Bill. It's also a pro minority Bill. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point was just made, but I want to reemphasize, Ladies and Gentlemen, we already have veterans preferences in public employment. It's been working well. We know that has been working well. This is a Bill that if an employer would like to have this preference they can so choose. This is not a mandate. This does not mandate any private employer to engage in this type of preferential treatment of veterans. I certainly hope some would, but once again, this is not a mandate. This is only if they choose to do it, 'shall' not 'may'. Let's move this forward. Please vote for the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I commend the Gentleman for bringing forth this legislation, but with all due respect, the veterans that I talked to all the time they would prefer to have the preference elsewhere. They would prefer to have the preference in regards to their health care.

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

They would prefer to have the preference in regards to helping their families as far as education is concerned, as far as job training is concerned, as far as being respected for the services in which they gave to their country. Right now, the average veteran, there's a long waiting list for them to get their health care. There's a long waiting list for them to get the housing assistance that they so desperately need. There's a waiting list for their family to get help. So, if we want to give them preferences, let's not make it only in this particular section as far as employment. As the previous speaker spoke and said, they do already have preferences. But let us give them respect and preference where they need it the most in regards to their health as well as their livelihood. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Gordon-Booth: "Representative, would you agree that based on some of the commentary that we have shared today, would you be amenable to working with us in the Senate to add an Amendment that might ease some of the hostility towards this Bill?"

Pritchard: "As I said in the introduction, I certainly would be amenable to that. I'm not sure what that language would be because it hasn't been suggested yet, otherwise, it would be a part of the Bill."

Gordon-Booth: "So, are you amenable?"

Pritchard: "Yes, yes, yes."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard to close."

36th Legislative Day

- Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I know we have an issue with minority bias in our country and I certainly would support efforts to try to reduce that. But in this particular case, what we're doing is trying to narrowly carve out an area that would honor those that have risked their lives and served our country. I think it's part of the package of respect that we should have. And I will continue to work, as has been mentioned here, to make this a Bill that doesn't lead to unnecessary discrimination."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Durkin, Evans, Mitchell. Mr. Durkin, Mr. Evans, Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3303, Representative Reaves-Harris. You ready on this Bill, Representative? Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3303, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Reaves-Harris."
- Reaves-Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would amend the Freedom of Information Act. Currently, if there's an investigation involving a juvenile, those records... excuse me... while the investigation is taking place, those records are exempt from being disclosed. However, once the investigation is concluded, the records become FOIAable. This would extend that protection be indefinitely."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

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? Crespo, Durkin, Franks, Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Welch: "I'd just like to take a quick moment to recognize some hardworking students from my district from River Forest, Dominican University, the Student Government Association and the First in Family Club of Dominican University. Let's give them a Springfield welcome, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Happy you're here with us. Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A moment for personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Gordon-Booth: "I, too, would like to ask the robust Body in here to give a warm welcome to the wonderful students from Peoria, Illinois, attending Manuel High School, Richwoods High School and Woodruff High School. Thank you for being here."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Hope you're enjoying it here in the House of Representatives. Mr. Sims is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have on the floor joining me today just swung down from my district office and was working

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

hard back there but came down here to see how we do things in Springfield. Join me in giving a warm Springfield ra... welcome to A.J. Burse."

Speaker Lang: "Hello. Thanks for showing up today with us.

Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you. I rise, again, for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Wallace: "As many of you know, I'm a single mother and this job can sometimes be quite stressful on the family. But I'm just rising to recognize my younger sister, Ivy Wallace, who does a lot of the duties for my son while I'm here in Springfield. And I just want to say hi to Ivy and a round of applause for all the working families in the gallery."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Moving on to House Bill 2555, Representative Reaves-Harris. Do you wish to move this Bill, Representative? Please read the Bill."

Reaves-Harris: "Sorry. No, could you hold it."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record. House Bill 3764, Representative Scherer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3764, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House.

Today I'm presenting House Bill 3764 would change... save the state money by selling underutilized state vehicles. As many of you know, this is an issue that's come before the General Assembly several times but has faced many delays. I've worked closely with Members of the State Government Committee as

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

well as CMS to put forth an amended Bill that the state's vehicles not used at least 7 thousand miles during the previous fiscal year that are not used for emergency or heavy duty use or were purchased in the middle of the year must be sold or redis... redistributed. The Bill also lays out a process of what will happen if agencies continue to fail to report their usage data to CMS. I ask for an 'aye' vote. And I'm available for questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Sue, can you kind of just go through what the ultimate idea here is to do? Just so we know what the end game of your Bill purposes to achieve."

Scherer: "Absolutely. The end game is that the Auditor General ruled in 2011 that a car that was not used at least 7 thousand miles was not cost-effective. So, the end game here is to save the state money."

Sandack: "And the idea is to have good fleet management and efficient fleet management so that we get the cars and the vehicles we need on the road and ones that we don't need and are inefficient off the road."

Scherer: "Absolutely."

Sandack: "Thank you. Appreciate it."

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? Gordon-Booth, Willis. Gordon-Booth. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'present'.

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1646, Mr. Sosnowski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1646, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on House Bill 1646 Sosnowski: to do with elimination tournaments. which legislation would allow for elimination tournaments to come back to Illinois while ensuring adequate safety measures for all the participants involved. Many venues and mayors across the state are in support of this. Many of you may recognize this. They were previously known and had many bouts in the State of Illinois under the 'tough man' logo. Many venues including Rockford, Villa Park, Moline and Peoria and in others around the state had expressed an interest in support of this. I will point out, as many of the analysis probably state, there are a couple of concerns with the legislation in regards to the department. I have agreed with them that, you know, I want to continue to work with them on this, see what we can fix as far as the regulation to clean up any of the language. Just with time, we're going to continue to work on that in the Senate. Many of these tournaments, as many of you are familiar, occur right now such as the Battle of the Badges in Chicago, which is coming up soon. Those are geared more towards nonprofit. Fighters aren't allowed to receive any... any prize money as part of it. This would make this more of a professionally regulated opportunity where prize... prizes could be given. The fights are happening now. The same types

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

of fights, same types of regulation and safety would be part of this. I would ask for an 'aye'... 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Riley: "But Representative, why is this Bill really needed? I mean, wouldn't this come under the… the current statute dealing with boxing and mixed martial art contests? What's the difference?"
- Sosnowski: "This is in a slightly different form. It's kickboxing, more of an amateur status. Again, these fights actually occur right now and they're permitted on a not-for-profit basis. Really, when you fundamentally look at it, the major change is just the allowance of a prize to the winning fighters. Currently, right now, there's no statute that's set up to allow for that."
- Riley: "So, this would be what? Would this be analogous to... you know, there are karate tournaments every weekend that are done on an amateur basis. And so, this would be similar to that except for it allows prizes?"
- Sosnowski: "Yeah. Very... very similar to the amateur fighting, different type of fighting, but yeah, very similar and it would allow for prizes."
- Riley: "Okay. I'm having a hard time... I'm not going to vote against your Bill, but under MMA, myriad types of styles, Muay Thai and taekwondo. I mean, you know, there's myriad styles that are involved in MMA. So, I'm just trying to find the difference. You know, what are we doing with this Bill?

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

What... what's the difference between this and what's already going on?"

Sosnowski: "Currently..."

Riley: "What..."

Sosnowski: "...currently, according to my understanding, within the State of Illinois the only two types of fighting that are regulated are mixed martial arts and boxing."

Riley: "Boxing."

Sosnowski: "And so, you've got those two right now. This doesn't fall within one of those categories because it's more of a kickboxing amateur fight. So, as it's re... it's not regulated right now. It's allowed in the not-for-profit area or in the sport for fun, as I... as I mentioned in the Battle of the Badges which happens in Chicago. But there are other fights and tournaments that happen. It's just most go to other states because fighters, you know, want to participate. It's not a, you know, necessarily their full income, but they want to be able to, you know, make money if they're victorious in these. And right now, the way they're allowed to exist there is no prize money as part of it; whereas, with boxing and mixed martial arts those are allowed."

Riley: "Thank you."

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? Franks, Borden... Gordon-Booth. Mr. Franks. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 3592?"

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3592 is on the Order of Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Please place that on the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Now, we have a few cleanup matters, Members. First, House Bill 2933, Mr. Stewart. Out of the record. House Bill 3323, Mr. Acevedo, on Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3323, a Bill for an Act concerning the environment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3323 requires that the IEPA and IDOT rules requiring the use of certified industry professionals when conducting corrosion prevention projects on public water supplies or bridge infrastructure. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "I'm sorry, Representative. I was away from the... from hearing you. Can you explain your Bill a little bit, please?"

Acevedo: "Basically, what they're trying to do, they're trying to get certified... you have to be certified in order work on these jobs. To work..."

Sandack: "And what jobs are we talking about?"

Acevedo: "To work I'm talking about bridges, bridges and roadwork."

Sandack: "Okay. And I see..."

Acevedo: "It's... it's... this is for corrosion prevention projects."

Sandack: "Okay."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Acevedo: "That's what it's for."

Sandack: "All right. And at least in my... the analysis I have it says the IEPA opposed the legislation. Are they still opposing it?"

Acevedo: "No. What happened was yesterday we had... added an Amendment and it's come to an agreement now. The Amendment will be added once it's in the Senate."

Sandack: "I thank you. One more question, Representative. Are there any other opponents with the Amendment you... you've added to your Bill? Is anyone..."

Acevedo: "Not that I know of."

Sandack: "Thank you."

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? Ammons, Conroy, Frese. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Flowers. Your light was on, Representative. The Lady does not wish to speak. House Bill 3840 on the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3840, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Sims, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Floor Amendment #1 changes the... the title of the

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Bill and changes the title of the task force. It's no longer the Economic... Red Line Task Force. It's the Equal Opportunity... Equal Economic Opportunity Task Force and it also places the task force within the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity talking about various economic opportunities in local communities."

- 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. House Bill 3841, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3841, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Sims, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

- Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3841, the Amendment addresses concerns that were raised by interested parties. We've... we've agreed to continue to work on the Bill in the Senate, but the Amendment effectively removes opposition from the State Police and the Department of Public Health by adding specific requirements for when the individuals can be transferred or what individuals will be responsible for applying for background checks."
- 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."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. We have several Bills now on the Order of Second Reading, Members. If you have a Second Reading Bill that might be on this list, please pay attention for your name. First, House Bill 3510, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3510, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Phelps, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps on the Amendment. Do you wish to withdraw the Amendment, Mr. Phelps?"
- Phelps: "I... Mr. Speaker, I handed the Bill over to Representative Ammons, so I wasn't in committee the other day. So, I think she did the Amendment for me."
- Speaker Lang: "So, Representative Ammons, is this your Amendment?" Ammons: "Yes, Sir."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed on your Amendment."
- Ammons: "Thank you. This Amendment just really extends the period of time necessary for long-term care subcommittees to create their reporting. And I ask for a support vote on this."
- 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. House Bill 3573, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3573, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ammons, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "I'm holding it on a Second, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "What... what do you wish to do with the Amendment?"

Ammons: "We can adopt the Amendment for right now. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Please explain the Amendment."

Ammons: "The Amendment just changes the language and increase...
includes persons, carnivals and fairs in the dying of fish as
well as hermit crab."

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: "Please hold that on the Order of Second Reading,
Mr. Clerk. House Bill 494, Representative Cassidy.

Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 494, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No... Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Cassidy, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy on the Amendment."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment 2 represents agreement with the State Board of Education on the appropriate time frames and prior crimes that... that people could have committed in their past and the amount of time that should pass between those events in their

36th Legislative Day

- lives and the opportunity to seek employment in school systems. And I ask that it be adopted."
- 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. House Bill 3529, Mr. Demmer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3529, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Demmer, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment 3 just clarifies the supplies the folks who are on a Medicaid spenddown plan. I ask for its adoption."
- 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. House Bill 735, Mr. DeLuca. Mr. DeLuca. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 735, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative DeLuca, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."
- Clerk Hollman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt House Floor Amendment #1. And this brings municipalities more in

36th Legislative Day

- line with the state in regards to how they advertise spending taxpayer money. I ask for the adoption."
- 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. House Bill 2513, Mr. Evans. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2513, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4013, Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. House Bill 1004, Mr. Ford. Mr. Ford. Out of the record. House Bill 3240, Mr. Fortner. Mr. Fortner. Out of the record. House Bill 2791, Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2791, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Lilly."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly on Amendment 2."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 2 basically changes the departments from DCEO to Divisions of Children and Family Services and it broadens the scope of the study to include general barriers to paying child support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

  Mr. Clerk."

36th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Lilly and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly on Amendment 3."
- Lilly: "Amendment 3 provides that the Division of Child Support will perform the study. It eliminated any opposition from the Department of DCEO. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 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. House Bill 3324, Representative Christian Mitchell. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3324, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 500, Representative McDermed. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 500, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1, 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed... or excuse me, Representative Zalewski on Amendment 1."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative McDermed and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."
- McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 restores to the Bill the requirement that the consent order resulting in a fine exceeding \$10 thousand, suspension or revocation must be approved by the entire board and the secretary and not just one member. And I ask for approval."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative McDermed and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."
- McDermed: "House Amendment #... the Floor Amendment #3 states that a dentist using assistants in terms of administrating nitrous oxide or general anesthetic shall be on-site and available and not supervise more than four such assistants. I ask for approval."
- 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. House Bill 184, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 184, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 4 and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Nekritz."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz on Amendment 4."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment... I'll just explain them both together. Floor Amendments 4 and 5 remove the opposition of the... the pediatricians and the Hospital Association and are an effort to try to bring the Department of Public Health on board by limiting the amount of information they have to disseminate."
- 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: "Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Nekritz."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz explained that Amendment already. Those in favor of the Amendment will vote 'yes'... 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. House Bill 3398, Mr. Phelps. Out of the record. House Bill 3126, Mr. Pritchard. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3126, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Representative Pritchard, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill simply has more precise language in it about some of the national racing competitions that we have and trying to give exemptions for those that were excluded of the original law that we passed given the fact that these races are all highly insured and registered with the Department of Natural Resources."

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. House Bill 3123, Mr. Pritchard.

Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3123, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Pritchard, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill is simply trying to make it permissible for school counselors and social workers to serve the needs, special needs, of our students. And it would allow the counselors to do some of the duties that they already do in some schools on a broader basis. I would ask for your support."

36th Legislative Day

- 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. House Bill 3622, Representative Barbara Wheeler. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3622, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Barbara Wheeler, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler."
- Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask that we approve
  Amendment #2 which simply removes... replaces the word
  'managed' with the word 'owned'."
- 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. House Bill 3251, Representative Winger. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3251, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Winger, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Winger."
- Winger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Amendment does is it simply names the Department of IDOT as having the management

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- of the complaint database rather than specifying a department within IDOT which was the Department of Aeronautics."
- 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: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 3240, Mr. Fortner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3240, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Fortner, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."
- Fortner: "Floor Amendment 1 is agreed language between the Department of Natural Resources and the Farm Bureau to set the fines at no more than two times the amount of permit fee."
- Fortner: "I move for its adoption."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the..."

- Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Sir, I didn't mean to cut you off. Those in favor of your 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. House Bill 1004, Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1004, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was a second time on a previous day. Amend... Floor Amendment #2 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Ford, has been approved for consideration."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. It's a simple technical Amendment and it simply states that individuals in medical settings can make the HIV testing a part of the regular consent form for routine health screenings. I move for the adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendments is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. But a fiscal note has been requested on the Amendment and not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "House Bill 3766, Representative Scherer. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Please hold the Ford Bill on Second Reading. So, 3766, Scherer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3766, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Scherer."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer."
- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House.

  I would adop... request now that we adopt House Floor Amendment

  1 and 2."
- Speaker Lang: "Have to tell us something about the Amendment."
- Scherer: "Act... Okay. So, House Floor Amendment 2 is what we're working on and all it does is change the effective date. It just clarifies it."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Scherer, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer, Amendment 2."
- Scherer: "Okay. Amendment 2 clarifies the effective date."
- Speaker Lang: "Well, then what did Amendment 1 do, Representative?"
- Scherer: "And... and Amendment 1 was the one that took out... originally, this Bill covered large corporations. So, Amendment 1 took out large corporations and changed the amount to \$150 for small companies."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of Amendment 2 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. House Bill 1015, Mr. Verschoore.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1015, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments are approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3271, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, out of the record. Hou... Moving to Third Readings, Representatives. The first Bill on this Order would be House Bill 3215, Representative Bourne. Please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3215, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of the Department of Natural Resources that would allow the department to notify operators of abandoned wells that are leaking salt water, gas or oil. Also, by newspaper posting and by posting it at the wells rather than just giving them the alternative of sending it to the last known address. I would be open to any questions on the Bill."

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? McAuliffe, Meier, Poe. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "House Bill 3197, Representative Chapa LaVia. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3197, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Speaker, you look really nice today."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Chapa LaVia: "So, do you, Lou. House Bill 3197 creates... the Amendment itself to the Bill created an Attendance Commission with the Illinois State Board of Education to study recommendations that we had found through, not only Chicago in the work that I've done last year with the task force, but

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

an ongoing task force to help consult not only the City of Chicago but the entire state on absenteeism and tardiness. I'll take any questions."

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

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Linda, we talked about this in committee and it was pretty extensively discussed. At its core, what is it you're trying to have accomplished with this commission?"

Chapa LaVia: "Are you soft talking 'cause I didn't hear one word you said?"

Sandack: "What is it... I'm... I'll talk louder. Is that better?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yes."

Sandack: "What is it your goal that this commission undertake? What is it you're trying to accomplish?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, there's a couple. And you know, during my... we did a subject hearing matter in education because we want to go further with it. There is a couple issues especially in the special ed arena and the amount of time kids miss there. There is issues in high minority, high poverty areas on kids getting to school. There's a lot of issues that come up. And what we see and find if a kid misses more than eight days of school their chances of retaining or going on to the next level are cut down by like 56 percent. And what you find in a high minority, high poverty districts is that we're not tending to the kids' needs the way we should to make sure they become productive citizens in the State of Illinois. So, what it would do is help the different school districts in

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

coming up with best practices from around the state and how we can implement them to get kids to school earlier."

Sandack: "That's what I was going... hoping you'd say. Last question. Someone mentioned in committee that there is an ongoing committee right now meeting with the state as to some aspects of truancy?"

Chapa LaVia: "I think it was the bilingual committee that we..." Sandack: "That's it."

Chapa LaVia: "...we started, but the p-20 committee, as we're speaking right now, which I happen to be an honorary member, but Leader Currie is on that... that leadership on p-20. It's... it's now become an interesting bureaucracy, right? Everybody knows what everybody's doing within that circle, but we don't get the information. So, this is really... goes to the heart of things about getting the kids' bottoms in the seats, making sure that they're learning and they're becoming... they're graduating on time and being able to be a productive citizen of the state."

Sandack: "Last question. Thank you for your answers. Is there an end date when this commission has to conclude its work and report out?"

Chapa LaVia: "No. This would be an ongoing commission."

Sandack: "Good. I'm still voting for it..."

Chapa LaVia: "Wait, wait. Wait a minute, I stand corrected."

Sandack: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "Twenty... 2020."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. And I ask for affirmative votes."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3197 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 yourself. Warren, Brady, Bryant, Bellock, Currie. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3197, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1485, Representative Brown. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1485, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1485 amends the Illinois Parentage Act to provide that an administrative determination of parentage can be challenged on the basis of fraud, duress or material mistake of fact. There is an Amendment coming over in the Senate offered up by DHFS which will neutralize all opposition. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote. Happy to take any questions."

Speaker Turner: "And we have Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, why is DHFS opposed?"

Brown: "Actually, we have a Senate Amendment which removes their opposition. We weren't able to get their language together by deadline, so they've come forward with that language. I'm happy to adopt their language."

Franks: "What... what is their opposition at this point to the language and what is the language that will be adopted?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Brown: "Well, the shock work carried this through committee and so, their opposition persisted through committee. We determined we'd work it out with them. I think their changes are very minute."

Franks: "I just want to know... I'm not sure... is it a technical change or just... This is a pretty significant change in the law for the statute of limitations from two to five years, correct?"

Brown: "Incorrect. We didn't adopt that Amendment. It remains at two years."

Franks: "Oh, it is. That's what I was trying..."

Brown: "Correct."

Franks: "That... I'm trying to figure out what the Bill does?

Because you're telling us it's agreement, I don't know what

it does. Because you said there's some minor changes, but I

don't know what they are. So, what does the Bill do?"

Brown: "So, as the Bill sits, it allows for administrative determination based on fraud. For my constituent in particular, we had a DNA test that was brought forward after there was a court determination that this... this gentleman was the father, came up with a DNA challenge 14 years prior to that... or after that, actually. And it wasn't able to be accepted in courts at that point in time."

Franks: "So, you're not changing the statute of limitations on this? It's not going to be increased?"

Brown: "Correct."

Franks: "Just one moment. I'm told by my learned counsel that this may allow for an appeal directly to the courts which we don't have presently. Would that be an accurate statement?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Brown: "That's correct."

Franks: "Okay. So, there is still procedural safeguards?"

Brown: "Absolutely."

Franks: "Okay."

Brown: "And as I mentioned previously, there's going to be no opposition to this Bill once we adopt the Amendment over in the Senate."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brown to close."

Brown: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The ques... the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1485 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1485, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2580, Representative Costello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2580, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. So, currently, highway commissioners may permanently post a road at a lower weight limit with no input from the public or from any other public official. House Bill 2580 seeks to create a system of checks and balance. It requires, before a highway commissioner could permanently post a road at a lower weight limit, he must first conduct a public hearing. After that, he must file a memorandum with the road district clerk explaining

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

the decision and answering questions that came up during that hearing. Then the county highway superintendent would either sign off agreeing or disagreeing with this. The township officials are neutral on this Bill as of now. I thank you. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2580 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 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2580, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3670, Representative Davidsmeyer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3670, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "This... this Bill simply says that current... current law says that if you're involved in an accident on the road and a fatality occurs that your driver's license is immediately revoked without any due process or anything. This simply changes that and says you have 90 days from the time the Secretary of State mails out a letter notifying you that your license will be revoked before it will actually be taken away. So, it gives you the time to... to go through the process and file an appeal to make sure they understand the circumstance of the actual accident. So, I'm more than willing to answer any questions. And I move for its passage."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, I see that the Secretary of State is opposed."

Davidsmeyer: "They are now. This is actually their Amendment, the Amendment we added. Originally... actually, let me grab this here. The original Bill changed... changed the word 'proximate' to 'direct cause'. And they wanted to leave that 'proximate cause' because the 'direct cause' would mean that your car actually, you know..."

Franks: "Right."

Davidsmeyer: "...caused. So..."

Franks: "It would be a higher standard. It would make it more difficult to revoke."

Davidsmeyer: "So, the Secretary of State actually came back to me and said let's leave that word 'proximate' in there and we'll change it from an immediate, you know, immediately revoking your license to 90 days. And that was their agreement."

Franks: "Okay."

Davidsmeyer: "So, they are now neutral."

Franks: "So, that... Okay. So, we will still be maintaining the standard of a 'proximate cause'..."

Davidsmeyer: "Correct."

Franks: "...for the 'direct cause'?"

Davidsmeyer: "Correct."

Franks: "So, the only change is requiring the Secretary of State to actually notify someone of their revocation?"

Davidsmeyer: "No. They currently notify, but it gives you basically a week from the time they mail out that letter. It

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

doesn't give you any time to react or appeal or anything of that sort. So, I think... I think this just gives... gives a person the due process that they need to... to go through it."

Franks: "And how much time will this Bill give them now?"

Davidsmeyer: "Ninety days."

Franks: "And right now, how much do they have?"

Davidsmeyer: "A week..."

Franks: "Okay."

Davidsmeyer: "...five days."

Franks: "All right. And the Secretary of State's okay with this?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "They... they wrote it for me."

Franks: "Thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer to close."

Davidsmeyer: "I appreciate the opportunity to continue work on this through committee. And I move for its passage."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3670 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? Guzzardi, Jones, Tryon. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 91 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3670, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3497, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3497, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is an initiative of the Capital Development Board. Over the last 10 years, we have given CDB the opportunity to experiment with the use of single prime contracting rather than multiple prime contracting. And what we've discovered is that we are able significantly to reduce change orders and legal claims thus saving the state money. Second, under single prime we are meeting the goals of minority and female participation which we do not do as well under the multi-prime approach. In addition, today 48 states, the Federal Government, the City of Chicago, practically every private contractor uses single prime not multiple prime. So, under this Bill, CDB will have the opportunity to continue using multiple primes, but they also would have the opportunity to move to single prime contracting. That opportunity would last for five years and I think it is time for Illinois to move into the 21st century and give our construction program the opportunity to save money, to be responsive to the interest, the needs of minority groups. This Bill has the support of many organizations that are involved in contracting and that would include... that includes the AFL-CIO, the American Institute of Architects, the U.S. Minority Contractors Association, the African-American Contractors Association and the AFL-CIO. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd be grateful for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Sandack: "Representative, outside the chambers I was given a sheet by the Associated Builders and Contractors of Illinois who tell me they oppose. They like the concept for large projects, but they... they say, and I'd like your response, that to require all state contracts to be bid under a single prime may have a profound... I'm using their words... negative affect on minority, female, and merit shop construction contractors. What would your reply be?"

Currie: "My response would be that that's flat out wrong. That, in fact, I believe under simple prime there are more opportunities for minority and female bidders. The... the experiment that we have done over the last 10 years shows that we do a better job at CDB at meeting those goals for minority and female participation under single prime than we do under multi-prime. There's another inaccuracy in those ... letter you just read. That is the CDB would still be able to do multi-prime, if a particular contract looked as if it would be a more efficient, more effective way to do it. So, this measure doesn't say everything goes immediately to single prime. It does say that CDB will have the option. I think that is important. And let me tell you one reason why I think that the single prime approach, the way we do it in Illinois, is helpful to smaller businesses, minority-owned businesses and so forth and that is that under multi-prime everybody has to put up a significant bid. Not every company is mature enough, able enough, to put up that bid. Under single prime, the other subcontractors can use the bidding of... the bond ability of the prime contractor. For many businesses that has been a particularly effective way of expanding their own

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

opportunity and also giving them the experience that may make it possible for them to do a single prime contractor at some point down the road."

Sandack: "You anticipated some questions, so thank you for that answer, Leader. One more on that sheet again, it says that this removes provisions for policy and procurement board oversight."

Currie: "In fact, their... under the experiment that we did, there would be one additional layer of procurement policy board examination, but an absolutely clear in this Bill and with the experience of the Department of Transportation, that there is every opportunity for the Procurement Policy Board to engage in oversight of any construction contract at CDB."

Sandack: "Thank you for your answers, Leader."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Dunkin: "Okay. Representative, I know this occurred some time ago, what, about 25... 25, 30 years ago when they came up with the multi-prime, when they took the multi-prime approach?"

Currie: "I don't know how long. I can just tell you that we're one of only two states in the nation that uses multi-prime.

The Federal Government does not; the City of Chicago does not and neither do 48 other states."

Dunkin: "So, what was the need or the rationale with Illinois coming up with the multi-prime?"

Currie: "I do not know. I just know that I think it's time for us to move into the 21st century and give CDB the opportunity to do contracting in a more efficient, more cost-effective way

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

that is also responsive to the minority and female participation goals that are part of their responsibility."

Dunkin: "Sure. And let me say this. If anyone supports participation of minority contractors, certainly I do, and I'm on... the record will show that. But you know, along with the lines of some of Representative Sandack's questions with the Associated Builders and Contractors of Illinois, their opposition, I'm a bit perplexed as of why there wasn't sort of a compromise in this regard."

Currie: "We talked with some of the groups that oppose the Bill.

We were unable to reach any compromise. I thought putting in
the five-year sunset would give everybody a comfort level
that we're not jumping off the diving board into the deep
blue sea without the opportunity to come back and consider
whether there might be a different way. But I would tell you
that we have support..."

Speaker Turner: "Shhh."

Currie: "...for this Bill from the U.S. Minority Contractors Association with the Reverend Larry Bullock, from Omar Shareef who heads the African-American Contractors Association, from Joe Williams who heads the Target Group, which is an African-American consulting organization that has been advising the people at Navy Pier how best to meet their contracting goals. So, we do have strong support from many of the African-American contractors that are involved in CDB activity. And I cannot explain to you why the Chamber of Commerce chose not to support the Bill with these other organizations."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Dunkin: "Point taken. Is there a cost savings that we can look forward to if this Bill were to pass?"
- Currie: "In fact, what we've found over these 10 years of experimenting with the single prime approach is that you generally end up saving something between five and seven percent because there are fewer change orders because there are fewer legal claims. So, it is efficient, effective... costeffective as well as, I say, responsive to the goals of minority and female participation."
- Dunkin: "Is there an estimated cost number, roughly, that they're projected at... the CDB is projecting or looking towards meeting?"
- Currie: "Well, as I say, they... what their what their experience shows is about a five to seven percent savings in the area of change orders and legal claims."
- Dunkin: "Is there a... is there a reason for the five-year pilot compared to the three years or seven years?"
- Currie: "And that was my choice, Representative. I did that because I knew there was opposition. While we were not able to fathom the actual objections, I thought perhaps it would provide a comfort level to people if we were to say let us take five years, giving CDB the opportunity to move to single prime. And at the end of that period, we can better assess whether it was as effective as on the basis of 10 years' experience we think it will be."
- Dunkin: "Sure. A few other questions. Part of the association...

  Builders and Contractors of Illinois opposition is that
  they're... they're saying that single prime has the... has its
  place in larger projects and will streamline oversight for

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

CDBG; however, they don't believe that single prime is appropriate for all projects..."

Currie: "Well..."

Dunkin: "...and there should be a threshold to distinguish between small and large projects. Such an approach they believe..."

Currie: "Yeah."

Dunkin: "...will protect small merit shop and minority contractors.

What's your response to that?"

Currie: "My response, first of all, is that CDB will be able to engage in multi-prime contracts, not just single prime, that they think that it's going to give them a better shot at success, they still have that tool available to them. Secondly, I would say that if 48 states do not use multiprime, that the Federal Government, the City of Chicago and practically nobody in the field of private construction uses multi-prime, it's hard for me to see that there's some special reason apply in Illinois. It has to be different. I think it's also important that we should understand that unlike most single prime contracting when a single prime makes the bid, that single prime has to identify subcontractors and the single prime has to stick with those subcontractors. They may not be removed without the approval of CDB. So, I think we have a program, single prime as operated by CDB, that is particularly protective of the rights of smaller participants in the construction arena and I think that most states don't offer that kind of protection to subcontractors. I am glad that we do."

Dunkin: "Okay. Final question. The... so, this is a 'may' and not a 'shall', correct?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Currie: "This is 'may'. They have the option of multi-prime; they have the option of single prime."

Dunkin: "And this has a sunset of five years, correct?"

Currie: "Yes."

Dunkin: "And CDBG will... by the way, what is the effective date?"

Currie: "Let me check that. I didn't... I didn't check that, but we

will. We'll... So, I'll get right back to you on that."

Dunkin: "Okay. Thank you for your responses."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Davidsmeyer: "From my experience, when you go to these single prime contracts, the single primes, the larger businesses tend to win a lot of these bids and kind of push out the smaller businesses that they tend not to work with. I think it takes away opportunity from... from these small businesses. The... the other issue that I have... the concern that I have is if a small business does want to do this they don't have the bonding authority to... to go after these projects. And so, if... if they know that the larger businesses in their area are not going to use them as a sub, they have to go at it... after it as a prime and they're, you know, if my bonding limit is a million dollars and I go after a project that's a million dollars, I can't bid any more work."

Currie: "Well, I would just point out that under single prime the... the smaller business has the opportunity to use the prime bonding authority and that, I think, is key to this whole operation. So, a small business that doesn't yet have the experience or have the capacity to put out a large bond that

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

company is disadvantaged under the multiple prime program because each of those five sub... five multicontractors has to post his or her own bond. Under the single prime, the single prime winner can bond for all of the subcontractors and as I say, in Illinois in our CDB program, the subcontractors are protected. They are named; they are identified when the bid is introduced. And the contractor, the single prime winner cannot dump them without the approval... without a good argument and explanation and the approval of CDB. So, I would say that under single prime that's how some of the smaller companies actually expand, grow and find themselves able to ... to, at some point, bid for the single, but... and that's one of the arguments that the U.S. Association of Contractors, Reverend Larry, of African-American Contractors, one of the points he makes in his letter of support is that actually single prime gives some of the smaller operations a better chance at not only winning contracts but also developing the expertise that means that they, too, can bond at higher levels."

Davidsmeyer: "And a lot of times the only access the... the small businesses will have from the prime contractors is if they're friends, if they're buddies with the prime contractor. And that... it tends to lead... lead to pushing people out that will never have access because these large companies will always get the big work and these small companies will never have the 'in' or the buddy system to get into the projects."

Currie: "Well, except that under multi-prime it is sometimes said that the companies that do business are able to keep on getting the business because they push out the littler ones. So, I don't know that the methodology makes that all really

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

clear. I would also remind the Body that 78 percent of the CDB contracts are, in fact, under a million dollars. So, a lot of the smaller businesses can compete because even if their bonding limit is relatively low the actual price of the project is pretty low as well."

Davidsmeyer: "So, is that the price of the overall project not the individual contracts under multi-prime?"

Currie: "That's the overall project."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, if I come in as a small business, I'm going to have a better opportunity of getting that work when I'm bonding \$250 thousand than bonding as a prime at a million. Did..."

Currie: "Fifty percent... 50 percent. I said 73 percent under a million and 50... 53 percent are under 250 thousand."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Thank you."

Currie: "I'm... I'm sorry. Under 500... under 500 thousand."

Davidsmeyer: "One more question. Did the CDB give you any idea of how many contracts they will push toward the single prime?"

Currie: "You know, I think I have that, but I don't remember it off the top of my head. Let me look it up. We're looking for that information."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. While you're looking, I noticed there's a number of opponents. The Procurement Policy Board, the Illinois Mechanical and Specialty Contractors Association, Illinois Plumbing and Heating, Cooling Contractors Association."

Currie: "I haven't heard from them. I did hear from the Specialty people."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Currie: "And I'm not quite sure the Procurement Policy Board objection because, as I say, at every point along the way they had the opportunity to provide oversight and to raise questions and to... and to get themselves very involved in any CDB contract just as they have with the Department of Transportation."
- Davidsmeyer: "I think... I think my concern is when you look at the plumbing and heating industry, the plumbing industry, the mechanical industry, in my area, a lot of these people are small businesses. They're small family businesses. They may be, you know, just them and a couple employees. And if you look throughout the area, you're going to have the larger contractors from Springfield or from other metropolitan area coming in and gobbling up these contracts. I just have major concerns about losing opportunities for growing small businesses. We know that small businesses provide a great deal of opportunity and advancement for new people getting into industries and I don't want to stifle that. I understand what you're trying to do. I agree... I do agree with the general idea. I'm just concerned that DCEO... or I'm sorry... that the CDB will go to pure single prime and leave everyone else hanging, all the small businesses. So, I... I do urge an 'aye'... a 'no' vote."
- Currie: "The answer to the question is there are 10 that have been completed, 7 more are ongoing."
- Speaker Turner: "Members, we have eight people seeking recognition on this Bill. Can we please try to keep our remarks as brief as possible and move there, we'll have to move to the timer. Except we have Representative David Harris."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor?"
- Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."
- Harris, D.: "And I will be brief. Representative, my analysis says... well, first of all, the CDB currently has this authori8ty now, correct?"
- Currie: "They had it as a short-term. We'd given them the authority to engage in some single prime contracting."
- Harris, D.: "Right. And that... and that expires, as my analysis says, that expires July 1 of this year?"
- Currie: "I believe that is right."
- Harris, D.: "And we're extending it for five years?"
- Currie: "Yes. Well, yeah, yeah. I..."
- Harris, D.: "So... and my analysis indicates that we're giving them continued authority, but we're also giving them expanded authority, specifically it states..."
- Currie: "They would be able to use single prime, but they would not be precluded from using multiple prime across all their contracting opportunity."
- Harris, D.: "What... But what is... what is the expanded nature of their authority?"
- Currie: "That they would be able to do it on any size contract."
- Harris, D.: "On... and I think that may be part of the concern, on any size contract. There is a question about whether or not the smaller contractors might then be... be excluded from the opportunity to take advantage of..."
- Currie: "Yeah. It's hard for me to see how that happens since 53 percent of their contracting is under 500 thousand, 78 percent is under a million. So, I... I think that's an un... I think it's

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

an unrealistic concern especially given the experience in virtually all of our sister states, the Federal Government, the private contracting arena. I mean, they wouldn't all be doing it, private businesses, if it turns out not to be effective."

Harris, D.: "Right. Do you think it would make sense that given some of the comments we've heard here on the floor... do you think it would make sense to put in some level over in the Senate... some level of what... what size contract might be up..."

Currie: "Well, that was what we had under the pilot program. My point is that we've had 10 years of pilot programs that look to be very successful and I think if we'd done a 5-year limit, which I did by Amendment to provide a comfort level to the... to the Legislature and to the people on the outside who are sure this is the right approach, that gives us the opportunity to come back, if it is not working, and take this authority away from them. But I think that the experience we've seen is that you can save 5 to 7 percent in contracting costs and this is a program... an approach that is responsive to the goals for minority and female participation much better than has been true of the multi-prime contracts."

Harris, D.: "So, it's your preference not to... not to put in any size limitation what..."

Currie: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Currie: "At this point, I think we have enough experience and we have enough examples from other places to say that this is the way to go, but 5 years we will... we'll have enough

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- experience under our own individual belt that if it turns out I'm wrong we can change it."
- Harris, D.: "Although it's the same time limit, but it's not a dollar amount that we had before."
- Currie: "But that's what we had had. My point is that it has worked effectively..."
- Harris, D.: "I can... I under..."
- Currie: "...and I... and too, since most of the contracting is lower, it's under a million dollars, then if you say you could only do things above that le... that level, then you're avoiding saving the money you can save and being responsive to the minority and female participatory goals."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you for answering my questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis. Representative Will Davis, are you seeking recognition on this Bill?"
- Davis, W.: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

  Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."
- Davis, W.: "Representative, I know there were other groups that were opposed to this. And in my conversations with the representatives from CDB, they talked about moving this out of the House over to the Senate and continuing to work on it. So..."
- Currie: "We... they have made... You're right. They have made a commitment to continue to see if there is some common ground that we had not been able to find in the House. And I did put the sunset on to provide some additional comfort, but yes, always willing to talk."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Davis, W.: "Okay. So... so, you agree that maybe there's still may be some things that can be worked on with this Bill, so as it moves there's still opportunity to have that discussion?"

Currie: "Yes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As many of you know, I've served in this industry for about 30 years. Let's not make this Bill more complicated than it is. One construction method is not inherently better or worse. What we want to do is allow client, their managing agents and the architect who evaluate a project and determine what construction method is the best method for the project. We are merely allowing the Capital Development Board, their architects and their client to determine what is best for that project. There is an opportunity... ample opportunity for small contractors in either method to get involved in the project particularly when there is a larger prime. The smaller contractors, as the Bill's Sponsor said, has the ability not to vomb... bond the job, participate in the project with the larger contractor and still have an involvement in the project. I strongly support an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Leader, under the single prime model, I'm curious about how
the lien process would be handled?"

Currie: "I expect that the department, the Capital Development Board would put out a request for proposals and then they

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

would use a kind of... of algorithms they use in establishing winning bidders that they use today."

Kay: "No, no. I..."

Currie: "But today they have to have five primes. Under single prime they have one prime with the identification upfront of the subcontractor. It's just the way it works at the other 48 states, the Federal Government, most cities and practically every private industry construction project."

Kay: "No. Leader, my question had to do with liens. Under the single prime concept, how would the lien process be handled?"
Currie: "Same way it works under multi-prime."

Kay: "Well, how would... how would the priorities be set, then?"

Currie: "I'm not sure what you mean."

Kay: "Well, how would you de..."

Currie: "I mean, maybe we should get someone from private industry to come and answer your question 'cause it would work the same way that it works every place else."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "This is a good Bill and I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3497 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? Unes. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 95 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 3497, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Bill 235, Representative Fine. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 235, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The current law in Illinois provides that insurance cover the cost of anesthesia for under the age of six with developmental children disabilities. In many situations, families who have children who are older and cannot afford the sedation actually forego going to the dentist because it is very traumatic for the patient. As a result, many of these children grow up and develop very difficult dental diseases and they end up in the emergency room and it costs much more later or they do end up losing their teeth. So, what we're trying to do with this legislation is increase the age that insurance companies would cover that sedation so families could safely take their children to the dentist because the problem is if they do take their kids to the dentist, it could be dangerous for both the patient and the dentist or they might put the child into a straightjacket. We continue to work with the insurance industry; we have an Amendment on the Bill. And we talked about passing the Bill off the House Floor so we can amend it in the Senate. And I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 235 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Burke, Demmer, McDermed. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

count of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 235, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3788, Representative Fortner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Oh. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3788, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3788 simply brings into... into compli... not really compliance... brings into agreement the time period for which a person who has a leased vehicle can pay a missed toll. That was increased for all vehicles from 21 to 30 days by an Act of JCAR. This simply does the same thing for leased vehicles. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3788 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 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3788, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Andrade, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Andrade: "A point of personal... point of personal privilege. How was that?"

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Andrade: "I just... I looked up and I see my future alum school.

I'll be... I'll be actually walking this June for my bachelor's

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

degree, but I see DePaul University up... up on top. They're here Friday for the MAP program, but I just wanted to recognize my fellow classmates. And so... so, well, here is DePaul. I just wanted to say that..."

Speaker Turner: "Thank..."

Andrade: "...thank you for coming out on Friday."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol.

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

Willis: "Personal privilege, please?"

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Willis: "I'd like to recognize up in the gallery one of the best interns someone could have. Mike Petesic is up there. He's down to see us this day. And he's been a fantastic intern for me. Thank you, Michael."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And welcome to your Capitol, Mike.

House Bill 2750... Excuse me. House Bill 3528, Representative

Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3528..."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take that Bill out of the record. House Bill 3895, Representative Hammond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3895, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3895 is an initiative of the Department of Human Services. And it amends the Freedom of Information Act to include a list of records that are exempt from inspection from individuals

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

committed or detained by the Department of Human Services or the Department of Corrections under the sexually violet fac... Sexually Violent Persons Commitment Act. I know of no opposition and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3895 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3895, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 573, Representative Moeller. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 573, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 573 is a real estate transfer from the Department of Human Services to the City of Elgin. The city had been leasing the property for several years. The Department of Human Services had not been utilizing the property for a state function for many years. It's located near the Elgin mental health facility. Now, the city would like to extend a roadway connecting a sports complex with Route 31 and it needs this property in order to achieve that. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 573 pass?' All in favor vote 'ayes'; 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

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

take the record. On a count of 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 573, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 821, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 821, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This law seeks to address the rising problem of sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking in higher education. Statistically, one in five undergraduate women will become a victim of rape or attempted rape during their course of education according to the Department of Justice. A vast majority of student survivors of sexual violence will fail to report the incident. Many don't know what their rights are. They are embarrassed; they are ashamed. They may not trust the authorities of the higher education institutions or believe that their attackers would be brought to justice. Many schools in our state already have comprehensive sexual violence policies in place and follow federal rules and guidance, but others in our state are actually starting from scratch. This Bill provides a framework to help Illinois higher education institutions comply with Federal Laws and help to ensure that all students, no matter the size of their institution or its location, have access to the same resources and comprehensive policies that ensure a fair and effective response to sexual violence. We have incorporated input from survivors, students, higher education institutions, law

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

enforcement and advocates. The proposed legislation seeks to address all of these identified problems by encouraging reporting, increasing protections and services for Illinois students, strengthening guidelines for responsiveness, increasing accountability and bolstering collaboration among relevant stakeholders. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Now, we have Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to comp...

I really want to compliment the Sponsor on her hard work on this. I had a similar Bill, but it wasn't nearly as comprehensive of what you had put out. And this makes a lot of sense because these are minimums that need to be done and the universities will be doing this, but there could be a lot more they could do. And I... we certainly should encourage them, I would think, to have some additional information and maybe a seminar or something for incoming freshmen because I think this is such a huge issue throughout the country. And I think it's very timely that you brought this forward. And I think that this will serve really as a model for the nation to go forward. So, I want to commend you on your exemplary work and I'd encourage everyone to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Representative, I know we had a very vivid and expansive discussion in committee, which I thought was good. Can... and you may have mentioned this in your opening and I apologize, I had to be away from the floor. Is this existing Federal Law now?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Mussman: "So, what this Bill does is aggregate the various components of the Federal Law and also, various pieces of federal guidelines all into one place so everyone across the state will be following the same rules. Federal Law is kind of chopped up into various bits and pieces and it's very hard for especially our smaller institutions who don't have the money to hire a bunch of lawyers to put this information together."
- Sandack: "So, as we stand here today, it's disparate Federal Law that exists right now that all these schools are required to follow anyway?"
- Mussman: "Yes. There are a couple of components that we, as the state, are putting into statute ourselves because we believe that it's the right thing to do like creating... like compelling us to utilize the task force. That's under federal guideline, right now. Again, it's very confusing for them sometimes which parts were guidelines and which parts were law. And we saw that even with guidelines, when schools were not following those suggestions, the Federal Government... the Board of Education was coming in and investigating those buildings."
- Sandack: "Thank you. Last question, Representative. If the AG wanted to, couldn't the Attorney General do this aggregation and make it available on the website, give it to the schools and anyone else that's interested and just say, we've, apart from the task force and the component... other component you mentioned, and just say here's the law. Do we need to pass a law designating here are the Federal Laws?"
- Mussman: "So, it's not uncommon for us to basically duplicate Federal Law. You'll see that in a number of instances. And

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

this way, too, the Attorney General has the authority to come in and make sure that we are legitimately practicing these things and we haven't left it up to their own discretion. We feel it is that important for the safety of our students."

Sandack: "Thank you for answering the questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Representative Mussman, yesterday you came to my desk and to talk about this Bill and I appreciate that conversation. You also had a chart there that was detailing exactly how your Bill is different from current federal statute. So, my first question is, don't you actually expand upon Federal Law in this Bill?"

Mussman: "So, basically, there are two main components where we have gone a little bit farther than what we had seen at the gov... at the federal level. So, when we... we created the confidential advisor and we did that in response to... even Harvard University was under investigation for not providing that to their students even though it was not part of actual Federal Law, it was only part of the guidelines. We felt that was a very critical component that needed to be added and actually was at the behest of student and service providers because, again, it's a component... it's an essential component to making sure a victim and even the accused understand what their rights are. And then, also, we went a little farther with making sure that the task forces were going to happen. Again, those were only in the guidelines, but our advocates really felt that that was best practice. And it gives the

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

universities... they don't have to create their own task force. They could actually become involved with the task force that preexists in their region. So, we do not feel that's overly burdensome."

Ives: "Okay. Next question. There are Federal Laws concerning this. There are federal guidelines covering this topic. Are you taking any federal guidelines and now making them Illinois law, not just simply Illinois guidelines?"

Mussman: "Yes. Because we found that even though they were guidelines there were times where the Board of Ed was coming in and investigating schools that were not performing those functions, even though they were only guidelines. And we also want to make sure that all of the schools in our state are adhering to the exact same guidelines for their own protection..."

Ives: "Do you..."

Mussman: "...and for our students."

Ives: "Do you know of any of our universities that are currently in noncompliance with Federal Law?"

Mussman: "The University of Chicago and Knox College. Both of those are currently under investigation and we know that there are others pending."

Ives: "So, are they... is that going to be handled this... through this investigation process? Is there a process for them to come in compliance with Federal Law rather than us adding additional burdens?"

Mussman: "So, we're not able to comment on their individual investigations. They're going to have to work those out with the Department of Education, et cetera. We want to make sure

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

that we are protecting to the best of our ability all the higher education institutions in our state and our students so that we, hopefully, could avoid this kind of investigation in the future."

Ives: "Okay. So, you opened up your entire preference... or your entire discussion about this Bill saying that we are simply going to become compliant with Federal Laws and guidelines. The truth is you are expanding Federal Laws and guidelines and putting them into state statute. So, that's my first problem with the Bill. I mean, I appreciate what you're trying to do here. I get it. The other thing that you talked to me specifically about was the fact that you can now do, under this Bill, a person who feels like she was a victim of sexual assault can actually go in and electronically notify somebody rather than going in person, making a police report, doing all that. Now, they have the ability to simply go in and... and they be... can then be considered a victim or victimized by doing an electronic reporting to a nonpolice person. Is that correct under your Bill?"

Mussman: "So, again, this is based on current practice and research and input from our students. We found that students actually are in a much more technological age than we ever have been before and a certain level of anonymity encourages reporting. If you have been a... experienced an assault and it's 2 a.m. on a Saturday night, chances are the campus is not going to have 24-hour staff available to you, but this would set..."

Ives: "So, where else..."

Mussman: "...set proceedings in process."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Ives: "...where else in the entire universe of law are you allowed to go ahead and electronically report that you had a retail theft, electronically report that you had a verbal assault, electronically report any of the... you know, my car got stolen. I'm going to electronically report that my car got stolen. I mean, I just... I think that you're going down a path here where you are going to have people that are going to be electronically reported on and the... the person who feels victimized is not really going to get the right response be... about a very serious crime. This is very serious. And I appreciate what you're doing, but this is something that is best handled in the most... by the professionals who handle it on a regular basis."

Mussman: "So, on one hand, there are various other entities of law that do allow you to report many things electronically now, right? We also... again, we want to make sure that they have the... this does not initiate any sort of criminal proceedings. And it's important that a victim understand that there are different pathways to follow. There are many victims who do not want to initiate that kind of criminal investigation and have law enforcement involved. And they need to know that, even if they choose not to go that way, they can still have counseling; they can have access to health care; they can have accommodations made by the university to make sure that they could have their schedule changed or their housing changed, again, without ever having to involve law enforcement. This is a civil situation in many instances."

Ives: "And there's no way to remedy that right now on the
 university?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Mussman: "If schools do not make available any information about what their rights are, they will be in violation of Title IX."

Ives: "I... you know what, I have no problem with a lot... parts of your Bill. I have problems with the very... with other parts of the Bill and I think that those things need to be worked out in detail before we go down this slope of possibly having people who feel they've been victimized actually turn other folks into the victim..."

Mussman: "So, part of this per..."

Ives: "...through false reporting, through false... all sorts of other false things in thoughts and whisper campaigns and anything else that can go on that is not dealt with in the light of day. And I think it... I think I appreciate what you're doing. I think a lot of this is already happening on universities. I think universities are best to handle this in their own district. I think that your Bill expands, it doesn't just mirror, Federal Law and I think that this is something that needs a little more work on. So, I will be a 'no' vote based on that alone. Thank you very much."

Mussman: "Thanks."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Wallace: "Thank you. I stand in support of this Bill. As a former counselor on a college campus, it is extremely important for us to empower students, both male and female, who have been victimized sexually and who've been abused sexually. There

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

are already institutions that have electronic reporting methods..."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative. Members, can we please bring the noise level down? Thank you very much."

Wallace: "Thank you. This is indeed a very important subject so and I thank the Sponsor for this Bill. As a former counselor for Rock Valley College, I helped to set in place their behavior intervention scheme. And we had an online reporting mechanism that is sponsored by a particular software product. And you can, in fact, report many crimes or many conduct dis... violations due to the Student Code of Conduct. And so, I just say to the Bill. This is a wonderful Bill. I think this Body needs to be protecting our students. We understand that, what is it, one in five students will be sexually assaulted. And we need to have more issue... more policies in place that support those victims and survivors and help them receive justice. So, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Yeah. Representative, I just have one... You and I have dialogued a little bit about this. I just have one question from the previous debate today. Does your Bill expand on the Federal Law or is it identical to Federal Law?"

Mussman: "So, my law, as I said earlier, it does expand based on guidelines and based on what... what items of concern the Federal Government has been using in their investigations against other universities including a university in our own state. So, again, there's the two components. It... it has the

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

confidential advisor component and also the task force component. Again, those were only in guidelines and we want to make sure that they are happening uniformly across the state."

Kay: "Oh..."

Mussman: "We have seen that the Board of Education has gone in and investigated universities that have not provided those."

Kay: "Okay. So, those are the only two areas where you have gone
beyond the Federal Code?"

Mussman: "Yes. To my knowledge, everything else is already a law or... in various parts of Federal Government or in their quidelines."

Kay: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Barb Wheeler."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I stand in strong support of this Bill. Accurate reporting in crimes especially, sexual crimes, are often difficult in comp... in campuses. And this provides an opportunity for them to get it right on college campuses and to provide support for the young women and the young victims who are a victim of sexual assault. Thank you, Representative, for bringing this forward."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mussman to close."

Mussman: "So, this Bill is in a response to a growing trend in colleges and universities that must be reversed. This has been developed by the Attorney General's Office to provide a roadmap for our schools to comply with Federal Laws and with those of our state while also increasing protections afforded the victims of sexual violence, domestic, and dating violence

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

and also stalking. I appreciate the lively debate and questions. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 821 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 Jesiel, Tryon. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no' and 0 (sic-1) voting 'present', House Bill 821, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3311, Representative Kay. Sorry. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3311, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of House Bill 3311 is to require DHS and IDPH to enter into an agreement granting the Department of Human Services access to IDPH's electronic reporting system for death registrations. This requires public aid recipients who are found to have a death record in IDPH system and are subject to immediate suspension of their public aid benefits which includes an immediate deactivation of their LINK card. This initiative comes from the death match records which have existed for the past 10 years whereby we have been providing people within the State of Illinois moneys for dead people that are passed and also providers who have been provided money from the State of Illinois for those who are deceased. This practice is an attempt to stop that and get timely information to the appropriate parties so that the

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

DASH records are synced up and payments are discontinued. Open to any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Davis, W.: "So, if I understand you correct, Representative, if someone who is receiving public assistance passes away, you're asking the Department of Public Aid to notify the Department of... or should I say, the Department of Public Health to notify the Department of Human Services that the individual has passed away so they can immediately stop either sending them benefits or providing benefits via their LINK card, correct?"

Kay: "Right. Representative, what we have done is come to an agreement with the department where they will use the internal system they have now to communicate department to department so that those who are deceased no longer generate payments to providers within the State of Illinois, whether it be hospitals or nursing homes. And if you're curious, in the past 10 years we've spent some \$60 million by not adhering to death information... death records that have come to the state."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, how is the information shared? Is this a file that gets uploaded once a week? Is it every day that this happens?"

Kay: "The... the coroner from each county will submit that record as they have done for the past... well, many years... and they will submit that to the department. And the effort with... that I'm initiating here would coordinate that information and make sure that the files are closed on the deceased."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Davis, W.: "I mean, but how often does this happen? Will it happen once a week, once a day?"
- Kay: "Well, it'll happen more often than it's happened in the past. I'm not sure when they will upload, but I'm assuming that when they get the coroner's information that that information then will be uploaded and this Bill will certainly bring attention to whether it's a daily or a weekly but certainly a large quantum leap forward from what we have today."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. But you don't know when those records may merge?"
- Kay: "I... I actually did not ask that question of the department, but if we require them now to make sure that we're not expending money for deceased people, I'm sure they'll pay more attention to it."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Are there any provisions in your Bill... are there any provisions in your Bill that speak to... let's say someone went to the doctor on Monday, they passed away on Wednesday. That provider may have submitted a payment request. Is there anything in your Bill that would still allow, that even though the person is now deceased, but since they saw the provider before they were deceased that the provider will still get paid or is that payment to the provider going to be stopped or held up?"
- Kay: "No. The provider will be paid for all... all matters pending prior to the person passing. So, there should be no issue with that whatsoever and that's not the intent of the Bill. We've had... we've had several thousand people who have exceeded 600 days after they died and payments continued, 600 days.

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

And that lasted for a number of years. And so, this is not to address short-term issues. This is to address long-term issues."

Davis, W.: "Okay. But still not certain how often the... they will merge?"

Kay: "Well, I got an answer for you. It's every month."

Davis, W.: "It's every month. Okay. But so, in the month, if something happens... I guess I'm just concerned about I won't say adverse action against someone, but well... I'll just... I'll just leave it at that, Representative."

Kay: "Yeah."

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

Kay: "Yes. You're welcome, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Of course."

Willis: "One of the things that we've heard oftentimes is that many of our departments are dealing with inefficient computer systems and reporting systems. Is this going to be a burden for this to happen?"

Kay: "No. We... we spent some time with the departments, both departments, and they have a program called the EVE system and that will be used to facilitate this process at no cost."

Willis: "Okay. Thank you very much..."

Kay: "You're welcome."

Willis: "...for answering."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, G.: "I'm sitting here next to my consultant on this issue, Representative Dan Brady, so he may be coaching me. But, Representative, can you tell me... actually, this is my question. He just sat here, it's opportune. I noticed this in our analysis the Department of Human Services is listed as being an opponent to your Bill."

Kay: "To the original Bill, not this Bill. Not after it was amended."

Harris, G.: "So, without the Amendment, the department is in support?"

Kay: "That's correct."

Harris, G.: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have one question. Why is the Department of Human... is it the Department of Human Services still opposed?"

Kay: "No, they're not."

Davis, M.: "One of those departments, they're... they're opposed."

Kay: "There is... there is no one opposed at this point. There is
 one department that's neutral."

Davis, M.: "But I think they're showing up here as in... in opposition."

Kay: "Not... not af... not after the Amendment."

Davis, M.: "Well, I'm kind of like... asking this question in reference to like Will Davis. Suppose they were parents of children, you know, they were taking care of the kids and now they're gone. And the month isn't over yet and someone has to kind of step in really quickly. How does that work out?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Kay: "Well, this has nothing to do with bills that are pending and have been approved and put in a queue to be paid. It has nothing to do with that."

Davis, M.: "Okay."

Kay: "What it has to do with are people who have long passed who have received benefits or providers who have received benefits from Medicaid and DHS. And we need to stop that. We have large sums of money that have gone out the door for no good reason for people who are deceased."

Davis, M.: "About how much?"

Kay: "About 60 million."

Davis, M.: "Per year or..."

Kay: "No, no, no. That's about a nine-year period of time."

Davis, M.: "Over a nine-year period."

Kav: "Correct."

Davis, M.: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Kay: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Flowers: "Representative, just a point of clarification."

Kay: "Sure."

Flowers: "This Bill... if a person that's on public aid dies and he or she has family members that's also recipients of public aid, the services and the benefits will not terminate... will not terminate?"

Kay: "That is correct."

Flowers: "And so, this legislation is merely to indicate that there has been a death. It is to establish that there are

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

other members... family members that are on this benefit and there will not be a gap. It is only to clarify the death of that person and that name and that portion of the benefit to be extracted?"

Kay: "That's... that's correct, Representative. What... what we have and well, just for legislative intent. This is looking at deceased people who have received benefits many months after they were deceased."

Flowers: "Not the deceased person?"

Kay: "The deceased person."

Flowers: "Family."

Kay: "No..."

Flowers: "Their family has..."

Kay: "...no. This went... this went to providers, predominantly providers who were billing for whatever reason."

Flowers: "So, the providers was billing the state for the deceased person?"

Kay: "In many cases."

Flowers: "Not the deceased person who..."

Kay: "No, no, no."

Flowers: "Okay."

Kay: "No, no."

Flowers: "So, the providers. So, now, what did you do to the providers?"

Kay: "Well, I'm not doing anything to the providers today. That's someone else's job. Today, my job is to make sure that an inefficient or maybe a... a negligent practice ceases. And that's what this Bill does."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Flowers: "And so, how will... will the Department of Public Health or will the Department of DHS notify all the providers that DHS would have a record for, in the first place, because how were the providers to know if they're not notified by DHS?"

Kay: "Well..."

Flowers: "And the family's name is still on the card."

Kay: "Here... here, I guess, here's the thing, Mary. A little bit of common sense has to come in here because if you have an empty bed and that bed's empty for over 600 days, you should not be submitting bills to the State of Illinois."

Flowers: "I agree with you 100 percent, but you are assuming that the person that's doing the billing has been notified that the bed is empty. The person that's doing the billing does not necessarily know because the bed is in a different section..."

Kay: "Well..."

Flowers: "...as opposed to the billing."

Kay: "...you may be..."

Flowers: "So... so, DHS... DHS and the Department of Public Health have a right and should notify all the providers."

Kay: "Let's put it this way. To answer your question and maybe coming through the backdoor. When a death record is submitted and entered, that's acknowledgment to DHS that they should stop paying bills for people that are deceased."

Flowers: "I agree. So, the question then becomes why is it that DHS does not doing their due diligence as far as notifying the proper people as to the deaths of one of their constituents?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Kay: "Representative, could you repeat that one more time? I'm...
 I think we're past what my Bill is really trying to do here."
Flowers: "Well, but we just need to establish the intent and I agree with you."

Kay: "Yeah."

Flowers: "And I just wanted clarification."

Kay: "Well..."

Flowers: "I agree. But this... the clarification is that the family members will still be able to receive their benefits. There will not be a gap in their benefits?"

Kay: "Correct."

Flowers: "It will be incumbent upon DHS to do their work and..."

Kay: "You're right. You're right."

Flowers: "That's the point."

Kay: "That's the point and I... and I take that point and I accept
that."

Flowers: "Thank you very much."

Kay: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Ladies and... Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just to the Bill briefly. About 2002 I initiated through legislation what's called the electronic filing of death certificates here in the State of Illinois. We became one of nine states in the country to do this. And simply what the Representative is doing and what has been found over the last several years is that state agencies have been able to use the electronic filing of death certificates to do things such as purge records from voter registration, to do what the Representative is talking about here, through

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

the Department of Public Aid or other services in Human Services, where the individual has been deceased for some time. The Representative who spoke earlier is exactly right that those agencies need to do their due diligence in making sure the electronic record is forwarded on which is secured to use by state agencies that we've advanced, but it's just a use of technology that wasn't there. And the Representative's Bill is just simply trying to make sure that it is used in a manner that is as efficient as possible, as timely as possible to take people off the rolls of records in this state by voter, by driver's license, by services in Human Services, you name it, when they're deceased. That's it. Nothing more, nothing less. I ask in support of... I ask for an 'aye' vote for his Bill and I support his Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay to close."

Kay: "Yes, Speaker. I just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Arroyo. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the gallery above me are some guests. Kim Zoeller and the good people from Ray Graham that do amazing work in their community. They're down lobbying us and the good people of the administration. Let's give them a warm Springfield welcome, please."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Happy you're here with us. Mr. Butler."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Butler: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Butler: "Today I would like to recognize two constituents from the 87th District here as Pages of the day, Katie Lynn and Olga Harris from Zion Lutheran School in Lincoln. Welcome and thank you for being here today."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Butler. Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce my inaugural Page for the day, Liz LeBeau who is here from Lombard. And if you got to sample some of the banana bread in the... in the lounge, you will know that Liz's mom is a very, very good cook. And I also want to recognize her dad, Bob, who's here in the gallery with us. So, thank you guys for being with us."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Glad you're with us today. House Bill 3438, Mr. Smiddy. Mr. Smiddy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3438, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Take your time, Mr. Smiddy. Take your time, Sir. Please proceed."

Smiddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3438 would require the State of Illinois to purchase or lease vehicles that have been assembled in the United States or Canada. Any vehicle that is currently owned or leased by the state will be grandfathered in. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Sandack: "Mike, is this the same Bill that we did last Session?"

Smiddy: "No. We..."

Sandack: "Okay. What's the difference?"

- Smiddy: "The difference is, is we've added Canada into the legislation. So, we would be able to purchase vehicles that where final assembly was either done in the United States or Canada."
- Sandack: "All right. And remind me, it doesn't necessarily mean they're American brand vehicles, right? So, if they're made in Tennessee and it's a Japanese vehicle, does that make it or not make it?"
- Smiddy: "That does make it. There are 13 different automobiles manufacturers in the... in the United States. And all of them would be eligible to be purchased."
- Sandack: "And I remember some discussion last time about cars that are brought over and/or mainly manufactured in the United States. Is there any, I guess, substantial manufacturing qualifications in your Bill?"
- Smiddy: "No. The only thing is, is it has to be assembled... final assembly has to be done in the United States or Canada, which means rolling off the line."
- Sandack: "All right. And last time I remember there being some pretty stiff opposition. Is there continuing to be opposition to this Bill as you've changed it?"
- Smiddy: "Yeah. There is still opposition to the Bill, but we tried to help out with adding Canada into the legislation.

  Unfortunately, we still have some individuals opposed to the Bill."

Sandack: "Is General Motors opposed?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Smiddy: "Yes, they are."

Sandack: "Were they opposed last time or was it Ford that was opposed last time?"

Smiddy: "General Motors was last time. Ford has not weighed in on this issue."

Sandack: "Okay. And the Illinois Chamber of Commerce is still opposed?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Sandack: "And IMA is still opposed?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Sandack: "And the Illinois Automobile Dealers Association?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Sandack: "All right. How about CMS? Are they still opposed?"

Smiddy: "They might be. Last time they were a proponent of the Bill."

Sandack: "All right. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I sincerely appreciate the Sponsor's candid responses. We had a vigorous debate last Session over the propriety of this notion. In spirit, I think it's a wonderful idea. I think it ought to be a practice the state can utilize rather than a law. I don't know we have to pass a law requiring this mandate when we have, frankly, manufacturers who manufacture cars in the United States opposed to the concept. So, this is a better idea in practice than it is in implementing the law. So, I would suggest a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

36th Legislative Day

- Harris, D.: "Representative, the information I have indicates that if this Bill were to pass that Illinois would be taken off the market for fleet purchases of several vehicles made by GM. Specifically, the State Police would not be able to buy the Caprice which is the only full-size, rear-wheel police cruiser in the market. Is that accurate?"
- Smiddy: "Currently, the Caprice is made in Australia and not within Canada or the United States. There is, however, Dodge and Ford produce a police pursuit vehicle that would be comparable to the Caprice."
- Harris, D.: "What about the impact to local auto dealers who... we don't buy these fleet vehicles necessarily directly from the manufacturers, but rather we buy them through the local auto dealers. Aren't they going to be impacted by their inability now to sell to the state the vehicles that they have available?"
- Smiddy: "When you look at how many vehicles the state purchases over the… over the past few years and going through the next few years, I believe that that would be minimal compared to the daily purchases of individuals in that community. So, I think if… I don't believe that it would be a hindrance to their business."
- Harris, D.: "And even though you... as I understand, you brought Canada in. In other words, they are now part... they are now not part of this Bill. A vehicle can be made in Canada. Is that correct?"
- Smiddy: "That is correct. Last year's Bill only pertained to the United States."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Harris, D.: "But Mexico is still in. In other words, if it's made in Mexico, that vehicle is not permitted to be purchased by the state?"

Smiddy: "That is correct."

Harris, D.: "Did the Counsel General of Mexico send a note or a message to the Members of the committee regarding the impact of this Bill?"

Smiddy: "I sit on the Labor Committee and I did not receive such a letter."

Harris, D.: "It's my understanding that he sent a letter, I don't know if it was to the Members of the Labor Committee or whomever considered this Bill, but he indicated that this really does have a direct impact on the relations between the United States and Mexico. Specifically saying that he thought that it would have a very negative impact on the strong economic and trade ties between Illinois... our State of Illinois, and Mexico. I think we have a real concern here. We had problems, many concerns, with this Bill last year. The Gentleman has not included Canada this year, but I think the same problems that we had with the Bill last year, while they might be somewhat lessened, are still here with this Bill. I think it's sent an extremely negative message. And I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, we've debated this quite a bit and the previous two speakers have done a good job of kind of flushing out what our concerns are. One more concern that maybe you

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

can answer, and I'm not sure it's in the Bill, I haven't been able to find it is, what if you have an agency that has a specialty vehicle that can only be manufactured in and in then is put together in another country? Are there any provisions for any specific instance like that where, you know, that would be exempted from this Bill?"

- Smiddy: "Specialty vehicles such as off-road vehicles like ATVs and those things... those types of vehicles... are not in this Bill. It's only... it is only for the purchase of vehicles that are meant to be on the roadways. So, it's not a specialty type of a vehicle that would be in this Bill."
- Sullivan: "Okay. But maybe we have some law enforcement units, some fire units, that have these vehicles that are manufactured overseas. I don't know where all the fire trucks are manufactured, you know, so have we looked into that provision where we might have some specialty vehicles that do go on the road that have VIN numbers, and that's how you're categorizing these I'm assuming is off the VIN numbers, right?"

Smiddy: "Correct, yeah."

- Sullivan: "So, if they have a VIN number and they're a specialty vehicle, wouldn't it be wise to maybe have an exemption for a specialty vehicle that is not, you know, manufactured by multiple different companies?"
- Smiddy: "That would be something that we could consider in the Senate as an Amendment, if it were to be put into there."
- Sullivan: "Okay. And... and I think you did talk about opposition.

  Do we have CMS and ISP and IDOT are all opposed to this? Isn't

  it our understanding that these three units of government

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

agencies CMS, ISP and IDOT are opposed to this legislation? Is that your understanding?"

Smiddy: "They are this year. Last year they were proponents of the Bill."

Sullivan: "Okay. But today, as this Bill moves forward, they are opponents of the Bill?"

Smiddy: "They are opponents even with adding in Canada as one of the requests that some of these individuals made."

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you for your responses."

Smiddy: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, I'm not going to... I'm not going to go back and ask the same questions in a different way that we've gone over already, but I'm going to ask you the same question I did in committee or I think I did in committee and that's this. If you were General Motors who you basically have taken offense to, would you think that General Motors would ever consider the State of Illinois as a place that they would build a manufacturing facility?"

Smiddy: "I will answer it this way, Sir. As far as I don't take offense to General Motors, I drive a General Motors vehicle, as a matter of fact. What I take offense to is that they have... what they've done is they have moved a lot of their business overseas when other manufacturers have brought their vehicles here. And when it... relating to the Caprice, that I'm sure that people are alluding to that's made in Australia, when you bid out that vehicle actually when you look at side-by-

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

side comparisons between the Ford and the Dodge, they're actually higher in price point than those two other vehicles. So, it is actually costing the state more money to buy those vehicles than the ones that currently are final assembled here in the United States and Canada. And more importantly, the Ford is actually assembled right here in Illinois in Chicago."

- Kay: "I understand that, but let me... let me go back to my original question. Do you think that General Motors would ever consider Illinois as a location to place an assembly plant?"
- Smiddy: "I'm not a businessman, Sir. I am a Legislator and I'm doing what's best for my constituency and I believe, for the State of Illinois."
- Kay: "Let me ask another question. Supposing that General Motors has the best product to offer to the State of Illinois at the best price, are you still making the best decision for your constituents and the State of Illinois?"
- Smiddy: "Well, as of right now, it's more expensive. So, in these tough budget times, in the State of Illinois, I think the best... the best decision financially would be to look at the Ford or the Dodge product and save the state money."
- Kay: "Yeah. Representative, I'd... I'd say this. I know you're very passionate about this, but we have a reputation second to none in the nation for being a state that doesn't much care about business. And this is just one more nail in the coffin that says, forget it, don't come here, and by the way, if you're here, we may come after you. And this is just a bad, bad sign, a bad signal, and a real hot point when it comes to

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

how open we are to business in the state. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "I... when you brought this Bill up last year, I asked this question. I didn't get a good answer, but I'm going to ask it again. I want to know if you know whether or not this Bill violates international trade agreements that we have at the federal level? Can you definitively tell me that we are not violating any trade agreements that we have?"

Smiddy: "Well, Representative, what actual trade agreements are you speaking of?"

Ives: "I'm asking you. Any that we may have with foreign companies, is this in violation of any free trade agreements that we would have with Australia, with any of the other countries?"

Smiddy: "Specifically, which trade agreement?"

Ives: "Back at you. I'm asking you. Do you... have you checked with the Federal Government to know whether or not this violates any trade agreements?"

Smiddy: "Well, to my knowledge, I think the State of Illinois has the right to purchase a vehicle or whatever however they choose... choose to. And that's what thi... I'm trying to do with this piece of legislation by saying that we need to purchase..."

Ives: "Okay."

Smiddy: "...American or Canadian made products. So..."

Ives: "Well, the answer here is obviously that you don't know whether or not we're in violation of federal trade agreements

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

with this Bill. You've not checked that out and I think it's important to understand. I think it's also important to understand that..."

Smiddy: "Well, I would think that you would need to actually tell
me what trade agreements you're talking about because there
are so many out there right now on the federal level, but to
my understanding, no."

Ives: "Okay. My understanding is that actually you would be in violation. But to a bigger point and that's actually trade with Australia. I think it's important for this Body to understand that this Bill essentially would start its own Illinois trade war with the state of... with the country of Australia. And one thing that you should realize that Illinois ranks number one in the Midwest as a destination for foreign investment from Australia. Over 1700 firms employ more than 270 thousand people in Illinois from Australia. Australian firms employ nearly 4 thousand Illinoisans at more than 100 different locations. On top of this, five industries that we are... that Illinois exports to Australia in machinery, transportation equipment, computer and electronic products, fabricated metals and others. So, our total trade, and this is actually from 2013, Illinois ranks second... second among the 50 U.S. states for exports to Australia. Illinois exports to Australia total \$2.7 billion. That's a 72 percent increase since 2009. So, why would we want to... why would we want to turn the tables on Australia? Do we want them, instead of buying Caterpillar products, to go nearby to Japan to buy Komatsu products instead? Because I don't know why they would to support trade with the State of Illinois when we decide

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

that we're not going to support trade with them. And all this Bill does is open us up to attacks by other countries that we're not playing fair when it comes to trade and exports to Illinois are a big deal. They're a big deal. So, I encourage you to vote 'no' on this. It's not about Ford or GM. My family, as a matter of fact, only owns Ford trucks and cars. So, it has nothing to do with that... about that. It has to do with free trade and actually enhancing Illinois exports rather than taking away that ability with other countries. So, I encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So, what countries would this actually allow us to do business with?"

Smiddy: "The United States and Canada."

Davidsmeyer: "That's it?"

Smiddy: "To purchase vehicles, yes."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So... so, not North... not all of North America just the United States and Canada. Why are we just picking Canada?"

Smiddy: "Canada is... has similar standards as far as workers' rights go as well as they're actually higher paying than what the United States does with as a result of the auto manufacturers. So, it was an agreement between... last year between the... the Sponsors of the Bill and the... and the Canadian Consulate."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you know, I understand last year you came through with a Bill that said, you know, it should be U.S.

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

made and I understand that. I actually supported your Bill last year. I don't understand why now we're picking and choosing which countries have the... the different groups can agree with. And do you know is Australia not... do they not have any type of standards, labor standards? I mean, they're not a third world country."

- Smiddy: "No, they're not. But Canada's our number one trading partner with the State of Illinois."
- Davidsmeyer: "And after hearing what the previous speaker said about the number of people that Australian companies employ and the State of Illinois, we don't have any type of relationship with them either?"
- Smiddy: "They are not our number one trading partner and I have not heard anything from them regarding trying to be a part of the Bill."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I think... I think in this Bill we are picking and choosing what nations we want to do business with. And I think that's kind of... kind of ridiculous. I understood the American made, but I will be a 'no' on... 'no' on this. Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you very much. I have a question about the process of this Bill. Let's say, for instance, that a manufacturing plant in Illinois here were to be building engines for vehicles we might want to purchase, but the final assembly of that vehicle were to take place in Mexico, one of our largest trading partners. Would that product then be excluded from purchase?"

36th Legislative Day

- Smiddy: "Yes."
- Wheeler, K.: "And why we would be attacking the opportunity for Illinois jobs to be growing because the vehicle's final assembly is in Mexico?"
- Smiddy: "It's not going to affect the jobs. They're still going to be able to put those in the vehicles and sell them to the public. We're just saying that the State of Illinois needs to purchase vehicles where their final assembly is done either in the United States or Canada."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. Then more directly to you. Why is final assembly the judgment call on this Bill? Why not some other aspect of the creation and delivery of this vehicle?"
- Smiddy: "'Cause final assembly means it rolls off the assembly line in the United States or in Canada which of course is an economic driver for jobs in this area."
- Wheeler, K.: "Right. But the assembly of the other packages or parts of those vehicles that would not be counted towards that, correct?"
- Smiddy: "Correct."
- Wheeler, K.: "And why would we not include Mexico in this process since they are one of our largest trading partners?"
- Smiddy: "Because of the wage disparity and the workers' standards that are in Mexico compared to the United States and Canada."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, we look at... why is this just for vehicles, then? Why aren't we using this for computers or for furniture for other items that the state purchases? Why doesn't this apply to everything?"
- Smiddy: "Because I believe that the vehicles were something that I wanted to look at and that's what I did."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Wheeler, K.: "No. I appreciate that. But I'm just saying we buy computers; we buy furniture; all kinds of state purchases, but we're not applying those types of..."
- Smiddy: "Well, if that's a Bill that you would like to put together, Sir, that'd be great. And I'll support it."
- Wheeler, K.: "No, I appreciate it. I'm just trying to see what the difference would be why we select just Canada and the United States and not the entire free trade agreements that we have with countries all over the world. And finally, just to the Bill. The opportunity that we are giving up by looking at this Bill for Illinois taxpayers to me is... is something that is counterproductive. We try to include so many opportunities for people to provide services for the state and products for the state. This Bill is counterintuitive. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Hernandez: "Representative, when selecting North American made, doesn't Mexico... isn't Mexico included in North America?"
- Smiddy: "It is. It should have... what we should have called it was the America... the United States and Canadian and not North American."
- Hernandez: "I have to share with you that there has been significant concern. The Mexican Consulate, in particular, who reached out basically taking it offensively that they were not included in this Bill. Do you know or are you aware if there were any discussions that did take place with... with Mexico about this Bill..."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Smiddy: "To my..."

Hernandez: "...with the Mexican Consulate, I should say?"

Smiddy: "To my knowledge, no."

Hernandez: "Okay. And for these reasons because I think because of the... I don't think it was ill intended. I think it was just an oversight on how we label this particular Bill, but it did rise and gave concern and stir up a conversation. I have asked if we... as we move, if the Bill passes, if we move into the Senate, that there be a communication, a conversation, with the Mexican Consulate on this Bill. I ask that of you, but for now I will not be able to vote for this."

Smiddy: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "I just want to expand on what some of the other people...
what some of the other people have brought up about parts
being built here, shipped abroad. I have a constituent that
is a parts manufacturer and he makes parts in my district,
jobs in our district for cars that are built around the world.
This is hurting jobs in my district. We changed... the easiest
way to describe this, this is a 20th century Bill being passed
in the 21st century. I understand this Bill in 1970, 1980. I
don't understand this Bill in 2015. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank
you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy to close."

Smiddy: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that I think helps protect American workers and keeps jobs here locally and within this country. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

36th Legislative Day

- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? Acevedo, Anthony, Flowers, Mitchell, Scherer, Thapedi, Unes. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2635, Mr. Sandack. Please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2635, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Sandack."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack on the Amendment."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment simply is a product of a working group that has agreed on language that would provide a statutory bonding process for mechanic lien claims. I will elaborate on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2919, Mr. Zalewski.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2919, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has the Amendment been... we have adopted the Amendment. The Bill creates a system whereby if a person is in custody for 30 days, an option exists, under... for retail theft an option exists for the person to be released of their own recognizance. The Retail Merchants have told our... are neutral on this Bill. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Bellock, DeLuca, Ives, Phillips, Pritchard, Tryon. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3341, Mr. Tryon. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3341, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3341 simply amends our statutes to be the same as the federal statutes with intent on what is a nonstationary source engine. So, we regulate stationary sources and they have to go through the permitting process required by the Clean Air Act, but nonstationary sources like off-road vehicles and generators that are used in industrial locations that doesn't apply to. So, our statutes now actually reflect what the federal statutes reflect. So, any questions

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

I would answer them. Otherwise, I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Hammond, McDermed, Unes, Welch. Mr. Welch. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Fine."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Fine: "I would like to welcome in the gallery the students from McDowell School in Chicago. And they are with their tour guide who just had a very special birthday yesterday. So, happy birthday and welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday, glad you're here with us. House Bill 745, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill. I understand you have an Amendment, Sir. Please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Clerk and please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 745, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Welch."

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

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #4 is purely a technical Amendment. And I ask for adoption."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 341, Representative Barbara Wheeler. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 341, a Bill for an Act concerning health.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler, B.: "This Bill provides immunity for the law enforcement who incarcerate a person who has a medical marijuana prescription. Now, what... but while under the supervision of law enforcement by Federal Law is unable to provide the prescription. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "Representative, you said this provides immunity for law enforcement?"

Wheeler, B.: "To law enforcement, correct."

Davis, W.: "Could you further explain that a little bit, please?"

Wheeler, B.: "Let me give you an example, Representative, if I may. If a police officer incarcerates somebody for whatever the crime might be and that person's in prison or in jail or the DOC and they need their prescription, they're bound by law have to give them their prescriptions. Medical cannabis is illegal because it's a federal... because it's illegal federally. And so, the law enforcement is not able to provide medical marijuana to the criminal to be incarcerated and on

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

parole as well because they'll be taking drug tests. So, this provides them immunity. Medical cannabis, there are plenty of substitutes. They would have to give them the substitute for their medical marijuana prescription, but they won't be able to give them the medical marijuana."

Davis, W.: "Okay. But if they're not giving them the medical marijuana, then why do they need immunity?"

Wheeler, B.: "The law enforcement needs immunity just in case there's a lawsuit. This is brought forward actually by law enforcement to make sure that they're not sued for not giving them the prescription that they have. They're required to give them all their prescriptions. Medical marijuana, they'd have to find a substitute."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, if the inmate wants to sue them for not providing them with prescription, then this would provide them with immunity from that prosecution?"

Wheeler, B.: "That's exactly right."

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

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Cavaletto, Evans, Franks, Reis, Unes. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 11 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3504, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3504, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3504 is a piece of legislation that helps streamline the health facilities planning process. The Bill you have before us is a product of ongoing discussions between all interested parties. And we rec... we've come to the agreement that while we've made significant progress we still have a little ways to go, so we want to work on this in the Senate. So, we want to move the Bill along with the process. We continue do that. Ask for its favorable consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "Representative, where does the health facility services review board... are they... do they have a position on this Bill?"

Sims: "The Health Facilities... the Health Facilities Planning Board's in favor of the Bill, correct."

Davis, W.: "They are in favor of it?"

Sims: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1531, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill. I understand there's a Floor Amendment. Mr. Clerk, please put

36th Legislative Day

- the Bill on the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1531, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Kelly Burke."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment 3 is a... it just clarifies four aspects of the Parentage Act. It clarifies that in adjudication of parentage, serves as a rebuttal or confirmation of the presumed parent. It removes Article 7 which deals with assisted reproduction. And we intend to address that issue in a trailer Bill. We removed the repeal... it removes some language that also references Article 7. And then adds clarifying language regarding inheritance rights of a posthumous child and requires that that child be in utero at the time of the decedent's death in order to qualify as a child for inheritance purposes."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2755, Representative Golar. Representative Golar. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2755, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2755 removes facility license as long-term for under 22

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

for under the umbrella of the IDD and DD Community Care Act. It creates the Medically Complex Developmentally Disabled Act. Medically complex for developmentally disabled. This new Act will accurately define the true nature of these facilities and the care that is being provided. For many years, the center for developmental disabilities has had these two entities as one. This separates the medically complexes for ages 22 years and under, the age for one of the facilities is 11 months and I think there is one... the older individual in there would be something like 75. They believe that this particular Act separating these two entities will better serve those individuals in this particular facility. Under the age of 22 and under there are 10 facilities in the State of Illinois and they are: in Bloomingdale, Illinois there are two; Chicago, Illinois one, which is Misericordia; Harvey, Illinois, Sterling, Elgin, Canton, Champaign, and Loves Park. This will better serve these individuals that have the older age population, the 22 and under. And they believe that this will help, even in regards to how their money is being spent for both of these two agencies. And I will yield to questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "So, Representative, obviously this is a little complex and yeah, I think you've done a good job to try and explain it. We have right now two groups that are licensed under one Act, is that correct?"

Golar: "That is correct."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Sullivan: "And so, your Bill, in essence, is going to separate these two unique groups into two separate Acts."

Golar: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, we obviously need this legislation for that.

The net effect is going to be what? And maybe you can focus
a little bit the reason for this change and why you want to
do that and ultimately what that means for... for the Body.

That would help."

Golar: "Okay. It reintroduces these facilities by giving them an appropriate name change that truly addresses the type of facility and care that is being provided. The new name would be medically complex for the developmentally disabled. This is 22 years and under. House Bill 27... 2755 will remove the connotation that these facilities are nursing homes for children."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Golar: "They will not be. Historically, these facilities were commonly referenced as skilled pediatrics which locked them into the thought process that they were nursing homes for children."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Golar: "It will remove the perception that only children are living in these facilities. The truth is these facilities are equipped and have been for many years providing the needed services for both children, adults who are medically complex. The reality is Mr... Representative Sullivan, is that the individuals residing in these facilities are thriving because of the active treatment and developmental training that is being provided."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Sullivan: "Okay. So, to break this down, what I'm hearing is you want to have the two separate facilities, one that has older adults and one that has 22 years un... and older to have separate identities and keep those separate identities because you have two very distinct groups of individuals in these two facilities. Is that kind of a nutshell of your Bill?"

Golar: "Yes, it is."

Sullivan: "Okay. When we go and do this, we're not changing facilities; we're changing names. Is there a reason why I see some of the administration, IDPH and DHS is opposed to this?"

Golar: "Well, at the onset, when I introduced this Bill, IDPH came up to me as I was introducing the Bill before going into committee and they had stated they had some opposition. We asked them to come to the table. They did not come at that time. However, the Center for Developmental Disabled just recently had a conversation with some questions from..."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Golar: "...the Illinois Department of Public Health. They have, in fact, worked those issues out and that will be taken care of in the Senate with the Senate Sponsor."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, I believe some of the other concerns that the department has is imbedded within your Bill, aside from the name change and the identity change that you're trying to achieve which sounds, you know, wonderful, is there an advisory council mixed in with this that potentially is causing some problems?"

Golar: "Not that I know of, Representative Sullivan."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Sullivan: "Okay. So, what we're hearing is that in part of the Act is this advisory council that is bringing the opposition, but you're going to have an Amendment in the Senate that's going to address some of these concerns."

Golar: "That is correct."

Sullivan: "Is that what you just addressed?"

Golar: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Okay. I thank you for your comments."

Golar: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Golar: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Thank you. And I'm supporting the Bill right now, Representative, but I do wish that you would continue working on this with them in the Senate 'cause I think it's a really good idea, but I think that there needs to be a few things that will probably be worked out. And it looks like you're..."

Golar: "I think that the Amendment, Representative, if I may speak on this. They have been working for the past two weeks..."

Bellock: "Okay."

Golar: "...in regards to many of the concerns that are coming from on your side of the aisle."

Bellock: "Okay."

Golar: "And it will be worked out in the Amendment for the Senate Sponsor."

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

Golar: "You're welcome."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Cavaletto, Frese, Willis. Mr. Frese. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, please be advised, I'm going back to Bills on Second Reading. These are probably Bills that have not yet been called, maybe your next priorities. So, please be alert. The first Bill on this Order is House Bill 3988, Mr. Anthony. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3988, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Anthony."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Anthony."
- Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor... Floor Amendment #1 was an Amendment that was worked out with Representative Golar and Representative Monique Davis. And it simply says that if the court determines that the person who committed the disorderly conduct is indigent the reimbursement provisions do not apply to that person. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

  Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4044, Representative Bellock. Representative Bellock. Please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4044, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 372, Representative Kelly Burke. Kelly Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 3234, Mr. Costello. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3234, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Costello."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."
- Costello: "The Amendment just says that the crossbow can only be used to kill coyotes during bow season."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2471, Leader Currie.

  Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2471, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is an Amendment that represents an agreement between the public defenders and the state's attorneys on how to respond to a Supreme Court case, the Miller case, dealing with how in the

36th Legislative Day

- future people under the age of 18 charged with felonies are sentenced."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4137, Leader Currie.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4137, a Bill for an Act to revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4096, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4096, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Feigenholtz."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #1 addresses the issue of individual care grants at DHS. Creates a children's cabinet in the Governor's Office and makes other changes."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3304, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3304, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3507, Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3507, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Gabel."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment maintains the prohibition against private right of action in DCFS; it's part of a larger Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment... Excuse me. Mr. Sandack waves me off. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3465, Representative Hernandez. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3465, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4006, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4006, a Bill for an Act concerning burn victims. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Amendment would change the funding source for this Bill to provide a fee... or a fine on arson and arson... people who are convicted of aggravated arson. In addition, it would use some money from the Foreign Fire Fund to help fund the project."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3577, Mr. Rita. Mr. Rita. Out of the record. House Bill 3687, Representative Wallace. Representative Wallace. Out of the record. House Bill 3588, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3588, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #2 is a gut and replace that requires the State Police to adopt a program using the specific drugs included in the Bill. It requires equipment of the ISP and requires the ISP to submit a report. I wish to adopt the Amendment and then hold the Bill on Second for a final page and line Amendment."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Moving to Third Readings, Ladies and Gentlemen. The first Bill on this Order is House Bill 3896, Representative Hammond. Representative Hammond. Out of the record. House Bill 3231, Representative Dan Burke. Dan Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 3444, Mr. DeLuca. Mr. DeLuca, 3444. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3444, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, under current law a person is not eligible to hold a municipal office if the person at any time during the term of office is in arrears to the municipality. So, that was the... never the intent of the existing law. So, the Bill, House Bill 3444, creates a standard and a process in the event that an elected official owes the municipality money. The way it is set up now you could be one day late and you'd be disqualified from holding office. So, what we've done is we've created language that if you are 30 days late that you would receive a notice and have another 30 days to pay the debt. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack. Gentleman yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. I think this is probably set up to avoid that 'gotcha' situation or an insignificant day late on a

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

library fine or something that doesn't matter. Is there an example, Representative, of I guess the current law being misused and why your Bill needs to go into law?"

DeLuca: "I know that there is an example where I think in a community out in the western suburbs where something like that happened. Where someone was a couple days behind on something, a water bill it might have been, and created a situation."

Sandack: "The intent here is not to open the floodgates, no pun intended, for people that, you know, that have arrearages. The idea here is, is to get fines paid, get people in compliance, but also not nix them from being, you know, eligible to run for local election?"

DeLuca: "That's correct."

Sandack: "Thank you. Appreciate the answers to the questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Is... I'm a little bit hesitant about this because I'm concerned about the actual legal requirements to run for municipal office. And this changes that legal requirement, meaning you have to be 18 years of age, you have to be a resident of that district for a certain period of time. Does this change that?"

DeLuca: "This does not make any changes regarding the eligibility for running for office."

Ammons: "Well, if this..."

DeLuca: "There's no changes."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

- Ammons: "...if this passes it would actually inadvertently change the eligibility requirement, meaning you can't run if you owe money for 30 days or more at something."
- DeLuca: "Actually, that's existing law and that's what we're trying to change because the way it is now if you're one day late..."

Ammons: "Okay."

DeLuca: "...you're disqualified. This creates a process where you're notified if you're 30 days late and then you have 30 more days to make the payment."

Ammons: "I see. Okay. Thank you for clarifying that."

DeLuca: "Sure."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair would like to acknowledge the State

Treasurer of the State of Illinois, Mr. Mike Frerichs.

Representative Willis is recognized. Representative Willis."

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

- Willis: "Is there an amount that this would go into affect? I mean, if someone owes \$50, \$5, does... is there anything in here that affects that?"
- DeLuca: "No. There's nothing that identifies a certain dollar amount."
- Willis: "Okay. So, would it be just if they brought it to collections or... For example, one of my previous speakers brought up a library fine. We have a whole building that probably needs to be named after the Willis Library Fine Fund. Is that in this... in fact, going to fit... affect that or not?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

DeLuca: "If the elected official owes the municipality money, the clerk would notify that elected official that they were delinquent. That notice would be given 30 days after... 30 days would be determined to be delinquent. And then they would have another 30 days to make the payment."

Willis: "Okay. Thank you."

DeLuca: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Jackson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3549, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3549, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Fine."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Floor Amendment essentially takes off a lot of the opposition that we had to the legislation and tightens up some of the language around step therapy."

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

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

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3268, Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3268, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Com... House. This is an initiative of the Human Rights Department. It's a technical adjustment to the statute that we already have in law now. And it just simply allows the department to work with federal and local agencies to carry out their duties. I move for the adoption of House Bill 3268."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke, Guzzardi, Jackson. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3384, Representative Kifowit. Out of the record. House Bill 4089, Representative Moeller. Moeller, Representative Moeller. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4089, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "I apologize. Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 4089 spells out the type of information... the types of information that could be provided by a county jail when a... an inmate is transported to a facility operated by the Department of Human Services. This is in response to an incident that occurred in Elgin last year with the Elgin mental health facility. We had

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

an inmate who escaped and there... had certain health information... personal information been provided by the county jail to DHS, they would have been able to make better accommodations in the transport of that prisoner. And so, this corrects that for the future. There's no opposition to this Bill. The language was negotiated between the Sheriffs' Association and DHS. And I ask for an 'aye' vote and would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, is it fair to say that you're now going to be known as Representative Moeller the bowler after the 189?"

Speaker Lang: "I didn't hear an answer."

Moeller: "I haven't... I have not agreed to that moniker as of yet."

Speaker Lang: "Too bad."

Moeller: "But thanks very much."

Speaker Lang: "Anything else, Mr. Hays?"

Hays: "Was... was the Speaker on your team yesterday after... evening?"

Moeller: "Was the Speaker on my team?"

Hays: "Were you on the same team?"

Moeller: "No, no. Actually, he was a competitor."

Speaker Lang: "I was not on her team, Sir."

Hays: "Okay. Thank you very much."

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? Brady, Hurley. Please take the record. On this question, there are

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4013, Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. House Bill 3896, Representative Hammond. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3896, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3896 amends the Sexually Violent Persons Commitment Act. It provides that the human... the Department of Human Services shall send a notification to the victim or the victim's family upon... a notice of release of the offender within 1 day of the plan. Currently, there is a notice that is sent at 60 days. Oftentimes the plan is not complete and there are not enough details. So, this just ensures that not just at 60 days but also at 1 day. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. And an... be happy to answer any questions."

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? Conroy, Kifowit. Please take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1004, on the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1004, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. Floor Amendments

36th Legislative Day

- 2 and 3 have been adopted. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 372, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 372, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Franks, get ready now. Mr. Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair. Mr. Clerk,
  House Bill 1121. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1121, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You may recall that we passed a Constitutional Amendment in November regarding crime victims. This is the enabling language so that state's attorneys and judges have a roadmap as to what to do with this Constitutional Amendment. I urge your support for the Amendment."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1121. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3932, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3932, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Turner: "Understanding there... Representative Currie would like to withdraw Floor Amend..."
- Currie: "No, no, no. I'd like to adopt Amendment 2."
- Speaker Turner: "Would like to adopt Floor Amendment #2. Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3932. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, can you please hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3190, Representative Will Davis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3190, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Will Davis."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is to alleviate the concerns of the School Management Alliance. We will continue to work on some of the other issues in the Senate, but this will alleviate the concerns of the School Management Alliance. I believe it does one more thing that I've drawn a blank on, but it passed out of committee

36th Legislative Day

- unanimously. So, we have an agreement to allow this Bill to move forward."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3190. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 1359, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1359, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Gabel."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment relieves some of the questions that the Illinois State Medical Society had about this Bill. It... the Amendment retains the spirit of the underlying Bill, but just makes three small changes mainly that the... it would have to be a criminal health care offense is the main change."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1359. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3128, Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. House Bill 2916, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2916, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2916 is an initiative initially of IMRF which would allow IMRF to seek reimbursement from delinquent municipalities. Normally, they would have to wait 30... they would have to wait 90 days and this would allow them to initiate their collection proceedings in 60 days. This affects a very small number of municipalities, but it helps IMRF keep their books in order. And with the current pension crisis, that's never a bad thing. Additionally, COGFA asked to be added on under the topic of public employee benefits for some flexibility with issuing a report under the PSEBA, PSEBA, which is the ... their analysis of public employee benefits. And there was a problem when we originally passed the law that allowed the ... required the reporting every two years except the way the report was generated with the timing they'll only be allowed to collect data for one year in order to issue the next report. So, this would give them an extra year of flexibility on this next report and then that would give them... that would reset the clock so they would have two years of data to issue more accurate reports. That's what the Bill does. There's... it is an initiative of COGFA and... and IMRF. There are no opponents. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Franks: "Representative, I understand what you're trying to do.

I'm just wondering. Do we actually ever use these reports?"

Martwick: "Sorry."

Franks: "Do we ever actually use these reports?"

Martwick: "Well, I don't know. I have not read one since I've been in here, yet. I don't know what the purpose of them is.

But... but the... I mean, I believe they've been in effect for a while. So, I honestly don't know."

Franks: "That's what I'm wondering if... I appreciate your honesty.

You know, 'cause I think there's some i... there's some irony
here."

Martwick: "Yeah."

Franks: "We're looking for the insurance folks, they get additional information... I'll wait 'til your counsel is finished advising?"

Martwick: "So, Representative, I'm sorry. So, there's only been one issued. It was issued in June of 2... 2014. And so, that the problem with this Bill was that because of the way we set it up with the dates they would only be able to collect a year of data. So, this is going to give them a one-year extension to collect two years of data. And I suppose then after they've issued the second report we could see if this was pointless, but there's only been one."

Franks: "Okay. I'm just think... that's exactly what I was going at and I appreciate you... your recognizing that. Because I think the irony here is when we're dealing with the asking for our insurance to get additional information, remember, our State of Illinois is not paying our providers."

Martwick: "Right."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Franks: "And there's... and this proposed budget that we just saw and we haven't voted on yet, obviously, would increase that time. Right now, if you go to your doctor, your doctor's not going to be paid for more than a year."

Martwick: "Right."

Franks: "Right? And this budget that we've... that we're going to be discussing is going to extend that for even longer. So, when I see a Bill like this say we're going to do a study on catastrophic illnesses to see what happens with the insurance, it's sort of like, really? I mean, how about paying our providers and then we can worry about some of this stuff. So, I appreciate this."

Martwick: "I couldn't... I couldn't agree with you more, Representative."

Franks: "All right. So, maybe after this we could, if they're not using it and it's a waste of time, then we should maybe clean up our books and get rid of this."

Martwick: "Thank..."

Franks: "Thank you."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Representative, amongst the other changes in the reporting that the previous speaker mentioned, the most important thing here though is the changing of the... the days upon which a municipality can seek to collect missed contributions. It was 90 days and your Bill takes it to 60 days. Correct?"

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Martwick: "That is correct. Yes. It's so..."

Sandack: "Why?"

Martwick: "Well, the… sorry. You know, there are two… and it's funny because there are really two separate parts to this Bill. One is the reporting under…"

Sandack: "Right."

Martwick: "...PSEBA and the other is the IMRF. So, the 90 days, my understanding, actually with the waiting period attached to it because they have to file a 30-day notice to the Comptroller, so it's 120 days, roughly four months, before they can... they can institute collection of delinquent contributions from employers. So, what this would do is this would take that 90 day and move it to 60 days, but with the 30 days of notice... or the 30 days of waiting time... excuse me... a notice to the Comptroller, it still is actually 90 days. So, it's truly... in effect, it's 120 to 90. And again, this is... there are 2,977 employers, Representative, that contribute to IMRF. There is about 4 to 6 employers who are delinquent each year."

Sandack: "And..."

Martwick: "So, what this allows them to do is then and we all know with all the pension woes we have in Illinois the model is IMRF."

Sandack: "No doubt about it."

Martwick: "And this allows them to make sure that those funds are put into the fund and so that their balance doesn't drop below for these municipalities when they go into venture."

Sandack: "And... and you touched on it. So, whether it's 90 to 60 or 120 to 90, it's a 30-day reduction in the period of time..."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Martwick: "That's correct."

Sandack: "...net?"

Martwick: "Yes."

Sandack: "And so... and you did touch on my next question, Representative. Which is, there aren't many delinquencies?"

Martwick: "No."

Sandack: "And that's one of the beauties of IMRF and that's why it's at 90 percent funded..."

Martwick: "Right."

Sandack: "...employers make contributions. Is there an example of, I guess, a delinquency that said, you know, we need 30 more days. Is there... what... Is there a particular motivating community and/or instance why IMRF... IMRF needs 30 more days?"

Martwick: "Well, my understanding is that these 4 to 6 employers who are delinquent are the same 4 to 6 employers and it's sort of a running, constant delinquency. And so, you know, this is the power of interest, right? Those payments are not being made. That interest is being lost. This allows them to shorten that up and clean things up a little bit better."

Sandack: "Thank you much. I appreciate it. Now, I saw that that came out a day and you were focusing on the reporting aspects on the other side of the Bill. So, last question. You mentioned in your statement, my analysis says that the Northwest Municipal Conference opposes the Bill. Are they no longer in op... in opposition?"

Martwick: "I would tell you that I have never... I've never seen any opposition from the Northwest Municipal League. And all of my analysis says that there is no opposition. If you'll hold on one second."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Sandack: "Sure."

Martwick: "They have not reached out to anyone on our staff to voice any opposition to this. So, I really don't know the nature of it. I apologize."

Sandack: "No worries. Thank you for answering the questions."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2916 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Representative Arroyo, Crespo. Mr.
Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes',
0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2916, having
received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
passed. Representative Brady, for what reason do you seek
recognition?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Brady: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 I'd like to introduce my Page for the day from Evans Junior
 High School in my district, Spencer Chubb and his mother,
 Hope who is in the gallery today. How about a nice round of
 applause for Spencer. He's been doing a great job today."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome, Spencer. Welcome to your Capitol. Thank you, Representative. This ends up Third Reading. House Bill 3384, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3384, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kifowit."

- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 80... 3384 actually allows us to bill an employee of the military who is serving outside of Illinois to secure motor vehicle registration up to 45 days after returning to the states. It also allows the Secretary of State to defer expiration of a driver's license belonging to a civilian employee of the military who's serving outside Illinois for 120 days after expiration. So, this is benefits that we are affording to our veterans now that we're going to carry over to civilian employees of the Department of Defense."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3384 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3384, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're going to continue moving Bills on Second Reading now, Members. First up is House Bill 3270, Representative Lilly. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3270, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3484, Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3484, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Nekritz."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #2 is a gut and replace that brings... makes sure that the inter... the pension intercept that the Comptroller is to use is to withhold funds from municipals of government if they owe pension... if they did not make their pension payment, being able to be implemented. It also expands it to all the local pension systems in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3484. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 1458, Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1458, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Welch."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for approval of Floor Amendment 2. This is the compromised language that I agreed to work on with the opponents to the Bill. I just ask for approval."

36th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1458. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 399, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. And House Resolution 400, offered by Representative Martwick."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Bolin: "The following committees and task force will meet upon adjournment: the Education Task Force will meet in Room 114. The Executive Committee will meet in Room 118. The Revenue & Finance Committee will meet in Room 122. The Judiciary-Civil Committee will meet in Room C-1. And one committee will meet at 5 p.m., the Appropriations-General Services Committee will meet in Room 118 at 5 p.m."
- Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House adjourn 'til Thursday, April 23 at the hour of 11 a.m., 11 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

  Committee Reports. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

committee action taken on April 22, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 574, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1452, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2568. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1588, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 2690, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3289, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3683. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 10, offered Representative Reaves-Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 43, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 46, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 66, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 156, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 730, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 810, offered by Representative Batinick, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Senate Bill 1222, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1256, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Senate Bill 1445, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Senate Bill 1484, offered by Representative Batinick, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1714, offered Representative Brown, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1786, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1798, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1804, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1806, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1947, offered Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 1, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 76, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 114, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 117, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 121, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 127, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 160, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 166, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 172, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 196, a Bill for an Act concerning capital improvement planning. House Bill 205, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 247, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 263, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 294, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 302, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 305, a Bill for an Act concerning

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

regulation. House Bill 403, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 408, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 438, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 574, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 670, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 675, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 676, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 688, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 733, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 734, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 805, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 809, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 811, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 812, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 850, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 940, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1047, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 1052, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1053, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1071, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1096, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1117, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1120, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1332, a Bill for an Act concerning probate proceedings. House Bill 1340, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1372, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1376, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1378, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1398, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1402, a Bill for an Act

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

concerning education. House Bill 1422, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1423, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1436, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1452, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1486, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1488, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1491, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1509, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1586, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1588, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1590, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1601, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1604, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1605, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1625, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 1626, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 1630, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1648, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1654, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1656, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1684, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1706, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1707, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1714, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1715, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1725, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1731, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1778, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1779, a Bill for an

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

Act concerning education. House Bill 1788, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1791, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1808, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1847, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 1857, a Bill for concerning safety. House Bill 1862, a Bill for Act concerning elections. House Bill 1864, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1867, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1870, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1876, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1886, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2055, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2148, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2194, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2246, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2404, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2415, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2435, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2487, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 2498, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2512, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2541, a Bill for an Act concerning business."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2554, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2568, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2583, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 2616, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 2617, a Bill for an Act concerning

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

regulation. House Bill 2637, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2646, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2669, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2683, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2690, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2691, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2717, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2743, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 2758, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 2762, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2781, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2787, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2816, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 2825, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2925, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2933, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 3121, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3128, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3141, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3152, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3155, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3201, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3207, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3219, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3221, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3235, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 3246, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3271, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3289, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3322, a Bill for an Act

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

concerning criminal law. House Bill 3345, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3398, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3407, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 3480, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3488, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3495, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3515, a Bill for an concerning government. House Bill 3517, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3519, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3547, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3548, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3554, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3575, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3577, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3593, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3597, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3603, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3605, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3609, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3620, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 3621, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3630, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3660, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3668, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3683, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3746, a Bill for an Act concerning motor vehicles. House Bill 3765, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3786, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3787, a Bill for an Act

36th Legislative Day

4/22/2015

concerning transportation. House Bill 3801, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 3815, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3822, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3830, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 3845, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3872, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3910, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3967, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3998, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4000, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 4009, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 4015, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4019, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4021, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4024, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4050, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 4051, a Bill for an Act concerning pharmacists. House Bill 4052... Correction. House Bill 4054, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4087, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4101, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4128, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4134, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4135, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."