37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 23, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 229, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3121, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 3620, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3746, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3932."
- Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Mattie Matthews who is with Philadelphia Holiness Full Gospel Baptist Church in Elgin, Illinois. Pastor Matthews is the guest of Representative Moeller. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Matthews: "Gracious Father, we come to say thank You. We thank You, Lord God, for this rich opportunity, for this privilege, oh God, to obey You, to obey Your word, to lift up those that are governing our state. God, we pray today for this House of Representatives. We ask that You do as You said into Job. You take Your seat in their minds, God, that they may govern us with wisdom, God, helping and encouraging us to become better people, better citizens. Lord, and as they do this, God, help them to lead us in the examples that You've called them to be. And we thank You for them, God, and we praise You for them, God. And we say, God, You get the glory out of all that they say and all that they do, Amen."
- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Hurley."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Hurley - 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 Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Let the record reflect that I have no excused absences to report among House Democrats today."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We have Representative Adam Brown excused absence today. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "With 117 Members present, a quorum is established.

Leader Riley, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Riley: "Thank you. Members of the House, I want to introduce some very special Pages that are down here for me today. Diavian and DJ Mehundrew, and what makes them special is they are the children of my Legislative Assistant, Alisha Mehundrew. Give them a round of applause and a surcharge for anything they do today."

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

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

Bourne: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, in the gallery, we are joined by the Lady Raiders of Central A&M, who are the reigning 1A girls state champions. If you'll stand up for us."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. And welcome to your Capitol. Representative Wehrli, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Wehrli: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd like the House to welcome today my legislative aide's niece, Madison Mahler. She's celebrating here today her ten-year birthday. She's from Lincoln, Illinois."

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

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

Meier: "Two points of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Meier: "First, I'd like to welcome Dr. James Underwood in the Youth Leadership here from Kaskaskia College. They're up in the gallery to my left. And then, secondly, our Page for the day is Brooklyne Luessenheide. She is a fifth grader from Nashville Middle School and her... she sent a message along with her father that he had to fix my water system in our lake the other day and my boat leaks."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. And welcome to your Capitol. Representative Mautino, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mautino: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Mautino: "Thank you. It's my honor and privilege to introduce to the chamber my Pages for the day, Francesca and Sofia Torricelli, and they're here at the rear of the chamber.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

They'll be visiting with us today to take care of any of the needs of the Members and get to know them. They're wonderful young ladies."

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

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

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the... point of personal privilege, how about that?"

Speaker Turner: "State your point, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm happy to be joined today, in the gallery, by a contingent from the Illinois School for the Deaf. We've got Dr. Janet Smith-Warshaw, who's the superintendent, and other staff with. And I wanted to make sure that everyone listens to this. I've got a number of people that go to the school, which is located in Jacksonville, Illinois, in my district. But these... these kids are from a lot of your districts as well. I've got Ryan Dryer from Representative McAsey's district, Elaina Bergen from McAsey's district, Michael Lappa from Dan Burke's district, and Abby Jones from Avery Bourne's district. So... and then, last but not least, I've got Kyla Clayborn from my district. So, I want to make sure everybody understands that this is a school that... that represents the entire State of Illinois. So, if you'd like to meet these kids before they leave, they actually have to get back to school, but if you'd like to meet them, I hope you can pop out front and... and say hi really quick. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. And welcome to your Capitol. Representative Lilly, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

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

 Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Lilly: "Ladies and Gentlemen, today is Illinois Museum Day sponsored by the Illinois Association of Museums. Over... we have over 13 hundred museums throughout our great state. As they visit you today, please give them a hearty Springfield welcome as they represent our museums throughout our great state. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Members, we're going to begin on the order... Bills on the Order of Second Reading.

 Please be at your chair and prepared to present. But first,
 Committee Reports. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on April 23, 2015: recommends be adopted House Resolution 375. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 402, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 403, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 404, offered by Representative Barbara Wheeler. House Resolution 405, offered by Representative Ford. These are referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3932. Representative Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3932, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you. This is a technical Amendment to the Bill having to do with campus police departments. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2690, Representative Breen. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2690, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Breen, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen."
- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 4 is language that makes all interested parties either agreed or neutral on the Bill to ensure that... so, it ensures the intent of the Bill but also then secures the neutrality of the Department of Public Health and the related entities."
- Speaker Turner: "Is the Amendment technical in nature, Sir?"
- Breen: "Well, I... let's not call it technical. It was... it was just agreed language. What it does is makes sure that there is an ability to sell raw milk but also ensure that there's enabling language for the Department of Public Health to regulate the sale."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 2690. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3289. Representative Breen. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3289, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Breen."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen."

Breen: "And, Mr. Speaker, we'd like to move Floor Amendment 3 if that's possible."

Speaker Turner: "You'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #2?"

Breen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Floor Amendment #2 from House Bill 3289."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Breen and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen."

- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an attempt to bring the parties together on the automated license plate reader issue. It extends the time of data retention by law enforcement, also allows for a warrant after that time of data retention for private law enforcement plate reader data."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3289. All in favor say 'aye'; all

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments but many notes have been requested, but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please leave that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 229. Representative Franks. Out of the record. House Bill 4015. Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4015, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3593. Representative Ives. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3593, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Ives, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."
- Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1, just makes some changes to the original Bill. It basically says we're going to limit community college administrator contracts to three years rolling, with a one year roll. It says severance is limited to... it makes the change that it's limited to one year's of severance plus benefits, and it adds the limitation for straight contracts. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3593. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3141, Representative Hays. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3141, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3398, Representative Phelps. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3398, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments... Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Phelps, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We made a promise to some groups and this Amendment just makes in an Agreed Bill, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3398. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3620, Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3620, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2, 3, and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Soto."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Yes, House Amendment #4 is simply a technical change."

Speaker Turner: "Number 2, Representative? Number 2?"

Soto: "Yes. I'm sorry, #2. Yes. Okay. No, it's House Amendment #4.

Oh, I'm sorry. Table... Yes, Amendment #2."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, can we withdraw Floor Amendment #2 from House Bill 3620?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Soto."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, we withdraw Floor Amendment #3 from House Bill 3620?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Soto and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "House Amendment #4 is a technical change. This Amendment simply moves subsection C of the Bill and incorporates it into a subsection A for clarity purposes."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 3620. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 1876. Representative Leitch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1876, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill was read a second time on a previous

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

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

 Speaker Turner: "Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you. This is an administrative Bill. It gives the Department of HFS another year to get its nursing home billing system up to speed. Ask for approval."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1876. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3683. Representative Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3683, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Wallace, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace, Floor Amendment #1."
- Wallace: "Yes, House Amendment 1 seeks to gut and replace the initial portions of the Bill so that income withholding... or failure to withhold income would then result in a fine for businesses not to exceed \$20 thousand. And the dollars..."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3683. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Members, we will be moving to Bills on the Order of Third Reading, starting in alphabetical order.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Please be at your seats and prepared to present. First up, we have House Bill 1531. Representative Kelly Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1531, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke."

- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 13... 1531 is the result of numerous years of work by the Illinois Family Law Study Committee, a committee that was authorized by this Body in 2008 and began its work in 2009 in an effort to rewrite the Illinois Parentage Laws. And they held... it was comprised of judges, lawyers, legislators, and advocates. They held committee hearings throughout the state, took input from many people. They drafted legislation that was filed in 2012, and we have spent several years trying to work through some of the issues with that legislation. In regard to parentage..."
- Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative. Members, we're on Third Reading and we have a very important Bill up. Can we please bring the noise level down in the chamber and have all side conversations removed to the back of the chamber? Thank you very much. Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As to... as to parentage, the parentage laws deal with the relationship between unmarried people who have children. And on January 15, 2005... 15, just this year, the Center for Disease Control reported that more... more than 40 percent of the children born in the United States in the previous year were born to unmarried women. This law controls the mechanisms of... of determining who those... the parents of those children are and ensuring that those children

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

supported throughout their lives. House Bill acknowledges a shift in family dynamics since the enactment of the original Illinois Parentage Act and it extends equal rights to every child and to the child's parents regardless of the parent's legal relationship. New presumptions have been drafted to provide for children born to same-sex parents, and the proposed Parentage Act would be the most significant revision since 1957. It would eliminate confusion caused by the current disorganized state of the Parentage Act. Key provisions include: it's better organized, it's easier for parents, attorneys, and judges to work with, it sets forth a public policy of the State of Illinois, namely that each child shall be limited to two parents and reaffirms that all children shall enjoy the same rights and financial support regardless of the legal relationship of their parents. Under current law, there is no limitation on the number of parents that can be recognized by a court. The Bill also makes changes and identifies a process for voluntary acknowledgments of paternity, it governs voluntary and court ordered genetic testing for the pur... for the purpose of determining parentage, it provides temporary relief, and it identifies scenarios where a court may order child support and parenting time during the pendency of the case. It also addresses proceedings to adjudicate parentage and provides for support orders and judgments incorporating language from the... from Section 505 of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. This is a Bill that has been vetted and weighed in on and changed in order to best address the problems of children. It is supported by the Illinois State Bar Association, the

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Illinois Family Law Study Committee, the Attorney General's Office, and the DuPage County Bar Association. This is a Bill that protects children who are in sometimes very difficult and complex family situations. It also continues to protect the rights of biological parents and in fact, makes some long overdue changes to give biological fathers more parenting time. I welcome any questions, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Morrison."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Morrison: "Is... is Illinois already required to go after deadbeat dads?"

Burke, K.: "I'm sorry, Tom. I didn't hear the question."

Morrison: "Okay. One of the… one of the reasons for this Bill, you said… or… Sorry, Mr. Speaker, could you come back to me? Is there anybody else that would like to speak?"

Speaker Turner: "No problem, Representative."

Morrison: "All right."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, a question of the Sponsor for legislative intent."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Zalewski: "Does the current Parentage Act allow for more than two parents, Kelly?"

Burke, K.: "Yes, it does. And there are cases where that has been determined to be more than two parents and we're seeking to restrict that."

Zalewski: "And does House Bill 1531 allow for ... "

Burke, K.: "No. It..."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Zalewski: "Does House Bill 1531 allow for more than two parents?"
 Burke, K.: "No. Mr. Speaker, could you ask for some quiet, please?"
 Speaker Turner: "Shhhh. Members, can we please bring the noise level down and remove all conversations to the rear of the chamber? It's very difficult to hear in the chamber. Thank you."
- Burke, K.: "Representative Zalewski, could you repeat your question, please?"
- Zalewski: "Sure. Does House Bill 1531 allow for more than two
 parents?"
- Burke, K.: "No, Representative, it does not. And I'm going to quote from Section 102 of the... of the Bill."
- Zalewski: "Please do."
- Burke, K.: "It is... it is on the first page of the Bill, in the first section, after the enacting clause: 'The parent-child relationship, including support obligations, extends equally to every child and to his or her parent, or to each of his or her two parents, regardless of the legal relationship of the parent and regardless of whether that parent is a minor."
- Zalewski: "Does House Bill 1531 establish rights for each child
 and the child's two parents?"
- Burke, K.: "Yes, it does."
- Zalewski: "And has House Bill 1531 been thoroughly negotiated between the interested parties?"
- Burke, K.: "More thoroughly than I could possibly imagine. This Bill was originally filed in May of 2012. We spent some time over that summer and brought it back in the next Session of the 98th General Assembly and we made many, many changes from all different groups. And one of the changes we made was that

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

in the original draft, the Bill was... did not limit it to two parents. And at the recommendation of the Illinois Family Institute, we changed that and limited it to two parents. That is not the norm in other states and it is not the norm in states that have enacted the uniform Act, including states such as Texas. So, we are definitely taking, you know, a significant step in that limitation. And it was definitely a concession and... at the suggestion of the Family Institute."

Zalewski: "Representative, congratulations on... I think you've done excellent work and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Burke, K.: "Thank you for your question."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Riley: "Representative Burke, does this Bill abolish or obviate the need for the putative father registry?"

Burke, K.: "No."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Representative, I know you've worked very hard on this and you've been very forthcoming with meetings and phone calls and everything, but I... I have a few more questions. Does this Bill require Illinois to recognize parentage judgments from other states?"

Burke, K.: "Yes, this Bill does through our full-faith and credit clause, as required by federal statutes and rules."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Reis: "So, you're aware that there are at least two states that do allow children to have three legal parents, so we would have to recognize that. Is that correct?"
- Burke, K.: "Yes. Several states such as Texas, Wyoming, all do allow, currently, for establishment of more than two parents."

Reis: "Texas, really?"

Burke, K.: "It's not all it's cracked up to be."

- Reis: "I was going to tell you about Maryland and California, but yeah... So, this Bill would require Illinois to honor those agreements. You said yes. If there are two presumed parents, how does a judge determine which parent gets the actual parental rights?"
- Burke, K.: "So, if I could circle back just a minute to your first question regarding the recognition. That's a requirement of federal law. And what that is for is that there needs to be a recognition of parentage orders from other states so that child support can be collected in Illinois. There are federal requirements for us to have those full-faith and credit clauses, and there have been suggestions on ways to change those... that full-faith and credit clause which we, in good faith, ran by... past the departments that deal with the collection of child support and the administration of child support. And I'll read you exactly what those departments said would be the result if we... if we differed from the fullfaith and credit clause that is in this draft in the Bill. 'Deletion of the full-faith and credit language would cause the department to be out of compliance with the Federal Government's mandate for Title IV-D child support program.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

The compromise language would have a similar effect. Failure to comply with federal mandates would result in disapproval of Title IV-D state plan. As currently approved, the Title IV-D state plan is required for Illinois to receive federal funding for the child support program. Further, an approved Title IV-D state plan is a requirement for approval of Title IV-A TANF state plan. Disapproval of the IV-A plan results in the ineligibility for a TANF block grant. In short, failure to comply with this mandate would have a devastating effect on the ability of the state to receive federal funding.' The Title IV-D funding alone is over 100 million annually. That opinion is backed up by the Attorney General, and I do not know why we would want to put one cent of funding in jeopardy."

Reis: "Well, so much for states' rights. I never understand that, but it is what it is. So, one final question here. So, if there's a biological dad and another person presumed to be a parent, who is not a biologic... who is not biologically connected to the child, the biological dad could lose parental rights to another person."

Burke, K.: "That is not correct. So, here's a typical scenario.

Two... husband and wife are married. Under current law, any child born while that couple is married is presumed... the husband is presumed to be the father. That is current law, longstanding, that's how it works. It could be that that husband is not the father of that child and there is a biological father out there. There are various ways in the current statute that are preserved in the new statute for that biological father to come in and assert his rights. The

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

biological father... as long as he asserts his rights within two years of knowing or should have knowing that he was... that it was possible that he was the father of the child, as long as he asserts his rights, his rights will be protected. And in discussing some of the changes and concessions that have been made to this Bill, the Bill originally had what is called a hold-out provision which many other states have. And the hold-out is that that bio... biological father's rights would be extinguished if there was another parent who had held themselves out as that child's parent for a period of time. I think it was two years. At the request and urging of the Illinois Family Institute, we removed that hold-out provision to give a further protection to biological fathers."

Reis: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. As I mentioned before, you've done a lot of work with this. This is the third session that we've worked on it. It's much closer to something that the Illinois Family Institute can agree upon, but while we serve in the same chamber, we come from different areas and I'm a traditionalist. If other Bills haven't passed in prior years, you know, we would still be talking about a dad and a mom, but we don't live in that age anymore. So, I appreciate your work on this, and thank you for your time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor mentioned federal funding. And she stated in her opening remarks that this Bill had... that there were negotiations on this Bill but from what I understand, there was a proposed Amendment that would've prevented Illinois from becoming a two-parent state. And it would've made sure that Illinois still complied with

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

federal requirements that we go after dead-beat parents. Is... could the Sponsor talk about that proposed Amendment and why she did not accept it?"

- Burke, K.: "Well, Representative, I'll disagree with your statement in two ways. First of all, as evidence on page 1 of this Bill, Section 102, and further evidence by the questions of legislative intent that I answered just a short while ago, this Bill intends to limit... limit it to two parents. It is crystal clear. As to the second issue, I believe I just answered it with the previous speaker. It is not in doubt that federal funding would be jeopardized. We have a statement from healthcare... the Department of Healthcare and Family Services that is backed up by the Attorney General, the chief lawyer for the State of Illinois. Federal funding would be in jeopardy according to these sources."
- Morrison: "We... we did some research into that. We contacted Congressman Randy Hultgren's office and asked for some assistance in verifying that and according to his office, that... that he doesn't... his staff does not agree with that."
- Burke, K.: "Well, while... So, two things. First of all, the language that was suggested to alter that full-faith and credit clause, we ran that specific language past both HFS and the Attorney General and they still have the interpretation that it would jeopardize funding. And while I appreciate all that Representative Hultgren does for Illinois, he is not the state's chief lawyer. He is not the Attorney General."
- Morrison: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. The Sponsor stated that this Bill would eliminate confusion. I don't believe that that would be the case. As Representative Reis stated in his

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

closing remarks, there would be quite a bit of confusion on this. And we believe it's a human right that children have certain one... two parents, a mom and a dad. And what this Bill would do, I think it would create more confusion. I know that the Bar Association is in favor of this. I think it would create more work for them, ultimately, because it's going to create more confusion in the courtroom. And I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hammond: "Representative Burke, if I may, I want to go back to... for a point of clarification. I was trying to follow your conversation with Representative Reis and I got a little lost in the weeds, I think. I want to... I want to ask about the, I think, it's referred to as the voluntary acknowledgement of paternity. Kelly, does it only allow for two years? Is there a two-year period or, you know... if a father finds out, you know, 15 or 18 years later that the relationship he had with this woman resulted in the birth of a child, is that biological father still allowed some claim of parentage?"

Burke, K.: "So, let me just clarify before I..."

Hammond: "Sure."

Burke, K.: "...flip through my 200 page Bill to look for the answer.

But are you talking about a situation where the gentleman didn't know..."

Manley: "Exactly. Exactly right."

Burke, K.: "...that he... All right, let me... if you could just hold a minute, let me check."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Hammond: "Be happy to."

Burke, K.: "Norine, the answer is if the gentleman did not know or did not have reason to know that he was the father of that child, it's toll. So, when he finds out or when he, you know, has a reason to suspect, he's got two years to bring that action."

Hammond: "And I appreciate that."

Burke, K.: "And also, if there's fraud, duress, any concealment, that tolls the time frame, as well."

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just two quick questions for the Sponsor, if she'll yield."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Kelly, I just want to make sure that I heard you correctly.

The intent on those two sections with full faith and credit is merely to meet the demands of Federal Law and not to expand beyond the bounds of Federal Law that have that requirement on our state."

Burke, K.: "That is correct."

Breen: "Okay. And then my second question was in regards to Amendment 3. There is an addition to, I believe, it's Article VI of the Bill, which talks about an adjudication under the Section, serving as a rebuttal or confirmation of a presumed parent. And I just want to make sure the intent of that was to ensure that if a biological father comes in and establishes his parentage, his biological parentage, that what that Section intends is that the presumed parent is ejected so as to ensure there are only two parents of that child."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Burke, K.: "You're correct. And I thank you for offering the suggestion for clarification. I think it made it a better Bill clearer, and I appreciate your intention to detail with it."

Breen: "All right. Thank you. And I will let my colleagues remarks stand as to the merits of the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is an important piece of legislation. We have not updated the Parentage Act on any sort of comprehensive basis in decades. And as we all know, and as one of the prior speakers acknowledged, we are living in a very different age with very different families of all different types, makes, and models. This Parentage Act is a really good piece of legislation that will allow us, in Illinois, to acknowledge that we have all those different makes, models... makes and models of families these days. I would hope that we would not base our decision on whether one interest group or another is opposed or supporting, but whether... whether this would be good for the families of the State of Illinois. And I don't think there's any doubt, with all the work that the Sponsor has put in, with all the involvement of a variety of stake holders that we have the best product we can possibly come up with right now for those families. So, on a personal note, I'd like to thank the Sponsor for sticking with this. I think I was the one that, as I've said in the past, I was the one that got her into this mess on the Parentage Act. But she has performed magnificently. I think has grown a lot during this discussion and I think the debate today shows just how much she ... she

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

knows about this legislation, how well prepared she is, and how she has brought this to a point where it is an... where it's the legislation that we should adopt. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Thapedi: "Representative Burke, I also would like to commend you on the hard work that you've put in on this monumental piece of legislation. And I think that it's important that the Body is aware of the number of subject matter hearings that you conducted on this issue, the testimony that you took. And if you would be kind enough to just kind of recap how many subject matter hearings we actually did in the Judiciary Committee and who we heard from during the course of actually vetting out this monumental piece of legislation over the last couple of years."

- Burke, K.: "Thanks, Representative. And what I'll do, I'll do you one better. I'll go back a little even further and talk about the Family Law Study Committee, 'cause truly the people on that committee, they are judges, lawyers..."
- Speaker Turner: "Hold on one second, Representative. Members, can we please have your attention while we close out this debate?

 Thank you very much."
- Burke, K.: "The folks on that committee volunteered to be part of that committee. There are judges, lawyers, advocates, legislators, people who have busy lives, but yet they felt this was an important enough issue that they took time out of their practices, their jobs, and traveled around this state to get input from all different sources. And as you can

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

imagine on an issue like this, there were a lot of differing opinions. So, by the time it got filed as legislation and got to the Judiciary Committee, there had been quite a bit of work done. But those folks continued to come to Springfield to testify and answer all questions of the Judiciary Committee at least four times. And I cannot thank them enough for the input and hard work that they've put on it. I can't thank the Judiciary Committee enough for taking such an interest and for shepherding the process along."

Thapedi: "Thank you so much. I urge an 'aye' vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was just asking that Representative Unes be excused from the Roll."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Burke to close."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank everyone for the questions. I thank everyone who has been involved in this process. I think through the input of all different sides we've come up with a strong Bill that Illinois can be proud of. And just to put the issue in perspective, the chief judge of the... who runs the parentage court in Cook County told us that last year her courts saw 89 thousand cases, eighty... in Cook County alone. These are your constituents. These are children who need the protection that... that only parents... or that parents can offer and they need guidance. The people who deal with these issues every day, the parents, the attorneys, the judges, they need guidance on how to proceed. So, I thank you for all your comments. And I would just like to let you know that we're recognizing the importance of children. We're

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

recognizing their right to be cared for. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1531 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 Flowers, Ford, Sullivan, Brown. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 65 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1531, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4044, Representative Bellock. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4044, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Bellock."

- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4044 is an agency Bill from DHS, and I don't know of any opposition for it. What it tries to do is amend the Criminal Code. It's trying to develop appropriate treatment plans upon entry for a DHS hospital admission. What it's asking the clerk of the Circuit Court to do is to attach the report of a defendant who has been ruled unfit when they send that person to a DHS facility. I don't know of any opposition. I appreciate your support."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4044 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'... Representative Flowers with a late light."
- Flowers: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. My computer is not up and I did not understand the Lady. And if you could please,

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Representative, just speak a little slow so I can understand what is the purpose of your legislation."

Bellock: "This is an agency Bill from DHS. What they're asking is that when the clerk of the Circuit Court, when a forensic examiner finds that somebody is unfit, that they just attach that report so that when they send it to a DHS hospital treatment plan, they will have the treatment plan that is correct for that person."

Flowers: "So, the person has been diagnosed as being mentally unfit, that will be attached to the court records. And when that person is sent to the hospital, they will have the diagnosis that was done."

Bellock: "So they can do a good treatment program for them."

Flowers: "And this is for a person that's been incarcerated?"

Bellock: "I don't think it's necessarily... Well, I'm not sure if they're incarcerated, but that they've gone before the court and they've been found by a forensic examiner that they are unfit and they need to have hospital treatment."

Flowers: "Is there any opposition to this Bill, Representative?"

Bellock: "No, there's no opposition at all."

Flowers: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Bellock: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4044 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4044, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

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

Riley: "Point of personal privilege, Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

- Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, it's my understanding that some students from our great school, Trinity Lutheran School, are here. I'd like for you to give them a good House of Representatives' welcome. Trinity Lutheran."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. And welcome to your Capitol. Representative David Harris, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Harris, D.: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the gal... Members of the House, we have in the gallery, today, two of my favorite constituents who are joined by two visitors from the wonderful City of London, England, who are here to see how we do business. I can tell you that having, myself, witnessed prime minister's question time in the House of Parliament, this is going to be far more interesting for our visitors from London. And please give them a warm welcome."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. And welcome to our Capitol. Representative Keith Wheeler, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Wheeler K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Wheeler K.: "Thank you. I've been asked to clarify something here on the House Floor for everyone. Mark Batnick's Page today may be easily mistaken to be his daughter; however, it is actually his wife, Ellen. We're very happy to have her today."

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

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Sommer: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have another state championship team with me today. Seems like the water has been very good in my area this year. Up in the gallery, on the Democrat side to the rear, are the ladies from the Deer Creek Mackinaw State Championship Class 2A volleyball team. And I'm going to read their names quickly to you. Brandon Mueller is the team's head coach. Kelsey Hough is the team's assistant coach. We have also these players with us: Miranda Schaley, Mikayla Seibert, Lauren Anderson, Maddie McGinnes, Kaleigh Krause, Caitlynn Whitaker, Kara Rich, Jenny Rickett, Kenzie Rhodes, Isabella Gruse, Lydia Weigand, Macey Peterson, Addie Patton, Chelsea Pawlak, Kathleen Creager, and their principal is Mary... Mary... Mary, I'm sorry. Mary... I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. The principal will take it out on me later. Mary Lanier. Please recognize these young ladies for their accomplishments as state champs."

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

Congratulations. House Bill 218. Representative Cassidy. Mr.

Clerk, please read the Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 218, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 218 will create a uniform civil enforcement strategy for low-level cannabis possession in the State of Illinois. We currently have a patchwork system where over a hundred municipalities have ordinances in place with varying amounts allowed, varying fines allowed. And the outcome from this patchwork system puts in place an unjust and confusing system wherein where you live and what you look like dictates whether or not you will be arrested for extremely low-level marijuana possession. The coalition behind this Bill is also unique to our state. In addition to what you would expect to support a Bill like this, I have had the pleasure of working with the Illinois State's Attorneys Association, individual state's attorneys, such as State's Attorney Berlin from DuPage, State's Attorney Alvarez from Cook, Sheriff Dart from Cook, the Illinois Policy Institute, and the ACLU to put together a truly comprehensive approach that allows us to start to get smart on crime and make better use of our minimal law enforcement resources to ensure that our police, prosecutors, our jails, and our prisons are addressing those that are truly a danger to our community. There is a tremendous benefit fiscally to both local governments and to the state. IDOC estimates a \$30 million savings from this Bill. There... of those local ordinances, there are... there are many that are both Home Rule communities and non-Home Rule communities. Nothing in this Bill will impact their ability

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

to continue to control this at the local level. In addition to the uniform civil enforcement language, we've included language at the request of the State's Attorneys Association to finally address some inconsistency and confusion in our law around impaired driving, putting into place some scientifically based measurements that will allow us to truly go after those who are a danger on our roads. Right now, this ... this science is actively evolving just as it did when we were looking at DUI with alcohol. We began at 2.0 and now we're down to .08. This is a very living component of the law. I expect that, as science improves, we'll continue to work on that. And it includes a new penalty for the manufacture of a drug known as butane hash oil. As I've come to understand what's happening in our communities around this, it's truly terrifying what people are doing. Folks are forcing butane, a highly flammable substance, through marijuana, creating a new substance called BHO, or butane hash oil, which is highly, highly intoxicating, very dangerous to consume but even more dangerous to produce. The people who are producing it are in danger and even more frightening, they are endangering the people around them. There are fires; there are explosions. It's highly, highly combustible. This is, as I said, an opportunity to get smart on crime. Please join me and this wonderful unique coalition in realigning our priorities and creating a safer and more just state. I look forward to your questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Sponsor used the term 'smart on crime' twice.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Let me introduce another term, 'right on crime'. We must start being smarter and, yes, we need to be right on crime. Reducing prison populations is a goal of this Governor. It should be the goal of every Member of this General Assembly as well. When the Illinois State's Attorneys, the Cook County State's Attorney, Cook County Sheriff's Office, the Cook County Public Defender, the DuPage County State's Attorney, and a number of judges, and a number of law enforcement agree that it's time to be smarter on crime and to be right on crime, let's do so. Let's work together. Pass this Bill. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor." Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, earlier today, I received an e-mail from an organization called Stop Drugged Driving, and it contains some information I'd like to ask you about. Let me first verify. As I understand, the... there is now going to be a... it amends... your Bill amends the Vehicle Code and there's now going to be a test, I assume, similar to a field sobriety test, that there is a level of THC which is permitted, and if you don't surpass that level, then you are not in violation of the... of any offense. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "So, just as with alcohol, there needs to be evidence of impairment, obviously. So, the field test, the physical field test that you see that we're all familiar with, the walking the line, et cetera, that's the same regardless. This will finally put in place a reliable standard… a chemical standard that can be utilized. The substance THC, or the active

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

ingredient in marijuana, is very different from alcohol. Under our current system, someone could have ingested marijuana weeks ago and still test positive, which puts in jeopardy a successful prosecution. This is actually a reliable, scientifically based standard both in the field and with follow-up that can... that can sustain a Frye test that can be utilized in court effectively. I saw those same e-mails. They're simply inaccurate."

- Harris, D.: "So, you simply say that what they're saying is inaccurate. They indicate that the limit that is proposed in this legislation, and I will quote what they sent out today, is by far the highest limit proposed in the United States and is not supported by science. You simply disagree with that?"
- Cassidy: "I do disagree... disagree. Very few states have begun using this. Colorado does have a much lower standard. Colorado has acknowledged their standard is far too low and still picks up folks who have not smoked anywhere near or ingested in anywhere... have not ingested the substance anywhere near the time of the driving. They have acknowledged that five is too low."
- Harris, D.: "And my... my concern is, quite frankly, if... while this might be... might not be low enough, I would rather error on the side of caution rather than on the side of the excuse of giving folks the opportunity to avoid an offense. They indicate that under the standard that we have proposed, 95... excuse me, 97.5 percent of all drivers who might be tested would be, basically, exempt from the offense. That seems to me like, basically, everybody you're testing, almost, is not going to... not going to be... have committed an offense."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Cassidy: "You'll note there was no study cited with that percentage. I don't know where you would be able to come up with a standard... a percentage like that. These numbers, the saliva and blood, or... other bodily fluids and blood numbers directly from the Illinois State's Attorneys Association. Matt Jones did an exhaustive research of the studies out there. He went into great detail into the science behind the achievement of those numbers and the time line with which ingestion occurs and when those numbers peak and when we reach those numbers. I feel very confident that the prosecutors would seek the levels that would give them the greatest opportunity to prosecute those truly quilty of impaired driving."

Harris, D.: "Thank you very much. And just briefly to the Bill.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the time may have come for the decriminalization of small amounts of marijuana. And there is a logic not to put everyone in jail who has a small amount of marijuana, but at the same time, just as we have a concern about driving under the influence, especially when it comes to alcohol, I think we should have an equal concern about the potential for abuse of driving under the influence when it... when that influence happens to be from marijuana. I don't know what the right standard is, but if this standard is too high, I think that's a cause for concern. And I would ask you to consider that before you vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we have many people seeking recognition on this Bill. So, we'll be moving to a timer going forward of two minutes. Please keep your remarks brief. We'll be moving

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

to a two-minute timer for this Bill. Next up, we have Representative Christian Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to start by just thanking Representative Cassidy for her great work on this. We spent a lot of time over the summer in hearings talking to folks, including the state's attorneys and public defenders and ACLU and others to potentially get this done. This is one of the more exciting pieces of legislation I've had a chance to be a part of. I'm glad that we have a great bipartisan coalition. And this is an effort to truly be smarter on crime. What's exciting about this is that we are in... potentially decreasing our prison population, which is important. We are saving taxpayer dollars. But importantly, we are making sure that an entire generation of mostly young men, many of them black and brown, will not be caught in a cycle of prison and poverty. So, I want to thank all the people from both sides of the aisle who worked on this, including folks like Representative Cabello. And I urge an 'aye' vote on something that will be transformative for our criminal justice system and for the lives of many young men. Thank you so much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Congratulations, House Repre... House Members. I am elated to see such bipartisan support on us being smart. No, not just smart, but intelligent on crime or some of these... these long-standing, relatively small penalties, finally with us coming into the 21st century. This is a great step for all of us moving the state forward and looking at some of these incredible changes. I mean, this

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

is unprecedented. I want to commend the Sponsor, all of the Sponsors who are coing, who really believe in giving our criminal justice system an opportunity to be intelligent on crime and to make sure that we are not wasting our precious public resources on issues that we know we can do better with, especially having a couple of joints or two, putting someone in jail. This here does such great wonders for it. I'm proud of the Sponsor's work and due diligence. I know that you put in a tremendous amount of time in helping to right our state and see to it that the citizens are not wasting the taxpayers' money off of some of these petty crimes. Thank you. And I would encourage all Members to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I also would... We're on a timer, so I'll be brief. This Bill is what every... what everyone should strive for when it comes to criminal justice reform. It's balanced. It's making sure that we realign our Criminal Code to focus on the truly important nature of what we're after here and reducing the valve when it comes to pushing forth on penalties that no longer make sense. Congratulations to the Sponsor, if indeed, it passes. To the questions about the limits in the saliva portion, I introduced a similar Bill that I think was in the provision. There's no ascertainable science right now on that. So, we're left with trusting advocates like the State's Attorneys Association to come up with this approach. No one's ever going to be happy when the science is new, so we'll... we can always revisit these things, but it's a good approach to make sure that in a new environment, we can crack down on those who choose to smoke

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

and drive. Again, kudos to the Sponsor and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Keith Wheeler."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I want to applaud your work on this Bill."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

- Wheeler, K.: "I have some questions for you. Are there any provisions in the Bill differentiating its effect based on the age of the offender?"
- Cassidy: "Other than language that conveys the same level of confidentiality within the juvenile system that is in current law, no, there is not."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. I bring that up because the health department official of mine as well as a probation officer reached out to me with respect to the part of our system that would affect treatment for young people. And I understand with the automatic expungement process this Bill would affect, that there may not be a way automatically built into the system that would help our public service health officials see who would need that treatment and how to get that to them.

 Am I correct in what I stated about the effect of the Bill?"
- Cassidy: "I believe with regard to those youth who are on probation, probably... it's probably not correct. I think that those youth on probation would get picked up one of two ways. One, their probation officer would know about the ticket, but they would also be subject to drug testing. And so, if they were using marijuana, they would... they would test hot and

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

they would be picked up at that... at that level. In addition, the language in the Bill around local ordinances, I believe and have double-checked, would not preclude a community from finding a way to do its own follow-up with youth."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. So, let's... following up on that part of it. For the... for the purposes of the legislative intent, you're saying that House Bill 218 would allow non-Home Rule units of government to affect their own ordinances with respect to possession of marijuana in the low limits below 15 grams?"

Cassidy: "My understanding is that of the hundred we currently have... the hundred areas that already have ordinances, at least 40 of them are already non-Home Rule. We went to great lengths to ensure that that process could still continue. And in the Bill, it's page 184, lines 21 to 25, the intent there is to allow those local communities, regardless of Home Rule status, to continue to... to engage in this at the local level."

Wheeler, K.: "So, to help me understand it, that it would include..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, can you please bring your remarks
to a close? The time has expired."

Wheeler, K.: "Yes. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you."

Wheeler, K.: "That would... that would include counties, townships, villages, and cities whether Home Rule or not then, correct?"

Cassidy: "I believe so, yes."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you very much."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in strong support of the Lady's Bill. Let me first commend Representative Cassidy for her long and hard work on this very important piece of legislation. This Bill is good for the public health. It's good for the court system. It's good for society. It's good for young offenders who make a small mistake and want to get on with their lives and not have it be in their way. It's... it's really an excellent Bill and well put together. I just wanted to address one portion of the Bill dealing with the DUI. A previous speaker indicated a concern with the 15 nanogram test. I, myself, am not a big fan of the nanogram test at all. In the medical marijuana legislation, we rejected this as a test; however, the 15 nanogram test is high enough to make sure that nobody who would be at that level could be said not to be impaired. It's also at a place where the state's attorneys are comfortable that it's a fair test. As Mr. Zalewski said, the science of this is such that if you make it a lower number, you run the risk that people will end up being incarcerated when they weren't impaired at all. As you know, cannabis stays in your system for a very long time. And so, we had to put a test together that was fair to both the potential defendant and to the state's attorneys and to other drivers on the road. In the end, it's still up to the police officer to determine whether a driver is impaired. The test should not be whether the person used cannabis. The test should be whether the driver is impaired. If the driver is impaired, off to jail the driver should go. If the driver is not impaired, then the driver is not impaired and should not be in the criminal

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

justice system. So, the 15 nanograms is just a place where some people drew a line because they felt they had to have some line, but it's a fair one and I support it. And of course, I support the Bill and urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cabello."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Cabello: "Representative Cassidy, I just have one question. Is the reason for this Bill to try to make sure that if you are in a large municipality and you have a small amount of marijuana that the punishment and the penalties are the same as when you go to a small community?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely. The purpose, my full intention, my desire in carrying this was to ensure that we had a uniform civil enforcement strategy statewide, that there was no confusion, no distinction between where you live or what you look like. The punishment, the penalties, the response from law enforcement would be the same."

Cabello: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is... we've heard these words before. We're being smart on crime; we are not being soft on crime. When we have the challenges that are facing our communities today, the crime that we have, this will help law enforcement move on quicker than what they would have to do if they had a law that made them tag the evidence, arrest these folks. It's going to clog our court systems. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of this Bill. It's part of us trying to move forward. We have a unique opportunity to change and reform our criminal justice system.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

This is part of that change. Congratulations, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lou... Representative Lang in the Chair. The Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill by Representative Cassidy. As a new Member of the House, this is one of the most important issues that I face as a former city council member and county board member. And we know, I looked at a new poll on this issue, that over 60 percent of Americans support not just your Bill, but they support us going further and looking at our future a little brighter. This policy change will get us one step closer to that. And I support the work that Representative Cassidy and so many other Members have done on this issue over the years, and I am here as a strong supporter of this legislation and other things that we'll do in the near future for our state. Thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to rise and to thank Representative Cassidy and all the organizations that you have been working with to bring this Bill to fruition. For years, Representative Davis and I have been begging and pleading to stop this. And finally, this is the beginning, the beginning. This is the beginning of us undoing some of the mistakes of the past because we have destroyed so many people's lives. And we have made it so that our children cannot be educated. Our elderly who's dying cannot be buried. We cannot get access to health care because of the mistakes that we, too, have made. So, Representative, if I may, just for a moment, because I've been wanting to say these words

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

for a very long time. I would just like to read off some of what you're doing in the executive summary. Representative, because of you, we are going to remove the criminal penalties for persons possessing 15 grams or less of cannabis. Because of you, Representative, we're going to remove the criminal penalties for people possessing drug paraphernalia. We're also, Representative, because of you, we're going to reduce the penalties for possessing large amounts of cannabis. Because of you, Representative, we're going to create new penalties for people who have manufactured and distributed drugs, but we're going to lower those penalties. So, because of you, Representative, so many people's lives are going to be changed. I want to thank you... thank you for having the tenacity to move this forward, but please know there's lots of other people that is waiting for us to set them free. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Well, Representative Cassidy, I, too, rise to congratulate you on your hard work. And I know it wasn't easy to bring both sides to the table and agree on something that's very important to everyone in the state. So, everyone that spoke previously, they made some good points and I concur with them. I just want to make sure that we can send a message, also, to the young people today that this is by no means a ticket for them to indulge in marijuana. And would you speak to that?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely. We are very specifically not decriminalizing. We are very specifically acknowledging that

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

this remains an illegal substance. We are very specifically making sure that the punishment fits the crime. Representative Ford, to your point, I had, as you all know, I've got young children, and I've got three sons and they asked me about what this means. And we live in an incredibly diverse neighborhood. And what I said it meant was that what we know now under our current system, I felt pretty confident that if they did this, they'd get a ticket but our neighbors would get arrested. And I didn't think that was fair, and they didn't either."

Ford: "Well, I thank you and I'm sure that people of the Austin community, where I represent, they thank you also because it has been such a troubling law that has hurt so many people and burdened their lives. So, I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Representative Cassidy."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond. Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Wheeler."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, in 2007, in my hometown of Oswego, there was a car crash that took the lives of five young people in my community. As result of that situation, legislation was passed through this chamber and the Senate and into law that changed possession of alcohol for a person under 21 on a first offense to lose their driver's license for 6 months. A second offense was 12 months, and a third offense was indefinitely. With this Bill, we are not putting marijuana and alcohol on a level playing field for those young people. And I want to just get your take on

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

how we could improve that and what we should do to... make that a more equivalent situation between those two situations for our youth."

Cassidy: "Absolutely. So, when we spoke about this, as we talked about it, alcohol is a legal substance, this remains an illegal substance. I do believe that as this evolves, there is room to look at that more. We are not changing the... the added penalties for juveniles who engage in DUI, those same sort of suspensions that exist with alcohol would exist with this. You know, I believe this is not the end of the road for this kind of legislation. I think that what you're suggesting is an interesting point to examine."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. And this brings forth, and this is my last point, that is the concern I have about the automatic expungement because we have no way to track those kids and help them before they become a problem. And this is not a driving under the influence issue, this is a possession issue."

Cassidy: "Right."

Wheeler, K.: "So, thank you."

Cassidy: "And to that point about automatic expungement, we are equally concerned that a young person would then be denied access to financial aid, admission to college, access to the military, access to professional licensing. So, we have to strike that balance and find a way."

Wheeler, K.: "I appreciate that and I appreciate your answers.

Thank you."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy to close."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Cassidy: "First of all, I want to address some of the DUI questions and make sure that folks especially with regard to the first speaker who brought up the impaired driving pieces. First of these thresholds provide a legal presumption impairment. Below that, a lower level, with proof impairment, someone who fails a field test, someone who's crossed the line, someone who has shown proof of impairment, the levels are no longer relevant. Their actions are. So, let's be clear. An impaired driver is still going to be charged appropriately. These thresholds provide a legal presumption absent proof of impairment. I, too, want to thank many of the Sponsors of other legislation that worked with me over the years: Christian Mitchell, Mike Zalewski particular, our former colleague, Dennis Reboletti, who was such an amazing piece of the work we've done on this over the years. And I'm so grateful to him and to the colleagues who followed him and my Sponsors. And... and my wonderful coalition of oddballs who don't usually work together. I'm looking forward to doing a lot more work with the Illinois Policy Institute and the ACLU together. This is... it is time. This is where we are. It is time to realign our criminal justice system. It is time to be smarter on crime. This Bill does that. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Anthony, Drury, Flowers, Franks. Mr. Anthony. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 53 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3944, Mr. Bennett. Please proceed, Mr. Clerk. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3944, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is House Bill 3944... thank you. Basically, it's an agreed to Bill by the State Police and the ABATE group. From the State Police perspective, this language does basically three things. It prohibits use of both red and blue light on bikes. It ensures these lights will not be distracting to other motorists on the road. And it also ensures these lights will be facing downward and not blinding to other drivers on the highway. So, I do move for an 'aye' vote, if we could please."

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? Anthony, Cabello, Davis. Mr. Anthony, Mr. Cabello. Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4120. Mr. Brady. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4120, a Bill for an Act concerning health.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4120 simply clarifies, when it comes to tissue donation and a body is taken to a procurement center

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

out of state, across the state boundaries, that a special permit is issued for the remains and the tissue donation to be done within 36 hours returning the body back to the Illinois side. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bennett, Golar, Hays. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hays. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3523. Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown. Out of the record. House Bill 2513. Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2513, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of the House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the Members of this august assembly. House Bill 2513 is actually similar to former House Bill 2494 that was introduced and passed last year. It requires retailers to obtain a license to sell cigarettes. The legislation was introduced to reduce the sale of cigarettes to minors, to prevent illegal sales of contraband and tobacco, and illegal smuggling of cigarettes to Illinois. The license includes an annual fee that is intended to help fund the interdiction of smuggling and retail inspections. There's no opposition to this Bill. It's supported by the Retail Merchants. I'd like to ask your support."

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

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Butler, Davis, Flowers. Mr. Davis. 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 1790. Mr. Cavaletto. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1790, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 1790 will make it easier for vocational teachers that were issued a career in technical educator endorsement or provisional career and technical educator license before January 1, 2015 to renew their licenses. This Bill will protect vocational education jobs throughout the state and specifically in my district. That would force educators to retire if they do not take the necessary test to renew their license or complete the 20 semester hours of course work. My district would lose four good vocational educators to retirement and then possibly the rest... some others in the other parts of the state. Our schools can't afford to lose those types of teachers and sever an important field due to the burdens and requirements to renew their license. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, what is the ISBE's opposition to the Bill?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Cavaletto: "They are typically opposed to it but they're not...

they're not fighting it."

Franks: "But they are on record as being opposed. Did they say why?"

Cavaletto: "They're opposed to getting rid of the requirement."

Franks: "Okay. And I'm wondering, why would we for an educator...

why would we take away a basic skills test?"

Cavaletto: "We're really not doing it. They're going to have to take the test later on."

Franks: "Oh. Then maybe my analysis is wrong, 'cause our analysis indicates that..."

Cavaletto: "They've... they've been teaching for years and they've all taken the basic skills test."

Franks: "Okay."

Cavaletto: "But, here's the problem. The problem is downhome we don't... we can't find vocational teachers. We get people who are electricians, plumbers, welders, and those guys who've been in the field and have done this for a long time, to come in and teach those students. So, we're not getting vocational teachers like we used to in the past. We can't afford to lose these teachers because there are young kids that don't want to go to college; they want a career in plumbing or electricity and so, this makes it a little easier for those people to stay."

Franks: "So, they're already there..."

Cavaletto: "Yes."

Franks: "...and they're already teaching..."

Cavaletto: "Yes."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Franks: "...but they never took a basic skills test some time before?"

Cavaletto: "That's right."

Franks: "All right. And they're proficient and they've been... since then, there's been no issues?"

Cavaletto: "Yes, Sir."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor... excuse me. Representative Ammons is recognized."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Just a very quick question. How does a current plumber or welder become a CTEN instructor?"

Cavaletto: "Well, I guess you might say that if he's spent a lot of years in the electric... in the plumbing business or welding business and he's kind of retired, and he comes to the school to teach a few... a few kids how to weld and electrical... do electrical work or plumb."

Ammons: "Okay."

Cavaletto: "So, it's the guys really basically are retired from it who have been in the field for a long time."

Ammons: "Okay. All right. Thank you so much."

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? Breen, Davis, Evans, Gordon-Booth, Sandack. Mr. Breen. Please take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no', 2

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 421. Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 421, a Bill for an Act concerning

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 421 is an agreement between the advanced practice nurses and the Illinois State Medical Society regarding collaborative practice. It provides for many things; a written collaborative agreement still required in many situations. It allows advanced practice nurses and doctors to more broadly determine the relationship of a team practice and eliminates a lot of things. I'd be glad to answer any questions, but this is agreed. There's no opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative Feigenholtz, I believe I heard you correctly that with your final Amendment, this is an agreed Bill. It removes all opposition to your Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Hammond: "And I just want to thank you for all your work on it. I think that's awesome. Thanks so much."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Representative. My pleasure."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to a potential conflict,

I'll be voting 'present'."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

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? Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4096, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4096, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 496 (sic-4096) is a Bill that addresses an issue regarding children and children with behavioral problems. Many of us in the human services sector under the dome have been working to make sure that we have a system in place for children. This Bill moves some important task from DHS to HFS. It creates a children's cabinet. And hopefully, is a framework for some issues that we are dealing with in the State of Illinois. I'm glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Sara, I see in the Amendment that HFS is mutual, but DHS is what? Have you heard from them?"

Feigenholtz: "They did not speak. I don't believe that they provided testimony in committee. Representative Bellock is a cosponsor of this Bill. I'm about to add her to this Bill. I think that... so DHS hasn't particularly weighed in either way. I'm not sure if your analysis says anything different."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Sandack: "No. It says that they were opposed to the underlying Bill and it says nothing with respect to the Amendment. That's why I asked. But you have not heard from them since your Amendment?"

Feigenholtz: "Neither way, no."

Sandack: "Thank you."

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? Meier. 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 3529. Mr. Demmer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3529, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3529 helps protect senior citizens from financial exploitation by ensuring that dollars that are meant to go for their medical healthcare actually go for their intended purposes. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davis. Please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3465. Representative Hernandez. Please read the Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3465, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 3465 creates the Roadside Monarch Habitat Fund and allows the issuance of monarch plates. As we all know, the monarch butterfly is the state insect. The monarch's population declined by 81 percent between 1999 and 2010. At the same time, there was a 58 percent decline in the Midwest in the density of milkweed, the only plant on which monarch caterpillars feed. Due to the loss of most of the prairies in Illinois, roadsides are now one of the best options for reviving monarch habitat by planting milkweed. The funds of the plates will go towards this fund, which will... sorry... will use the... will be used for planting the milkweed necessary to help the monarch survive.

I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, we passed last week, or maybe it was this week, I can't remember, a new license plate, kind of a universal plate law. Would your Bill be, because it's not in affect yet..."

Hernandez: "Correct."

Sandack: "...it would be, I think, applicable to the new law?"

Hernandez: "That's correct, yes."

Sandack: "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?

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz, Sims, Wallace. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2556. Representative Jesiel. Representative Jesiel. Out of the record. House Bill 500. Representative McDermed. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 500, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise this afternoon to talk to the Members about something that's very important to all of us and to all of our constituents, our dental health. House Bill 500 extends the regulation of dentists and dental hygienists for the next 10 years. What you need to know about this Bill is that it is agreed between the Illinois State Dental Society and the Department of Financial and Professional Responsibility. It has received some tweaks from the Speaker's Office and I urge your 'yes' vote on extending regulation of dentists and dental hygienists for the next 10 years. I'm happy to answer questions about the specifics of the little tweaks that have been made in the regulatory regime for dentists and hygienists, but I will leave that to you to ask. Otherwise, please vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

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

McDermed: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Flowers: "Representative, I really appreciate you carrying this legislation, but I just have one question. Because we're extending the practice and we are tweaking the language, are we adding in the language that dental is a part of the body as a whole and you cannot separate it when it comes down to the services that needs to be provided because one part could affect the other part of your body? Is that in the legislation?"

McDermed: "No. We have not addressed parts of the body."

Flowers: "Well, I just want everybody to be reminded because some of us seem to think that we can separate dental care and it has no effect on the other part of the body when we do not have access to quality dental care. And people with diabetes and other illnesses if they do not get the proper dental care, it could worsen the situation, cause people to go to the emergency room, and cause the cost to escalate. So, but... if in the tweaking we could tweak that to say that this is part of a body as a whole, and when you talk about access to healthcare, make sure dental is a part of that conversation. Thank you very much."

McDermed: "Thank you."

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? Andrade. Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3270. Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3270, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill addresses the need for healthcare coverage for those individuals who are leaving the correctional... correctional system and going home. This particular Bill allows for the state to provide applications for the ACA insurance program. If there's no questions, I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I stand in full support of this Bill. This is something that is being addressed nationally and it's very important. So, I encourage people to vote for this Bill. Thank you very much."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Andersson, Arroyo, Breen, Butler, Chapa LaVia, Crespo, Fortner, Leitch, Tabares. Butler, Leitch. Please take the record. There are 86 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2791. Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2791, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2791 is a study that was conducted by the Health and Family Services, the child support division. It's a broad study that looks at the general

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

barriers to paying child support. We'll be working with the department to minimize those barriers so that we can reduce the debt of child support that's owed to the State of Illinois. If there's no questions... if there's no questions, I'll ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative, you want to do a study to find out how much money is owed to the state for child support? No."

Lilly: "No, that's not... to look at the barriers that are preventing individuals from paying child support."

Davis, M.: "I can't hear you."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No. It's a study to look at the barriers of those who are not paying child support, what is preventing them from paying child support."

Davis, M.: "Are we going to pay for that study or can I just do it?"

Lilly: "The Department of Children... Health and Family Services, the child support division, we've worked and dialogued this very lengthy time to address why and how we can make sure that those individuals who owe child support will be able to pay child support."

Davis, M.: "Sometimes, Representative, they're incarcerated. Sometimes the people aren't paying child support because they're incarcerated and they don't have a job and they're not making any money in prison and yet, the state is saying they owe child support. Then the state is also adding interest to that money."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Lilly: "Exactly. And that's exactly why we're doing this study.

The Department... child support has a concern with that exact issue. And what we want to do is come up with solutions to make sure those barriers are removed and make sure that we are not putting those individuals in dire... further debt for child support."

Davis, M.: "Right. Because once they're released from prison, they can't get a driver's license because they owe child support. And the child support they owe is because they didn't have a job because they were in prison. So, it's like almost a catch 22 or it's similar to the days of slavery when... or let's say post slavery when people were released and they would work and try to earn the money to move on. But at the end, the slave master would tell them that they owed money for their keep... house keep or their children. And they could never get out of that home. They could never get out of it. And this is very similar to what happened during those terrible, terrible, atrocious years. I support your legislation. Do you have a time in which this study should be completed?"

Lilly: "Yes. May 2017."

Davis, M.: "Thank you very much. And please add me as a cosponsor."

Lilly: "Yes, ma'am."

Davis, M.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "Representative, in your process of studying the barriers to paying child support, are you also going to take

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- into consideration those individuals who owe child support that are purposely not paying?"
- Lilly: "Yes. They are... we're taking into account all institutionalized barriers of individuals who are responsible for child support."
- Davis, W.: "But when you say barrier that implies that someone may be having trouble paying child support. I'm talking about people... as a matter of fact, I've got a constituent issue right now where the ex-husband, and children's father, has simply just refused to pay child support."
- Lilly: "The study would highlight those issues and demographics so that we can begin to address them and create law that addresses that type of behavior."
- Davis, W.: "So, in other words, your study will hopefully identify deadbeats and the reasons why deadbeats are not paying, and to put forth ideas, legislatively, that will address deadbeats that are not paying. Correct?"
- Lilly: "It will look... it will look at all those issues where child support is not being paid. You are absolutely correct."

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Will the... Will the Speaker yield? I'm sorry, the Sponsor." Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Soto: "Representative, sometimes when there's barriers, yes, sometimes they're incarcerated. And maybe before you went in you didn't have an opportunity to motion up the case and modify whatever your child support payments were going to be withheld because they're incarcerated, so then they accrue in arrears. So, there's a lot of reasons of course, obviously,

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

that sometimes these noncustodial parents can't pay child support but there are opportunities. If they have an arrears and they're incarcerated and they're accruing in arrears, when they come out of jail, what they can do is go to the clerk's office, motion up the case, and then prove that they weren't working at a certain time because they were incarcerated. And then they can modify that information and maybe even get rid of those arrears for them. But lot of times, many of the noncustodial parents are nervous to go to court. It's like, if we were going to court, we get nervous. We start thinking about, oh, we're going to have to go before the judge and you don't know, you know, what he's going to rule on. And then also, you know, it's like anything. It's like when a police officer's behind you and they're following you, you start getting nervous. You're thinking they're going to stop you. Again... again, there's a lot of barriers, but I think there's... I support this Bill. I mean, just so that we can maybe just continue to ... to collect child support. At one time, we had a broken system. Child support has turned around a lot. I mean, we've passed legislation here in the General Assembly that has really made it much better. So, you know what, I guess it doesn't hurt to try again and see how we can help the noncustodial parents maybe feel more confident to come to court and be responsible to pay child support for their children. If there's anything I can do to help you, please, reach out to me. Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Phillips, Poe, Tryon, Wehrli. Mr. Poe. 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. Chair recognizes Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Speaker, please let the record show that Representative D'Amico is excused for the remainder of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Chair recognizes Mr. Wehrli."
- Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the record reflect that on HB 3270 I was a 'yes' vote?"
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions, Sir. House Bill 14... Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 23, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #6 to House Bill 229; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 373."
- Speaker Lang: "House Bill 1455. Representative McAsey. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1455, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey."
- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1455 provides a short term solution to the challenges facing electronic waste recycling in our state. This Bill is agreed language that is the result of hours and hours of meetings over several months. Stake holders, including

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

representatives of local government, including Will County, who first brought this issue to me, as well as other stake the electronics holders, including manufacturers, environmental advocates, representatives of hauler's industry, and members of the Illinois EPA have all been very involved in working to craft proposals, review drafts. And I can't thank all of those entities enough for getting us to this point. The Bill provides a short-term solution and includes several components. It establishes annual recycling goals, impounds for the manufacturers of TV's, computer monitors, and other electronic... covered electronic devices, rather. It increases the thresholds for manufacturers from currently 70 percent to now being required to pay 45 cents per pound if recycling less than 50 percent of the target or 35 cents per pound if recycling between 50 and 90 percent of the target. There's a prohibition on recyclers from charging local governments, and allows waste haulers to contract with local governments to provide services. There is language specifically related to CRT devices and the ability to count the weight of those towards recycling goals if those... if the glass is beneficially reused or placed in retrievable storage at a waste disposal site that's allowed to accept the glass. certification requirement for recyclers and refurbishers. And there is also a pilot program with regard to credits for manufacturers allowing for a carry forward credit of 25 percent of the weight the manufacturer collects over their recycling target that can be carried forward or sold for a one-year period. Again, I thank all of the different stake

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

holders for coming to agreement on this issue. I know of no opposition. Ask for your 'aye' votes, and I'm available for any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "For the purposes of legislative intent, I have a couple questions for you. Does this Bill allow electronic equipment manufacturers to meet its annual recycling or reuse goal if the CRT glass is treated and placed in an IEPA permitted retrievable storage cell?"

McAsey: "Yes. It is an option that can be utilized by a manufacturer to meet its annual recycling or reuse goal if all recyclable materials are removed and the CRT glass is either beneficially reused in accordance with Section 22.54 of the Environmental Protection Act or the CRT glass is managed in accordance with all applicable State and Federal Laws and regulations and placed in a retrievable storage cell at a waste disposal site that is permitted to accept the glass. Furthermore, an electronic waste certification body, such as R2 or e-Stewards, will not be able to prohibit its members within the State of Illinois from using a CRT management solution that meets the criteria outlined in Section 15(d) of the Environmental Protection Act."

Wehrli: "So, this is an option not a requirement regarding the management and disposition of CRTs and a manufacturer can utilize other legal options of recycling CRTs and count the total weight of the CRT toward its goal?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- McAsey: "Yes. And option, not a requirement. If a manufacturer or recycler decides it would rather use an out-of-state solution, such as smelting the CRT glass that would still be acceptable under Illinois law as long as all state and federal laws and regulations are complied with."
- Wehrli: "And we have some opponents listed. To be clear, this is now an agreed Bill. All of those concerns are removed?"
- McAsey: "Yes. My understanding is that there is no opposition to this Bill. All of the stake holders that were involved in the negotiations are either neutral or in support of this proposed legislation."
- Wehrli: "Thank you. To the Bill. I'd like to thank the Representative for her hours of hard work on this. This took a lot of effort. It's a good team Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Evans, Wheeler. Please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 178. Mr. McSweeney. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 178, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."
- McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 178 would freeze the township property tax levy for townships with a population of less than 100 thousand that are in PTEL covered areas. For some of the new Members, PTEL was passed in 1995. It freezes property tax levies at the lower five percent of the rate of inflation.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

This would simply freeze, for the town funds, the property tax levies for one year. Let me be clear. I support much broader property tax reform. In fact, I had the Bill that would freeze property tax levies for all government units for three years. This is what I can get done now. I think it's a good first step. There can be a referendum that's still allowed to allow an increase, but it just simply would freeze that levy for one year. People in this state need property tax relief. This would save \$3.6 billion, which is not a really big number considering the billions we're talking about, but it's a start. And it actually saves it forever 'cause it lowers the base. So, that's \$36 million over ten years. Very similar to the Bill that passed the House last year, also added in an exemption for areas that were affected by the 2013 tornados, the natural disasters. So, this is a small step. I want to see much broader property tax reform. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, one of the things in here, this excludes certain townships. Could you elaborate on how you picked what townships should be excluded from the provisions of this?"

McSweeney: "Absolutely, Mike. We had a separate discussion on this.

I'm more than happy to discuss it. The first thing is we set
the criteria at 100 thousand, I thought was a reasonable
level. That is..."

Fortner: "If I..."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

McSweeney: "That's the number that covers most of the townships.

And there are approximately eight townships that are exempted. And frankly, I would love to see a property tax Bill that would freeze all property taxes. But under the situation that we're in right now..."

Fortner: "Okay. Okay. I... We answered that..."

McSweeney: "...so... so... what I decided to do... Mike, if you let me answer the question..."

Fortner: "You did answer the question..."

McSweeney: "What I decided to do is I decided in order to get the legislation passed to accommodate certain requests, and that's what we're doing. So, that's... that's what the criteria that's being used is. Again, I would like to see a broad property tax freeze. This is a small first step. That's why the Bill is here."

Fortner: "This is not... I would consider a first step if the number is... in one part, you say there's a 100 thousand of which you did not describe any basis, if I'm correct, other than it seemed like a good number. Am I correct in..."

McSweeney: "That... that isn't correct, Mike. The 100 thousand is actually to try to pick up as many townships as possible.

That covers every township in my district. That is why the 100 thousand number was used."

Fortner: "Okay. So, it covers every..."

McSweeney: "That... that's number one, if you let me answer the question. That is why the 100 thousand is used as a number."

Fortner: "So, to the Bill. I think we just heard a key point here.

The Representative stated the reason for 100 thousand is it covers every township in his district would be exempted.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

That's not a rational basis for picking a limit. furthermore, there are a number of other townships that are also exempted that are below 100 thousand. There's no basis for that. If 100 thousand's a meaningful number, then 100 thousand's meaningful. To then go and cherry pick specific townships really does not support this idea that we want to have a freeze. The Representative had a fine Bill, a fine Bill, the other day that had extremely rational basis, based on Home Rule versus non-Home Rule that he could point to and stuck to that. That's not the case in this Bill. This is very different. This is a much more arbitrary number. And I want to go to another matter of the Bill. By it being a one year freeze for property taxpayers, an average homeowner in my township which, by the way, is the only one of the nine DuPage Townships that would remain impacted. The other eight townships are exempted. But the township I happen to live in, Winnfield Township in DuPage County, is impacted. Surely, arbitrary. It's not the only one under 100 thousand, but it's the only one that would be impacted. The typical homeowner in that township would save less than \$1. The savings to the taxpayer, less than \$1. Even over ten years by changing the base, we're talking less than \$10. That's not real savings. That's not really an effective way to get at what I think the Representative has said when he wants to talk about a much broader statewide thing. We should be doing that and not something that's arbitrarily cherry picking which townships are in which are out. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair is going to begin to use the two minute timer and recognizes Mr. Mitchell."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

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

Mitchell, B.: "Representative, we had a communication this morning. I indicated I will support the Bill and if I could kind of ask for... I didn't understand. I thought Representative Fortner had some good points. I didn't understand the rationale why you would... let's... could you elaborate on the 100 thousand? I mean, property taxes are the most onerous tax, I think, that we have here in Illinois. I appreciate what you've... are doing and what you have done in the past. I mean, downstate Illinois, I've got a little township, Austin Township, 200 people. Ten bridges. That road commissioner's going nuts. He can't have the money to fix those bridges. He's going to come to me and say, why does Austin Township be frozen but bigger townships of over 100 thousand aren't? I need to give him an answer. I haven't heard that from you."

McSweeney: "And, Representative, let me first of all make sure I'm correcting from the last question. All of the townships in my district would be covered; they're not exempted. They would be covered. Their property tax would be frozen. To your answer, just like the PTEL when it was set up, there are 39 different counties in the state that have actually adopted the PTEL, were covered under the '95 law. The \$100 thousand... 100 thousand person limit, excuse me, was set to try to pick up as many townships as possible. And let me be clear, your road funds would not be affected. This is only for town funds. This is not for highway funds of townships. That's the best answer."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Mitchell, B.: "Well, thank you, Representative. I will support the Bill."

McSweeney: "Thank you."

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

Yingling: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... To the Bill. I rise in support of this Bill. I want to thank the Sponsor for bring this to the House Floor. I think there are a couple of things that we have to address here. I think everyone in this room knows that the Illinois property tax system is broken and there's something that needs to be done to fix it. And I think that Representative McSweeney's Bill here is a good first step to addressing this. But until this chamber is willing to recognize that we do have a dysfunctional property tax system in this state that needs to be completely overhauled, we are going to have to use these smaller steps to accomplish anything. And I would wholeheartedly support Mr. McSweeney if he put together a comprehensive Bill and I would encourage my colleagues to support it as well. But in the meantime, this is what we have to work with and I think that this is a very reasonable first step. I used to be a township supervisor. I'm very familiar with township government. I'm familiar with township tax levies. And this freeze is something that the township forum of government can easily handle. This is not going to bankrupt anyone, and it's also going to provide some relief to the property taxpayers. And I know there was another speaker that mentioned that maybe it would only save about a dollar or \$10, but the reality is, is that that money belongs to the property taxpayer. If the government doesn't need it, whether it's a dollar, ten, or a thousand dollars, is that

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

money should belong in the pockets of the property taxpayers. So, I strongly encourage a 'yes' vote and, again, I thank the Sponsor."

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

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a good start. You know, we've had more comprehensive Bills and we've passed them in the House but they've gone down in the Senate. This Bill won't solve all the problems but, folks, the first thing you have to do when you're in a hole is to stop digging. This Bill will help accomplish that at some levels. And understand that the townships are not going to get one dollar less than they got the year before. Now, we're looking at cuts throughout the state and we've been asked to do more with less. Our townships will still get the same amount they got the year before, they just won't get an automatic increase. That's it. So they don't get the multiplier or the CPI of 1.5 percent, or even if it's 2 percent. This is not going to be catastrophic. We're just asking that they tighten their belts. Now, in McHenry County where Mr. McSweeney and I represent, we have lost population for four years in a row. We used to be one of the fasting... fastest growing counties in the entire country. And now, we are losing population. And we are losing population because we have one of the highest property tax burdens in the entire country. Our folks cannot handle it. They are getting buzz sawed. They've lost 40 percent of their home values and they've seen their property taxes increase. It is obscene. We need to help our homeowners.

This is a start. Everyone should vote 'aye'."

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

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

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

Martwick: "Representative McSweeney, I know you and I had a spirited debate on this the last time it was up and I'm going to try and be a little bit more soft on my questions. But none the less, can you explain Addison, Bloom, Calumet, Orland, Rich, Stickney, and Wayne? Why excluded if you picked up everybody of 100 thousand?"

McSweeney: "Absolutely. Listen, I look forward to a spirited debate. That was great last year; I look forward to it today. I received requests from various Members and in order to, I believe move the Bill forward, I accommodated those requests. And, as I told you, respectfully, I would like to have the Bill apply to everyone. I would like to have it even beyond, not PTEL..."

Martwick: "Okay."

McSweeney: "...but frankly, that ... that is why I have to ..."

Martwick: "So, you... so you exempted certain townships at Members requests in order to get their votes to pass the Bill?"

McSweeney: "No, that's not true. Actually, I think most of the Members actually will probably vote against it. It was to... to, in my view, get the discussion going on the basis of property tax reform. It's a small first step and I... and again, I understand that."

Martwick: "And I understand that. And you make a very good point about property tax reform..."

McSweeney: "Right."

Martwick: "...as did the other prior speaker. There's no doubt that property tax reform is what we should be seeking in this..."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

McSweeney: "Right."

Martwick: "...state. So, my opposition in this Bill isn't regarding that but..."

McSweeney: "Right."

Martwick: "...what reform does this bring other than just freezing the levy?"

McSweeney: "And, Rob, what it really brings is it's a first step, in my view. And the reason for the first step is it actually provides a basis for further property tax reform. I know we're going to have, hopefully, a broader discussion over the next five or six weeks on property tax relief, on mandate relief. I have a Bill, again, to freeze property tax levies for three years. This is just a simple first step, something that I could get to the floor and something that shows the people of Illinois that we're serious about property tax reform."

Martwick: "To the Bill. I see I'm running out of time, Mr. Speaker.

Can I have an extension to make my summation here?"

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Martwick: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, a great intention to relieve property taxes, but a freeze, a simple freeze on a selected number of townships with special exemptions for other townships, does not accomplish that goal. This is not reform. We have done nothing to relieve the property taxes in any significant way for any town that's not included in this and really in no significant way for any town that is included in this. And we've done nothing to change the system. If the system is broken, a simple freeze does nothing. So, what are we doing here? You know, I said this last year. If you believe in democracy, if you believe

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

in democracy, then perhaps you believe that the people that are elected in these townships are the ones that should be making this decision, not the people in the State of Illinois. There... if there was one form of government that should not be telling any other form of government that they're fiscally irresponsible, it's us right here in the Capitol. This does not accomplish anything accept it takes away the rights of the duly elected members of those townships to make decisions about their finances. And if they're doing a bad job, there is a process to get rid of them. It's called election day. That's democracy. The last thing we need is big brother State Government tying the hands of the local governments. What are we doing? What happened to being fiscally responsible? We push everything downhill to the local governments because we refuse to address our situation here. And now we're telling them we're going to tie their hands down there. What if they are responsible and they need that increase? We said, nah, you're all irresponsible. That's the wrong message to send. This is a bad Bill. It's a great intention, but it does not accomplish what it's seeking to do. Let's pass real property tax reform. Let's kill this Bill. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Thank you. I just wanted to ask a question about...
unfortunately, a township board that I just sat on will be
impacted by this Bill. What is the process of recovering
losses for those townships if they're under the tax cap?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

McSweeney: "They could actually go to referendum. That... that is a recourse. This Bill allows them to go to referendum, Representative, as we discussed. This actually applies the town funds. And under the PTEL law, they still can go to referendum. So, if there is a rationale that they can sell to other constituents, they could actually still get an increase. But they have to do it by referendum. That... that's what... that's the way they can recover it."

Ammons: "And how would they be able to capture new construction and future taxes on this?"

McSweeney: "That's a great question. That's excluded. This only freezes the extension so new construction is not included in this freeze. That is exempt. It only includes the definition of the extension of the property tax freeze which does not, repeat, does not include new construction."

Ammons: "And is the Township Association in support of this?"

McSweeney: "No. They're opposed to it."

Ammons: "Thank you so much."

McSweeney: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "You know, actually, I'm going to go straight to the Bill. We heard that you could go to a referendum if you need more money. We've heard that it only affects certain townships. I rise in support of this. Sometimes the enemy of the good is the perfect. Is this a perfect Bill? No. Is this a good Bill? Yes. This is absolutely a good Bill. It provides us an opportunity to freeze and see what the citizens do. If

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

they need more money, they can go to a referendum. Let's see if that system works. If it works for these townships, maybe it is something that we should expand: the park district, library district, school boards, and everything else. Maybe it shouldn't be, how many times have you sat in a board room and heard the phrase, taxed to the max 'cause you're not going to get the money back? You know, the Gentleman who said it's only a dollar. I've been to so many board meetings at the local level where they say it's only a cup of coffee a day it's only a cup of coffee a month. Well, I'm buying like 600 people a cup of coffee every day in my property taxes and frankly, I'm tired of it. Once again, this is a good Bill. I rise in support of this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney to close."

McSweeney: "This is a small step toward property tax relief in this state. I strongly ask my friends and my colleagues to please vote 'yes'."

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, Jesiel, Lilly, Sims, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Meier."

Meier: "Yes, I just... point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Meier: "I'd like to recognize the Bartelso School from my district, just walking through the gallery right now. They were named

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

the number one school in the state, as you read in Reboot Illinois earlier. Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Welcome to the Illinois House of Representatives. House Bill 3324. Mr. Christian Mitchell. Out of the record. House Bill 3217. Mr. Phelps. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3217, a Bill for an Act concerning Shawnee Indians. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Today, I have before you House Bill 3217. This Bill provides state recognition for the Vineyard Indian Settlement of the Shawnee Indians down in Representative Reis and my district, but mostly in my district. State recognition will allow this tribe to apply for federal funds that are available to state recognized tribes. Sixteen states already do this. Not one dollar comes to Illinois and we're just trying to get a piece of the pie, so to speak. And I just ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Anthony, Arroyo, Cabello, Mitchell, Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3126. Mr. Pritchard. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3126, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Pritchard: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a Bill that may be viewed as helping tourism. It's a Bill that takes into consideration that there are people from outside of our state that come into Illinois for boating races. And what this Bill does is allows an exemption for those individuals that come in, providing the race has been sanctioned by the Department of Natural Resources and has the proper insurance. I ask for your support."
- 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? Zalewski. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2635. Mr. Sandack. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2635, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that has been around the Capitol for a while that's finally gotten to this point because of the cooperation of almost every stakeholder, with respect to liens. The Mechanics' Liens Act in Illinois is obsolete and we are an outlier state. This Bill allows mechanic lien claimants to file their liens, retain their rights, and go to court on the proprietor lien, but it allows owners and general contractors to bond the lien amount so that the project can continue. All parties were at the table. This is negotiated language. I ask for your affirmative vote."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

- Harris, D.: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You said all parties are in agreement. I thought I received something from the Homebuilders Association earlier today indicating that they are opposed to the Bill. Has that opposition been removed?"
- Sandack: "They were there... with all due respect to their...

 Representative, they don't understand the Bill. Most of the homebuilders that... they're represented by a variety of groups, Representative, including small contractors and homebuilders. I am told by Jim Rolphing, Louie Giordano, Jim Covington, and others that they've been at the table, they agreed to the language but they don't like, now, the Bill. They're the only ones that don't like it. I don't think they understand it."

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

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Bourne, Bryant, Butler, Franks, Guzzardi, Sente. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3674, Mr. Sullivan. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3674. a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This simply allows 14 year olds to use a crossbow during deer hunting season. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Evans, Feigenholtz, Guzzardi, Moeller, Nekritz. Please take the record. There are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2555. Representative Reaves-Harris. Out of the record. House Bill 37... Excuse me. House Bill 3766. Representative Scherer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3766, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer."
- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House.

 I'm presenting House Bill 3766 which simply caps the cancellation fees for utility customers. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 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? Phelps, Smiddy, Wallace, Winger. Winger. Please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3840. Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3840, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3840 creates the Equal Economic Opportunity Taskforce to study barriers to economic opportunity and economically depressed communities. It also will examine issues discouraging local investment in business development. The taskforce will report... or shall provide a report evaluating current state laws and recommending new changes to existing law. I ask for its favorable..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "Representative, will this kind of study include dealing with issues like food deserts as well?"

Sims: "It certainly could be part of it, Representative. We're looking at trying to make sure, we're examining issues of local investment and food deserts will certainly fit into that category."

Davis, W.: "Okay, but when you call it a redlining study, this will examine why there is so... why there's a lack of investment in minority communities."

Sims: "Yes. Well, we changed the title from the Economic Redlining Taskforce to the Economic Opportunity Taskforce to make sure that we're looking at all those... all those issues and any challenges that present themselves. So, yes, the food deserts would fit in that category."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Representative. To the Bill, very quickly. I would encourage everyone to support the legislation. And I know sometimes we talk about redlining in

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

a way that kind of talks about minority versus nonminority. And while that may be a subject of this, sometimes when you just look broadly at different communities. It's amazing how just next door to each other, communities are thriving in some cases and not thriving in others. And then sometimes you... you just have trouble figuring out why. Even in my own district, there's a community of almost 30 thousand people that has no grocery store, no major grocery store in it. But right next door to it is a community of 12 thousand people that has four, four full service grocery stores in it. So, please explain to me why the community that has none doesn't have any. And unfortunately, when you ask the question of some of these corporations, they have a long litany of answers as to why outside of the fact that one community may be a community of color and one may not be a community of color. So, it's important to examine why we have such disparities that exists amongst communities, why malls are closing everywhere when you've got Lincoln Mall in the south suburbs, which has officially closed, but the median income around that mall is \$90 thousand. So, why are we always forced to go to Orland to shop? Is that the only place that there's a mall where people can go in the south suburbs? We need to look at these kinds of issues. So, if this is the opportunity to bring out in a full disclosure a broad conversation why we have such disparities that exists between neighboring communities like that, then this is the type of legislation that we need to support. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. A few questions of the Sponsor, please."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Sandack: "Elgie, which state agency would monitor and/or be responsible for this taskforce?"
- Sims: "The Department of Commerce... Ron, the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity would be the state agency overseeing the taskforce."
- Sandack: "And, I don't know if you've had any conversations with the Governor's staff about this. What if DCEO is no more or is transformed? What would happen to this... to this taskforce or committee?"
- Sims: "Well, that's exactly why we're... we're trying to be proactive, Ron, and we're looking at the current state of the law. We know that there's a proposal out there to make some changes in DCEO, but we want to make sure we're getting the taskforce to go... getting it together right now in anticipation of that."
- Sandack: "Okay. And with respect to the ongoing operations in DCEO, there are a number of programs they run that may be useful to certain communities right now where we're trying to spur economic development. Is there any intention of using the Community Development Assistance program, the state's Summer Youth Employment Program, or Advantage Illinois, right now, to try and help those who need help the most?"
- Sims: "Ron, that's... and that's exactly why the taskforce is being created so we can have an examination of what current law exist... what current law says, what current programs are there so that we know... Thank you, Mr. Speaker... so that we know what the programs are and we can invite committees... communities to

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

invest in those programs that participate so we can spur local investment and local business development."

Sandack: "Thank you, Representative, for answering my questions.

I appreciate it."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr... Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Monique Davis. Representative Davis."

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

Davis, M.: "Representative Sims, will your study or taskforce look at the lack of loans by banks to small businesses, African Americans?"

Sims: "Representative, what... what the taskforce will be looking at would be all barriers to local investments. And that could certainly be part of it."

Davis, M.: "Thank you very much. I urge an 'aye' vote on this very important piece of legislation."

Sims: "Thank you, Representative."

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Representative Sims, I think this is a good piece of legislation. This is not just about minority communities.

Could you think of neighbors or communities down in rural Illinois that may need this Bill?"

Sims: "Absolutely. Well... and, Representative, so my district stretches from Chicago down into rural Will and Kankakee County. And there are certain communities in that... in both

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Will and Kankakee County who I would certainly be looking at... looking for programs in local investment and business development and they could certainly benefit from this taskforce."

Ford: "I think this is the right time because Chairman Crespo had a meeting and DCEO was at the meeting and they're looking to spur Illinois and grow jobs. And so, I think that this is a timely Bill and I hope that it benefits the Austin community as well as all the other communities that are struggling in the State of Illinois. So, congratulations on your Bill."

Sims: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Sims, I think this is a great Bill. And one of the things that I hope that the commission does... A lot of people are asking will the commission do this, will the commission... the taskforce do this? The taskforce will determine what's best to do, but I would say that there's already a lot of research that's already been done."

Sims: "Right."

Riley: "Matter of fact, South Suburban Mayors and Managers and University of Illinois at Chicago did a study which proved that there was disparities and retail redlining going on and it really spurred a lot of retail development. And I would hope that the taskforce does reach out to research organizations and some of the colleges that are experts at doing this kind of thing. One of the previous speakers talked about are there present programs within DCEO that might be

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

able to help out? Well, that's what DCEO's charge is. And even though they may reconstitute themselves, that still will be their charge. And frankly speaking, some of these things have been going on for years and DCEO was there. Now, that's not to castigate DCEO. They may have participated with some of the work that local communities have done. But if DCEO could've forestalled some of these things happening, which are large economic problems, they would've done so. So, I think there's a lot of people out there that want to help. And this is a very, very important issue and I really congratulate you for bringing the Bill."

Sims: "Thank you, Representative."

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? Please take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to get... get the Body's attention and introduce members of the Small Business Advisory Council, who are up in the gallery behind me. Elliot Richardson and Dan Johnson-Weinberger. They will be holding a reception tonight at the Statehouse Inn from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. And the new members of the Small Business Caucus, I'd like to invite you to come up to the gallery right now and take a picture with them. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Welcome to the Illinois House. Mr. Morrison."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 3270, it was my intention to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. House Bill 745. Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 745, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 745 is an initiative of Cook County Recorder of Deeds, Karen Yarbrough. House Bill 745 amends the county's code to grant a county recorder the ability to privately hold wills for testators. Such a will repository is just for safe keeping. It's an additional option and provides easier access for family members and others authorized to access the will. Currently, wills in the repository are public record. Under current law, someone can go to a recorder's office and obtain a copy of your will. I'm sure most people aren't aware of that and do not want that to occur. House Bill 745 would make that private, and it would not be a public record. It would not be subject to FOIA as well. I ask for approval."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. Chris, we talked about this a lot in committee. I just want to make sure of a few things that we're clarifying. First of all, is it your understanding that a law is required in order to give the recorder this power to be,

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- basically, a depository source and a safe keeping place but do nothing else?"
- Welch: "Well, a recorder currently has the authority to record wills. However, under existing law, that authority... wills can be viewed by the public. I'm sure you don't want your will viewed by the public. So..."
- Sandack: "I would never think to go to the recorder of deeds, 'cause we're talking about the recorder of deeds, to bring a will. I wouldn't bring my driver's license there. I wouldn't bring a lot of documents there. So, this is why I'm asking the question because typically the recorder of deeds records deeds."
- Welch: "Well, they... they actually record more than deeds. They record DD2's, military records. You know, and it's a valuable service that they provide. Veterans are thankful every day for the service that the recorder's office provides for that. But it's an option, just like this would be. It's purely an option. The key to this Bill though is that it would make it... a will private. You can't... a newspaper reporter can't go get a copy of your will."
- Sandack: "And does your Bill permit this for anyone other than Cook County?"
- Welch: "It does permit it statewide."
- Sandack: "So, any recorder in any county in the State of Illinois could expand their services to provide for recording of wills that will be kept private?"
- Welch: "That is correct."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Sir. I appreciate the answers to the questions."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bennett, Davidsmeyer, Flowers, Jesiel, McDermed, Sosnowski, Wheeler. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 3674, I would like to be recorded as having voted 'no'."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions, Sir. House Bill 3510. Representative Ammons. Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3510, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This House Bill just extends the subcommittee for healthcare facilities for seniors' long-term care, and I ask for an 'aye' vote on this Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions of the Sponsor." Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Sandack: "Representative, that was very truncated. Could you elaborate a little bit on what you're asking your colleagues to vote on?"
- Ammons: "Yeah. So, there's a subcommittee already in place. The subcommittee really determines the beds needed for long-term care facilities. In this case, we want to extend that subcommittee as well as add some people from DHS to the

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

subcommittee so that they can look at the entire state and determine the number of beds that we need in the state. And I believe this is an impact Bill that also will ultimately save us money on Medicaid bills... I mean Medicaid beds."

Sandack: "Thank you. Do you... are there any opponents to your Bill?"

Ammons: "There are no opponents to this Bill that I know of. We have certainly a lot of proponents to this Bill."

Sandack: "Thank you very much."

Ammons: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Acevedo, Chapa LaVia. Please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2555. Representative Reaves—Harris. Representative Reaves—Harris. Out of the record. House Bill 3324. Mr. Christian Mitchell. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3324, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you for your patience, Mr. Speaker. Just give me one moment. House Bill 3324 is a pretty simple Bill. It's just about reporting. I want to thank the Department of Human Services for their help on this. House Amendment 1 removes all opposition. Basically just says that we'll be collecting data on our snap program to see how things are organized by employer. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

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? Cavaletto. Please take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 494. Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 494, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 494, as I've worked on this Bill, again, with an interesting coalition, one thing has really struck me. The three most dangerous words in the English language are always, assume, and never. If we always assume that someone who has made a mistake in their background will never be rehabilitated and never be a productive member of society, we fail. House Bill 494 addresses one of the most harmful assumptions we've made in that category. House Bill 494 addresses a lifetime barrier to employment for anyone with low level drug penalties in their past and other minor offenses in their past who are currently prohibited from ever working in a school system. This simply lifts that prohibition. This does not mandate that candidates for employment be hired. This does not prevent... provide a preference to people with criminal backgrounds. This is about local control. This is about communities making the decision about who they want to employ, who the best candidate for the job is, regardless of the background. This Bill is about understanding that when

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

someone has paid their debt to society and turned their lives around, there are times when that experience actually enhances their qualifications for employment, actually makes them more empathetic and better qualified to serve in our communities. House Bill 494 will increase job opportunities for people with criminal records and puts the hiring decisions back in the hands of local school districts. It's the result of many of hours of negotiation with the State Board of Education. I am deeply thankful to everyone at ISBE, from the staff all the way up through the leadership. superintendent and the chairman have been... have been incredibly gracious in working with us on this. They are in full support of this Bill. Once again, this is time. A barrier to reentry is a path to recidivism. When people come out of our prison system and have an opportunity to work, recidivism rates drop dramatically. This, again, puts opportunities where they belong and it puts control where it belongs, in the hands of our local communities. I look forward to your questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Kelly, can you differentiate a little more between the types of crimes that someone would be, essentially after a seven year period, forgiven and then permitted to even apply for a job in the school system?"

Cassidy: "So, drug offenses are currently under the lifetime ban.

This would put a seven-year wait, which is appropriate. It

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

would give... give people an opportunity to show that they have... that they have shaken off any addiction issues that they might have and have moved on from that. In addition... so it creates that waiting period. It also removes a handful of misdemeanor offenses from the list of offenses barred. It does not lift the barrier on more violent offenses, on crimes against children, on anything that would, in fact, be a danger to our youth."

Sandack: "So, any crime against a child, any felony, any violent criminal act still would be a lifetime barrier to even applying for a job?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Sandack: "A misdemeanor transgression would require a seven-year waiting period, clean, frankly bill of health, and then they... someone could apply for a job?"

Cassidy: "They could apply."

Sandack: "And that's it?"

Cassidy: "Yeah."

Sandack: "They aren't guaranteed employment?"

Cassidy: "Nope."

Sandack: "They're just going to get a chance at maybe getting a
 job?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely."

Sandack: "Thank you much. I appreciate answering the questions."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phillips."

Phillips: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak toward the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Phillips: "I'm... I'm rising in favor of the Bill. I, personally, have used this in the private sector for hiring people that have had these and they make very good workers. And they need to be given a second chance. So, thank you for bringing this to the House."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As a member of the Citizen Policy Advisory Council and, as you can clearly see, a young black man from the south side of Chicago, I've seen far too often when criminal records have prevented folks in my community from moving forward. I just want to quickly read a quick excerpt from the website, from the Citizen Policy Advisory Council. 'All penalties shall be determined both according to the seriousness of the offense and with the objective of restoring the offender to useful citizenship.' That's from our Illinois Constitution, Article 1 Section 11. I think our focus should be restoring folks to be productive citizens, to be taxpayers. I salute the Sponsor of this legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "So, I just want to make... get this clear that there is a seven-year period? Where is Kelly?"

Cassidy: "Yes. Right here."

Bellock: "Oh, sorry. So, there definitely is a seven-year period after the offense that they have... that they're cleared of?" Cassidy: "Actually, after the sentence."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Bellock: "After the sen..."

Cassidy: "'Cause someone could actually serve longer than that, so this is after the sentence."

Bellock: "Okay. And then, that this is definitely under local control by each school district, can make this decision on their own?"

Cassidy: "The decision whether or not to hire now would be placed in local control. No longer are we saying you can't hire them whether you want to or not. We are saying, you can be fully informed to make a fully informed decision. Local control. Absolutely."

Bellock: "Thank you. And is it nonviolent offense?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Bellock: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Flowers: "Representative, you stated that this is local control and it's up to the municipalities whether or not they want to hire that person. But what about the Bill that Representative Ford passed that took the X off the applications, number one, and the law that we passed that stated that if you are an exoffender, you cannot be discriminated against because of your past and that you would have to be at least offered the job? And then, after you've been offered the job, the question then is asked, have you ever been convicted of a crime. How would this legislation clash with Representative Ford's legislation?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Cassidy: "It doesn't clash at all. In fact, current law would clash with that. Current law says that it doesn't matter how long it's been, doesn't matter if you disclose upfront or afterwards, you can't even apply in the school systems. This is the next step towards making right those failings that we have had along the way whether it was the box or... or open discrimination. This... this is... our current law refuses to allow a local school... a local school or school district from even considering a candidate with these backgrounds."
- Davis, M.: "Oh, with these backgrounds? Because current law does allow school districts to hire exoffenders, but with these backgrounds, they..."
- Cassidy: "There are a lot of... this is the... we are fixing that problem. As you may have... may be aware, there were many safe passage workers who were fired in the middle of the day when their criminal backgrounds came back. This would prevent that. You may have met some of the folks who've been here, a young woman who worked for 10 years for a delivery company. When her company got a contract delivering to a school, she was fired. Because even as a contractor, she could not have a criminal background with a drug offense in her background."

Davis, M.: "But this is with education, because..."

Cassidy: "Right. This is in... this is in education systems."

Davis, M.: "Okay. Okay. I just needed clarity on what it is that we were doing..."

Cassidy: "Yep. This is in school systems."

Davis, M.: "...here. And, once again, I want to commend you and say that this is long overdue and another step in the right

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

direction of the beginning of what needs to be done. Thank you."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Ma'am."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, I know you've worked hard on trying to remove some of the concerns about this Bill and certainly have extended the time period that someone has to be free of continued violence. But I noticed that in the drug section, you've reduced some of the… or allowed more of the drug prohibitions. Could you explain that a little bit further?"

Cassidy: "I'm not sure I follow. What we did do is create a longer time, seven years to wait before they would be eligible."

Pritchard: "I thought in terms of some of the drugs though that you were taking minor possession out of it. Or, excuse me, you were allowing minor possession."

Cassidy: "Just a minute. If I'm following you correctly, I think that we did narrow it from its original iteration to a lower level possession. Is that what you mean?"

Pritchard: "Yes."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Pritchard: "So, it's lower level possession and I think you're referring to cannabis..."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Pritchard: "...in this. So, what is a low level possession?"

Cassidy: "I believe it's under 30. Under 30 grams, I believe."

Pritchard: "Okay. And you had previous legislation that moved that to 15?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Cassidy: "That's a different... that's a different thing. And keep in mind that this... this is referring to people with charges in their past. And since, until today, 30 grams was the threshold for the felony that we would be dealing with people in their past."

Pritchard: "So, have you received any concerns from schools about this type of standard?"

Cassidy: "Working directly with the Illinois State Board of Education, they were very comfortable with this standard."

Pritchard: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, Representative Kelly Cassidy, great piece of legislation. Thank you for your work. I was a part of the committee when you were going through the particulars on this legislation. I think it does exactly what we've been talking about, what most county presidents and court clerks and chiefs of police and communities that want to be smart and intelligent on crime. Thank you for closing some of those gaps that we, as sometimes overzealous Legislators, I guess, try to impress certain folk when we're running for office on being tough on crime. This is being intelligently smart on crime. It's about time that we are coming into the 21st century. I applaud you for this legislation. I encourage Members to vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in support of the Bill, but I want to take this as a time to just remind people of the different types of hiring decisions we make in education. So, while we're giving these offenders a second chance, and

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

I applaud that, I still think it's simply outrageous that James Kilgore, a known terrorist, a murderer, is still sitting at the University of Illinois and educating our children. This is a man who escaped... took on the alias of a ten month old, took on the name of John Pape, got a PHD, hid out for 27 years before he was extradited. He calls his crimes political offenses. He has not decided that he is... that these are really crimes against a human. He participated in a murder in the 1970's. And yet, he's teaching at the University of Illinois. So, I appreciate what you're doing here. I don't appreciate the University of Illinois using our tax dollars to hire someone like that to educate our children. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I would like to commend Representative Cassidy for bringing this Bill forth. It is the first step in establishing good policy for the people of Illinois. People who have served their time and are returning home, this Bill gives them hope, gives them a notion that we show compassion for all citizens of Illinois as they work toward becoming vital citizens to our great state. Thank you, Representative Cassidy. Keep up the good work."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Davidsmeyer: "So, this simply is taking away the mandate from the State of Illinois that they cannot be hired. The school district can still do the background check, correct?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely. The school district will still do the background check. The school district will still know of the

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

background and will know the particulars and have an opportunity to ask more questions of the candidate. Perhaps, sometimes their experience will make them a better candidate. But they will absolutely have the final decision based on being fully informed about the candidate's background."

Davidsmeyer: "Now, will this open up the school district to any type of lawsuit based on discrimination?"

Cassidy: "No."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, if they choose not to hire the person based on that background, it will not be considered discrimination?"

Cassidy: "No."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "You did it again. This is what you call restorative justice and I really want to commend you for your hard work. And I know, I watched you walk around the campus here to do everything that you could to make sure that this happened and you convinced people because of who you are. And so, for people, as Representative Lilly said, she said that this Bill would give hope to a lot of people. It will give hope to a lot of people that we, in Springfield, understand that there are a lot of people struggling with the lack of opportunities because of their past. And so, I'll close by saying that I think you listened to our Pope, because Pope Francis said that we cannot have a throw-away society. We cannot have members in society that we throw away. We have to make sure

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

that we take care of all people and give all people an opportunity to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Congratulations."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "Once again, we have the unique opportunity to have one of my oddball coalitions come together and make a positive change for all of us in the state. I want to thank the Illinois Policy Institute, the Community Renewal Society, the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless, and all of the cosponsors and everyone who's worked so hard. The State Board of Education has been a remarkable partner. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Bradley, Jesiel. Jesiel. 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. The Chair recognizes Representative Tabares."

Tabares: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Tabares: "We have some very special guests today in the gallery.

We have Spry Elementary School. They are from my district.

And there are about 30 students... more than 30 students up in the gallery to my left with their teachers, and they're on their 8th grade field trip. And I just wanted to give them a warm welcome to Springfield."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for being here with us. Mr. Clerk, on the Concurrence Calendar, there appears House Bill 373. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 373. All the two Amendments together do is to clarify that it is in the public interest to make sure that park district land can be used for museums and other institutions that promote educational and cultural activities... parks in the City of Chicago. And clarifies, too, that land that once was submerged under water but was filled in is eligible for that kind of participation as well. The legislation further provides that the park district can enter into contracts with not-for-profit organizations to operate this kind of museum for a 99-year period. All this does is clarify what we believe to be existing law. I'd be happy to answer your questions. Those of you who, like me, think that the Obama Library belongs in Chicago, I would sure appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack on the Lady's Concurrence Motion."

Sandack: "Thank you. A question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Leader, when did this Bill get out of Rules?"

Currie: "Well, the... the Concurrence Motion came out of Rules today.

The language was filed in the Senate, I believe, yesterday.

And in fact, this has been under discussion in and out of the

City of Chicago for the last many, many months. As you know,

in March, the city council unanimously approved the grant of

20 acres of park land, either in Washington or in Jackson

park, to the... should the University of Chicago win siting for

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

the Obama Presidential Library Museum. That land was already scheduled to be given for that purpose."

Sandack: "I think I just asked you when the thing came out of Rules. But it was..."

Currie: "I knew... I knew you liked context, Representative."

Sandack: "Yeah. I love context. I like elaboration but in this instance, it was overelaboration. But I appreciate it. Why do we need to amend our laws so that the city, which is usually it... it's a Home Rule municipality. It takes care of its own zoning. What do we have to do with... and by the way, I'd prefer the Obama Library be in Chicago. I think that's wonderful. Where exactly in Chicago is really for Chicago. So, why are we doing this?"

Currie: "All we're doing is clarifying the meaning of current state law, which establishes how museum... museums and park land can interact. So, they don't need us to do this but it does provide additional security and comfort to the foundation, should the foundation choose Chicago, to know that there are no legal impediments. As I say, all we're doing is declaring existing law when it comes to zoning. Those decisions will surely be made by the city, in the city, not by us."

Sandack: "All right. Last question, 'cause I'm sure others have questions. Leader, where would I find the clarifying language that you think helps this along... or, I guess, buttresses or supports existing law? Where would I find it in the Bill?"

Currie: "Let me just get a copy of..."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Currie: "...the Amendment. But it... talking about the importance of museums and enriching and educating the citizenry, that

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

language is reiterated and the language that says that parkland can be used for these purposes, including submerge... I'm sorry, including park land that once was submerged, is just to clarify, as I say, existing law."

Sandack: "All right. Thank you. To them to the Motion to Concur. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is probably a wonderful thing to do. The fact that we're getting it now after getting out of Rules an hour ago... the fact that we're supposedly, I guess, clarifying existing law, I have to do some reading here because I'm being asked to vote on something pretty darned quick without really knowing what we're voting on. So, I would just suggest to everyone before pushing the green button, think things through and make sure we're not doing something that may have an unintended consequence. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, is it accurate to say that this Bill in no way allocates dollars towards a potential presidential museum nor allows for a vehicle or conduit to do so?"

Currie: "Not a penny."

Hays: "Is it also accurate to say that this concurrence would not have the General Assembly in a position of taking sides, so to speak, on multiple, perhaps, proposals on sites in various portions of the city? I'm not making the assumption now, because I think it makes perfect sense that the presidential museum should be in Chicago and I cannot fathom a circumstance where it would not be there. This would not be putting the

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

General Assembly in the position of getting involved in a decision that should be entirely local within the city?"

Currie: "Absolutely right. The only reason we're doing this with respect to park land is because one of the Chicago applicants has sketched out for us a proposal that would use park land. The other finalist in Chicago doesn't have the same problem and so we don't need to offer this helping hand."

Hays: "Thank..."

Currie: "But in no way does this choose between the University of Illinois at Chicago and the University of Chicago."

Hays: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. First of all, I am thrilled about the possibility that the Obama Museum will come to Chicago, only adding to our world class city by paying tribute to this great man. But I am very troubled about the components of the Bill that deal with Chicago's lakefront. As anyone who has spent any time on our beautiful lakefront knows, it's truly a treasure and the beauty of our lakefront and its skyline is unparalleled. Though we live in a dense urban environment, if you live in Chicago, the openness of the lakefront as it currently exists, provides quite a respite from city living from people all over the city, myself included. I'm concerned this Bill may put that at risk by eroding the public trust doctrine, which provides that specific uses of land, such as that on our lakefront, is not evaluated on an individual project basis. I'm concerned this may create a slippery slope and open up our beautiful lakefront to development and pet projects and who knows

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

whatever ... other similar projects down the road. I'm concerned the Bill jeopardizes the lakefront openness, Chicago's front yard, and the miles of wide open space we currently enjoy. I've heard from people and read in the paper that there is only a parking lot where we're proposing the Lucas Museum be constructed. However, you can see over a parking lot, you can see the lake through a parking lot, and parking lots can be changed into green space at any time. Once you put a building up, you can't take it down. The public trust doctrine exists to protect this land and preserve the use for everyone. I feel it's our responsibility to make sure and tread very carefully before we provide for any construction on public land. With regard to open space, Illinois ranks pretty low in terms of our recreational acres per citizen. The stat I recently... recently saw puts us at 40 out of 50 in terms of that statistic. We truly have such a beautiful open lakefront. I'm concerned how this Bill may change that over time. For that reason, I'll be voting 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this legislation and for various reasons. Many people understand that... that were here at the last General Assembly, there was controversy behind trying to bring the presidential library. That had to do with state assistance through a cash allocation of \$100 million. That is not in this Bill. We are not obligating any dollars. We are not obligating the state's credit and equity in regard to the presidential library through any form of bonds. We have no state land going to this. That's the intent of the Presidential Library

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Commission as I see it, and as I've researched over the years depending... within this Bill. What we're doing is allowing the locals to decide for themselves in the City of Chicago how they want to entice the presidential library through the use of certain public lands. These public lands are how things have been done in many, many, many presidential libraries, whether Republican or Democrat, over the years. This is how it's done. You do a land lease and you lease the property out, and then private donations in the library commission, Presidential Library Commission, and run and operate and build the facility. Ladies and Gentlemen, we should all be on this Bill because this is our president. Like him, not like him, he is our president. It should be, meaning the presidential library, should be in Illinois. Look at this as a jobs Bill. How can we help a community bring jobs to their community? This is it. This is the way to do it. I certainly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think Representative Sullivan just said a lot of what I was going to say. So, I just want to clarify just a couple of things, I think. What people should know is that the statute that's at issue here, the Park District, Aquarium, and Museum Act is more than 100 years old. It has been modified several times since to permit various types of museums and projects. My district will be deeply and overwhelmingly affected by the legislation that we have at hand here. I am extremely excited for the opportunity to have, potentially, both the Lucas Museum of Narrative Art as well as the presidential library.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

We are talking about an opportunity to create over 3000 jobs and more than a billion dollars in economic activity. Very seldom in Springfield do we have a chance to do something like that without being a guarantor, putting a single taxpayer dollar at risk. This is a very good Bill that is a jobs Bill. It is about making Chicago an even better world class city. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ensuring that President Obama's Library is sited in Illinois is a priority. For more than one year, I have worked to make Illinois proposals the most attractive and competitive. Today's vote enhances those proposals and clarifies this is a proper use of park land for this truly historic institution. I believe that it will be a destination for visitors from every corner of the globe and a repository of documents and artifacts from a transformational presidency. Current and future generations deserve the opportunity to learn firsthand the impact of President Obama on Illinois. He was a Member of the General Assembly, a United States' Senator, our President, and to also learn how our state had an impact on him. But we're proud to be able to say that Illinois is home to the Presidential Library Museum of our greatest president, Abraham Lincoln. But the opportunity to bring a presidential library to Illinois is rare. It is an opportunity that we should cease upon by supporting this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Concurrence Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Butler, Gordon-Booth, Nekritz, Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 373. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 229, on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Franks. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 229, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendments 1 and 3 have been adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendments 5 and 6 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Franks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "I'd like to remove Floor Amendment 5 and move Floor Amendment 6."

Speaker Lang: "Floor Amendment #5 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Franks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. Floor Amendment 6 would add the counties of McHenry and Lake to the underlying Bill that only at this time pertains to DuPage. And I'd be happy to debate it on Third Reading."

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

Mr. Franks, there are 14 Members of the House that wish to speak on your Amendment. What order would you like to take them in?"

Franks: "Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "I'm sorry, we're up to 31 now."

37th Legislative Day

- Franks: "Oh, good. Can we do it on Third Reading?"
- Speaker Lang: "Yes, we'll move all these people to Third Reading.

 Unless somebody really wants to speak on this. I didn't think
 so. 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. Mr. Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "House Bill 4128. Representative Bourne. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4128, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3573. Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Out of the record. House Bill 3152. Representative Cabello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3152, a Bill for an Act concerning safety.

 The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No
 Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are
 filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 4021. Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4021, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2781. Representative Fortner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

37th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2781, 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 Fortner."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 takes the program and makes it a three-year pilot."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2781. 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 3746. Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3746, a Bill for an Act concerning motor vehicles. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Mayfield."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "Okay. The Amendment just adds... it removes all the opposition and it is agreed language. It basically... I'm sorry. It exempts out antique vehicles, which was requested by some of the Members in the committee. And it shored up some of the language that the automobile dealers were concerned about. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3746. 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."

37th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3822. Representative Phelps. Out of the record. House Bill 30... House Bill 2717. Representative Ives. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2717, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3577. Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3577, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Rita."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. It basically addresses all the concerns from the committee Members in the Higher Education Committee in dealing with a grant program for medical assistance."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3577. 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 3910. Representative Reis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3910, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous

37th Legislative Day

- day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3680. Representative Smiddy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3680, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3967. Representative Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3967, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3687. Representative Wallace. Out of the record. House Bill 247. Representative Willis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 247, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2568. Representative Tryon. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2568, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Tryon."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Tryon."

37th Legislative Day

- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... actually, the Amendment will make some clarifications and make this process comply with all of our other state processes and refer people to the federal... or the state register when it comes to construction codes. And that language is what this Amendment's about."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2568. 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: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Tryon."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Tryon."
- Tryon: "Floor Amendment 2 actually incorporates Floor Amendment 1.

 It makes another technical change and becomes the Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2568. 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: "There are no further Amendments and no Motions have been filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3588. Representative Zalewski. Out of the record. Members, we will be moving to Bills on the Order of Third Reading. Beginning with House Bill 1121. Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1121, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, as you know, last year we put on the ballot and passed a crime victim's Constitutional Amendment. This Bill, House Bill 1121, embodies the enabling language so that prosecutors and courts and victims and defendants all know what their rights and responsibilities are under that Constitutional Amendment. It has definitional changes. It lists rights in Section 4 to conform to the wording and number of rights enumerated in the Constitutional Amendment, deals with the responsibilities of the prosecuting attorney and the court, and establishes various procedures and parameters. And I would appreciate your support."

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

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions of Leader Lang." Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Thank you. Leader, thank you for this, obviously. I got a sheet for the first time on this Bill today. Are there any opponents to your Bill?"

Lang: "The Cook County Public Defender is opposed to the Bill on a discussion of a constitutional... or what they believe is a constitutional problem with one of the standards in the Bill. The Attorney General of the State of Illinois disagrees with them."

Sandack: "All right. And I was going to ask you who the proponents were of the Bill. Obviously..."

Lang: "The proponents would be the Attorney General and all of the advocates who have been in this building for a number of years trying to pass this Constitutional Amendment. People are concerned about the rights of those who have been abused

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

domestically. People are concerned with victims of crime, et cetera."

Sandack: "Have you... have you heard by the state's attorneys as far as... again, you passed the Committee Amendment, but now we're implementing, you know, the will of the people. Have we heard from state's attorneys regarding your Bill?"

Lang: "The state's attorneys have signed on to this Bill, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you. Other than the opponent you mentioned, are there any other opposition to your Bill?"

Lang: "To my knowledge, there is not."

Sandack: "Thank you for answering the questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Pritchard: "Representative, you made some comment about all of the proponents for this kind of change are satisfied with this. Are there any that are concerned about the rights of the victim to, perhaps, have their own attorney if they're not getting the kind of advocacy that your Bill says that state's attorneys ought to provide?"

Lang: "Thank you for pointing that out, Representative. I did miss that. So, there is one particular individual person who's an advocate, who you and I both know, who believes, with some merit, that the Crime Victims Compensation Fund that's been created ought to be a fund that those who need to avail themselves of to pay for their attorney's fees under this Act ought to be able to access. I don't disagree that that's a worthy goal and I don't disagree that that's something we should work toward. In fact, I believe you, Sir, have a Bill

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

to deal with that. I merely expressed to this... this individual that we agreed to move forward in a way... in a consensus fashion at this point. The other advocates and the Attorney General do not believe this fund will sustain and support paying attorney's fees for people at this time. But I agreed that I would work with you, as well as this other individual, to try to accomplish that in the future."

Pritchard: "Well, I think, as you're aware in the particular issue that this citizen is bringing forth, that the state's attorney was not responsive to the victim's concerns and didn't adequately represent them. Are the changes that you've got in this Bill going to address that issue?"

Lang: "Well, certainly not the issue of the compensation for attorneys' fees."

Pritchard: "No, no, no. I don't mean..."

Lang: "...but all of the other issues. I've heard of no opposition from anyone other than what I suggested earlier to the other Gentleman or from this... this individual that has talked to both you and I about attorneys' compensation. In fact, to my knowledge, all parties that have had any interest in this have had thorough negotiations and thorough discussions. And I believe that even the individual you and I are talking about agrees that the changes that are in this Bill are appropriate changes. She just wanted one additional change."

Pritchard: "So, as a part of your Bill, what would be required is for the crime victim to indicate to the court what responsibilities they want to retain or what rights they want to retain?"

Lang: "Can you ask your question again, Sir?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Pritchard: "As a part of your legislation, will the crime victim have an opportunity to check off those rights that they want to continue to exercise as their cases move through the court?"

Lang: "So, this Bill sets up very specific protocols for how to go about this for victims, for prosecutors, for judges, for defense counsel. And so, everybody knows their rights and responsibilities and most will be represented by counsel or certainly have the ability to... to access the court system in appropriate way and they will check off their duties and their successes as they go."

Pritchard: "Very good. Thank you for bringing this issue forward and for so successfully negotiating the various interest here. I would urge your support."

Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1121 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, Wallace. Mr.
Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes',
2 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1121, having
received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 904. Representative Lang.
Please read the Bill. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 940,
Representative Lang. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 940, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming.

The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment becomes the Bill. This came to me from the conservation police who want to do a statewide raffle. But under the laws of the State of Illinois, if a person or a group wants to do a statewide raffle, they have to go to each one of the 102 counties and get a permit and each one of the 102 counties and pay a fee. This Bill simply says that law enforcement that want to do a statewide raffle can do it by paying one fee and one permit in the county in which the prizes will be paid. That's all this does. I would move adoption of the Floor Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 940. 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 3988, Representative Anthony. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3988, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Anthony."

Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3988, it amends the Criminal Code of 2012. It provides that the court shall order a person convicted of disorderly conduct to reimburse the public agency for the reasonable cost of the emergency response by the public agency. This is a Bill that's known as swatting. I've worked with Members of... Eshter Golar...

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Representative Golar and Representative Davis and I have worked out an agreed Bill, basically, that if a person is charged with this and if they're indigent, they will no longer have to... this... it would not... they wouldn't have to pay the fines associated with this. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3988 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 Gabel, Jones, Cavaletto. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3988, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 372. Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 372, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kelly Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 372 is an initiative of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. It provides a mechanism for the use of voluntary or involuntary demotions of employees of the MWRD. Under current law, employees of the district may not be demoted either voluntarily or involuntarily. They can only have their pay reduced or discharged. Be happy to take questions and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 372 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 Drury, Evans. Mr. Clerk,

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', House Bill 372, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3190. Representative Will Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3190, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is truly a Member initiative but it's based on a situation brought to me by one of my constituents where the high school that the young lady was attending, they investigated, for lack of a better word, her situation and then ultimately made a decision that the young lady did not live in the district. And as I had a chance to meet with the ... the parent, meet with the student, and also have dialogue with the school, one of the things that I noticed is that the process by which the school used, I thought, was missing a few steps along the way. Now, clearly we're talking about a school that has access to legal counsel. You know, they have attorneys, and in some cases we've aot families, particularly, you know, maybe single parents, in this case, who don't have access to resources. So, they don't necessarily have the financial resources to hire an attorney and fight this. So, when I looked at the totality or the continuum of that process, I thought that it was missing a couple of things. And House Bill 3... 3190 is an attempt to add a couple of steps to the process that tries to balance parent versus school. So, one of the things that we are attempting to add

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

into that process is something that I will call a discovery process. For those of you who are attorneys, you kind of understand what that means. Currently, if the determines the child does not live in the district, they ask the parent to come to a hearing. And then at that hearing, the parent can then respond to whatever evidence that's presented on behalf of why the school feels the child doesn't live in the district. But that's at the hearing. What I'm hoping to add into this is a process by which prior to the actual hearing, the parent will be made privy to all the information that the school wants to use against the parent or against the child, if you will, so that when the hearing actually comes about, the parent is better prepared to address those situations. And I'll give you an example. In my situation, one of the investigators that the district hired started there log looking at the child at 7:00 in the morning. And that started at the grandmother's house, where the child did spend the night there. But starting the log at 7:00 in the morning does not say whether the child spent the night there or not. They're making an assumption. They didn't ... they didn't investigate the other residence prior to, they just started where they thought the child was and then they followed the child from that residence, which in deed was out of the district, to the school. But at 7:00 in the morning, we don't know whether the child spent the night there or not. Come to find out that the mother is a hairdresser and some of her clients, they do have early morning appointments. So, that particular... I said the child spent the night there, they actually didn't. That particular morning, the child was

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

driven to the grandmother's house and dropped off and then she left from the grandmother's house and went to school. So, to me, at the very least, had the mother been able to see on that date what they are reporting, she would've at least been able to appropriately counteract or provide information contrary to that. So, I just think the process needed an extra step. So, one of the things we attempted to do, again, is to provide a process where all of the evidence against the family will be presented and then the family has an opportunity, prior to the hearing, to come in and dispute whatever they think they need to dispute. Now, of course the district can still rule against the family, so also what we wanted to add in this situation was a level of appeal other than circuit court. Under current law, once a school makes a decision, the only place the family can appeal is circuit court. And I wanted to add another level of appeal that would involve the regional offices of education for every place other than Cook County. And in Cook County, they would use the intermediate service centers, which is their equivalent... equivalent of the ROE's. Now, there is some concern about that from some of the school groups. So, what we hope to do and what we've agreed to do is pass this out and then continue to work on it in the Senate. They're deter... they want to determine whether the ROE should be the best place of an appeal or something called the regional board of trustees. I've looked them up a little bit in trying to learn a little bit more about them. The only challenge may be I don't know if they exist in Cook County where we have the ISC. So, we'll have to figure that out. But we have made an Amendment that removed all of the other

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

opposition to the Bill. The other school groups have allowed this Bill to move forward or have said that they would be willing to allow it to move forward to continue to work on it in the Senate. So, that being said, I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes, he will."

Sandack: "That was a very elaborative, elongated, and fu... I mean, it was... there was no stone left unturned on that, Representative."

Davis, W.: "I tried not to..."

Sandack: "But believe it or not, I do have a couple of questions.

Can you... just kind of bullet point what changes. You said you're filling in some steps in this process. I can see there's one step. You didn't mention it, but I'm sure it's important. One of the things school districts must do now is offer referrals for parents. Is that out now?"

Davis, W.: "We took that out."

Sandack: "Okay. So, that's not in there?"

Davis, W.: "That's not in there."

Sandack: "Okay. So, the discovery period, how many days prior to a hearing must a school turn over its file to a parent?"

Davis, W.: "Well, we know that the board... that the Bill does extend the amount of time from 15 to 30 days. Well, that's after the conclusion of the hearing. So, you're asking how much time do they need on the front end?"

Sandack: "Right. Before the hearing."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Davis, W.: "I'm not... I'm not sure if we specified that, but that is one thing that we certainly can clean up."

Sandack: "I think you're going to want to do that..."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Sandack: "...because it could happen two minutes before a hearing in which case the whole purpose upon what you're trying to drive new policy would be eviscerated, right?"

Davis, W.: "Yeah, it's pos..."

Sandack: "People can't re..."

Davis, W.: "It's possible that it may be in the language somewhere but in the analysis aspect of it, I don't know. So..."

Sandack: "Can you maybe have someone..."

Davis, W.: "...if it's not, we will..."

Sandack: "...look while we're talking? I have a couple more questions."

Davis, W.: "You have a recommendation?"

Sandack: "I would say no less than five days prior to the hearing."

Davis, W.: "No less? Okay."

Sandack: "I would... I would think that would be a minimum, but..."

Davis, W.: "Okay. No less than..."

Sandack: "...just a thought."

Davis, W.: "...five days prior to the hearing? Okay. I appreciate that."

Sandack: "After the hearing, you mentioned an appeals process..."

Davis, W.: "Yes."

Sandack: "...and I'm all about good process. So, there is obviously
 who do you appeal to, right?"

Davis, W.: "Well, currently, the Bill makes the appeal go to the $\ensuremath{\mathtt{ROE}}...$ "

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Sandack: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...or in Cook County, it would be the ISC..."

Sandack: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...executive director. That's what it currently is.

Couple of the school groups had some challenges with that.

So, they understand what I'm trying to do..."

Sandack: "Yes, Sir."

Davis, W.: "...and wasn't sure whether it should be the ROE or something called the regional board of trustees. Okay. Kind of an obscure group of people but they are indeed elected. I looked at a few of the other collar counties at the R... at those individuals and they're from various communities that make up that particular... particular county school district, if you will, or that school district. So, they weren't sure whether or not it should be that or not. Now, they reached out to some attorneys and, unfortunately, that feedback did not come back to them in time to move this, which is why they said okay and said if we can move it into the Senate, we can tighten that part up."

Sandack: "And... and that's what you intend to do in the Senate, right? If the Bill passes and some language becomes known on whether we add discovery language, we clarify the appeal process, it's likely it will come back..."

Davis, W.: "Oh, absolutely."

Sandack: "...a little more buttoned up."

Davis, W.: "I... I do expect it to come back on concurrence with some changes from the Senate."

Sandack: "Thank you for answering the questions. And thank you for being, obviously, an advocate for your constituent. You know,

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

obviously, that was a one issue driven matter. But I think the goal of this legislation is to have a clean process so whatever these hearings glean, everyone's got a fair shot at making sure they can answer allegations, clarify ambiguity, and make sure we have good rules followed. So, I appreciate the Bill very much, Sir."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Pritchard: "Representative, you certainly revealed for the committee a very important case, where this was an important situation in your area. Have you found that there are any other cases around the state where this has been a problem?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I hear... I've heard a lot about residency challenges in other parts of the state. Particularly, where you have an affluent district next to a less affluent district. So, you hear stories about folks wanting to go to the more affluent district and... and so, you've got residency issues there. Maybe even some involving communities that boarder the City of Chicago. So, I've heard a lot of stories in that respect. But again, with regard to any challenges with the process, I would say I can't say I've heard any issues with that. But again, as I've examined what happened to my constituent... that's why I'm not trying to, essentially, change the process, I'm trying to add to the process to make it more fairer, for lack of a better word, in my opinion."

Pritchard: "So, if there is a student that's attending from out of district, are they required to pay a nonresident fee?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Davis, W.: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?"
- Pritchard: "I say if there is a student that's attending that lives outside the district, are they required to pay a non-resident fee?"
- Davis, W.: "If they are determined to not have lived in the district, yes, that family will be charged tuition."
- Pritchard: "And is the regional office of education... what is the role for the regional office of education?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, currently, their role in the legislation is to review the dec... well, I won't say it that way. If there's an appeal, if there's a decision made at the local school level, either side can appeal that decision and the ROE would be an intermediate level of appeal versus, right now, the appeal would go straight to the circuit court."
- Pritchard: "Very good. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Representative has put forth, I think, a necessary procedure for some cases where we're finding nonresidents coming to school. And I would urge your support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Flowers: "Representative, just out of... I need a point of clarification, please."

Davis, W.: "Yes."

Flowers: "So, in regards to residency, how is that defined? Because from my understanding, residency is the place where you actually live or where you intend to live. And there is no length of time on... because you intend to live there, how long you must live there."

37th Legislative Day

- Davis, W.: "Well, I wouldn't disagree with you in terms of the definition. And we're not trying to change whatever the current statutory definition of residency is. We're not trying to change that. Ours involves, as I stated earlier, if a district is making the allegation that a student doesn't live in a district based on whatever they feel those parameters are, we're just allowing for at least an appropriate rebuttal to whatever the initial allegation is by the family so that when the hearing does take place, when the hearing does take place, the family is not simply responding at that time to whatever is being put forth as evidence."
- Flowers: "Well, I agree. I'm not trying to change anything either. It is what it is. And the word intend... intend. So, if I intend to live here, you know, that, too, should be a part of the rebuttal. And it doesn't say how long I have to intend to live, that the fact that I intend to live there. Period. So, that's just my contribution to the rebuttal that if I was the parent, that's what I would say. Thank you."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Representative. And to Representative Sandack's question, if he's still in the chamber, it's our understanding that it's a 10-day period. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis to close."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, everyone in the chamber. Again,

 I hope you can appreciate what we're attempting to do. And
 we're not trying to limit a school's authority to make those
 decisions, but it appears that the process may be a little
 bit one sided toward the school and this is an attempt to
 make it a little bit more balanced to give the parents and

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

the families the opportunity to present information, evidence if you will, to help dispute it. The school district can still make their own ruling and if so, this adds an appeal process into it as well. And then, of course, at that point, you still have the circuit court as the final say in this. So, hopefully, I can get everyone's support on the Bill. And, again, admittedly, we may need to make another change. We will work on it in the Senate and it should come back to us on concurrence. So, thank you very much, everyone. I appreciate your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3190 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 Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3190, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2471. Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2471, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a measure responding to a United States Supreme Court case Miller, having to do with sentencing of people who were under the age of 18 when they committed a crime. This Bill has the support of the Juvenile Justice Initiative, the State's Attorneys Association, including the Cook County State's Attorney, and also the Juvenile Justice Initiative. I'd be

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

happy to answer your questions and appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2471 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 Crespo, Gordon-Booth, Tabares, Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 66 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2471, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3240. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3549. Representative Fine. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3549, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What House Bill 3549 does is it puts a process in place so you can attempt to get the medications that you need if it... they're not currently covered under your plan or if you've tried other medications that work and your doctor knows the medication that works for you. We have been working on the Bill with both sides and we'd like to be able to continue working on it in the Senate."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3549 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. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 92 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill

37th Legislative Day

- 3549, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Cloonen."
- Cloonen: "Mr. Speaker, there must've been a mistake on my button.

 I did mean to vote 'no' on the last House Bill, 3549."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. 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. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a very extensive Bill. It is just technical. The staffs of all four caucuses here and across the rotunda have gone through this measure with fine toothed combs. I would say that I'd be happy to answer your questions, but I don't know that I can answer your questions. I hope you won't have any, and I hope you'll vote 'yes' so we can adopt the first revisory Bill of this General Assembly."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Hays, McAuliffe, Tryon, Wehrli, Zalewski. Please record yourselves. 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 Representative Bellock."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Please show me voting 'no' on House Bill 3549. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions.

 Representative Jesiel."
- Jesiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd also like to have the record show that I vote 'no' on 3549. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. House Bill 1004. Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1004, a Bill for an Act concerning health.

 Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1004 simply extents the repeal of the African-American HIV/AIDS Respond Fund from July 1, 2016 to July 1, 2026. It also amends the AIDS Confidentiality Act. One, it amends the definition of healthcare professionals and clarifies the inform consent and pretest information. Two, it amends Section 4, consent to testing. Three, it repeals the duplicative Section 5. And four, amending Section 9, allowing a physician to notify a civil union partner in the same way they are currently allowed to notify their spouse. I move for the adoption of House Bill 1004. And I want to thank all of the community organizations for helping make this possible."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Representative, so what you're doing in this Bill is extending the date of the fund, correct?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Ford: "Extending the date of the fund but not funding the Act."

Bellock: "So, there is no appropriation being made into this fund at this time, correct? And this Bill does not state any money going into the fund?"

Ford: "This is not an appropriation measure, and there is no funding attached to this Bill."

Bellock: "Okay, and I just wanted to go over... we had some concerns in committee on this Bill when it first came by. When it was brought back and we went back over that there was no appropriation, that it was just an extension of the time, I think the majority of our side was okay with that. But the Amendment on... I just wanted to go back over that again, also. Can you explain that briefly?"

Ford: "The Amendment #3?"

Bellock: "Yes."

Ford: "So, Amendment #3, it simply allows for the... when you go to the doctor and you have a routine testing, Amendment 3 just simply allows for HIV to be a part of your routine screening, but it also gives the patient or the client the ability to opt out of the HIV testing. But what it's doing is trying to encourage more people to be tested because we've learned that the more people we test, we could lead them to care and treatment and the spread of AIDS is reduced. So, it's really encouraging that we test more people and if we find people with HIV or AIDS that we try to direct them to care."

Bellock: "And is AIDS testing on the list, the federal list, of insurance coverage that does cover AIDS testing along with other general testings?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Ford: "It is. It's Medicaid and Medicare and private insurances all cover the HIV and AIDS test."

Bellock: "And do you agree to work with this, some clarifications on this Bill when it goes over to the Senate?"

Ford: "Could you think of any right now?"

Bellock: "Well, there was a little bit on the opt-in testing and the opt-out testing. Our staff thought there was a little mixture of the clarification the way it was written in the Bill. We'd like to continue to work on that with you in the Senate."

Ford: "I think that's important. If there's any uncertainty about opt-out and opt-in, I think we should fix it in the Senate. And I thank you for calling that to my attention. We want the best Bill for Illinois and if there's an Amendment needed in the Senate, I will support it and work with the Senate Sponsor."

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

Bellock: "...defining those issues."

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? Golar, Jesiel. 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. House Bill 2627. Mr. Mautino. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2627, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 2627 seeks to harmonize Illinois law with Federal Law, and it raises the high risk home loan trigger on loans for classified dwellings of personal property. Basically, trailers, where we changed the law a few years back, we omitted trailers and it has caused, in the loan market, the drying up of those funds. By making these adjustments, matching Federal Law, it'll make those loans, once again, accessible and available."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Bellock, Cassidy, Cavaletto, Kay. Bellock, Kay. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3229. Mr. Mautino. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3229, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. This is the appropriation Bill for the annual transfer for the Audit Expense Fund. This is the Auditor General's budget, and basically, it's comprised of two Bills that we do. We've done these each year. In order to pay for the audits that he does automatically and that we request from the different state funds money is taken from them and placed in the funds in specific amounts. This year is \$21.7 million. And from those funds, he conducts the audits. At the end of the year, any money which are unexpended are transferred back into those funds. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

37th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Representative Winger."
- Winger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just would like the record to reflect it was my intention to vote 'no' on the last Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. There being no one wishing to speak on this Bill, those in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bryant, Drury, Hurley, Jesiel, Walsh. Mr. Walsh. Please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Crespo is recognized."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. On House Bill 2471, I would like the journal to reflect I meant to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lang: "The journal will reflect your intention.

 Representative Hammond."
- Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record will reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' on House Bill 2627. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "The journal will reflect your intention, Representative. Mr. Hays."
- Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you have the journal reflect that on House Bill 3549, it was my intention to vote 'no'?"
- Speaker Lang: "The journal will so reflect. Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the journal reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' on all the Bills I voted 'yes' on?"
- Speaker Lang: "The parliamentarian will get back to you on that, Sir. House Bill 3507, Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3507, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3507 amends the Children and Family Services Act by providing that DCFS must continue to provide services aimed at assisting youth ages 18 to 21 in its care to achieve sustainable self-sufficiency. This Bill ensures that children in the care of the state are not left on their own until they are 21 and unless they are ready to live independently. This Bill preserves Illinois's long history of caring for children in care until they are 21. This long-standing practice is really supported by research. Young women remaining in care experienced a 38 percent reduction in the incidence of pregnancy before age 20. Remaining in care after 18 more than doubled the odds that youth would be working or in school at age 19. And remaining in care after 18 doubled the odds that youth would have completed at least one year of college by age 21. This Bill does not create a new obligation but recognizes an existing one and continuing obligation. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote, and if there are any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Robin, we had a little chance to talk before this Bill came. The fiscal impact, I know it's hard to understand, and yes, this is a past practice of the State of Illinois. The change back to 21, what would that generally cost the state?"

Gabel: "I believe you did ask for a fiscal note, and the fiscal note that they put on it was \$100 million, which is a little

bit high. I think it included, also, right of private action,

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

which we've taken out of the Bill since then. So, I don't think it would be that high. But on the other hand if we don't continue to serve these children, they will be homeless and we know that homeless people end up costing the state quite a bit of money as well."

Sandack: "There's no doubt that there's a legitimate policy debate as to pay now or pay later and what's more expensive and what's the best policy. But certainly these people... these children, could be homeless at 22 as well, right? And they..."

Gabel: "They could be but..."

Sandack: "And they could be the same expense..."

Gabel: "...these few years..."

Sandack: "Right. But I mean, we... is there any data that would help kind of divide... you know, these three years are so integral that we'll see less of an expense at 22 than we will at 18."

Gabel: "Well, I did state some statistics that show that there would be a 38 percent reduction in the incidence of pregnancy, and we know a pregnant woman... that young woman pregnant would cost the state more, that the children have at least one year of college, and that they would be working. It actually doubles the odds that the kids would be working. And if they're working by age 21, they would less likely be homeless. So, there are statistics that show this."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple more questions, Representative. Do you know the Governor... does the Governor's Office have a position on the Bill?"

Gabel: "DCFS is not in favor of the Bill at this time."

Sandack: "So, the agency still opposes your Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Gabel: "Yes. But they're interested in talking about this and they have some ideas on how they can do this."

Sandack: "Like what? I mean, help me out with that. That's a great
 answer. Do what?"

Gabel: "There may be some federal match funds that they can find."

Sandack: "Oh, okay. Appreciate the answers to the questions. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "We've had a lot of discussion about... since this group testified before us a week ago or two weeks ago. And a lot of people on our side of the aisle, I know support this issue. I don't know about supporting this Bill, so I respectfully ask you, Representative, if you would take this Bill out of the record today because we did not know it was coming up, so that we could have a discussion about it. Because this is involved in the entire budget of the Governor and all of this needs to be addressed in our working groups. And I know I spoke personally with Director Sheldon yesterday about just this issue, and we would like to find the money to replace this. We do not want to see this program end. But I respectfully ask you to take this out of the record just for a day."

Gabel: "Well, I appreciate your interest and your willingness to work on this and your concern about the Bill. I think at this time that this issue is so important that I would like to continue with this Bill. Thank you, though."

37th Legislative Day

- Bellock: "Well, I'm just saying this is part of the budget so this Bill is... it's not just 100. It's around a 140 million. I just went over this with the director yesterday, and we talked that we thought that at least 30 percent of the kids could probably be covered under a federal match. Maybe even up to 70 percent, but we don't know that right at this minute. And he's working on it. So, again, I would just ask you to hold it out of the record just for 24 hours. We'll be glad to vote on it tomorrow. But at least so that we, on our side of the aisle, could just have some discussion on this."
- Gabel: "I'm not comfortable with doing it at this time. I really hope that you can vote 'yes' and then consider... then we can continue to have further discussion after this."
- Bellock: "Well, Representative, I don't know how we can vote 'yes' at this time when it's \$140 million that we don't know where we're going to pay for that out of at this time. If we can work on it like... look what happened with the other programs that got cut on Good Friday. But that's where we need a little bit of time to do some negotiating on. And otherwise, it's just like saying this is put back in, by tomorrow we could have three other things that were in the budget that we all like put back in by individual laws also. And it's just very difficult to do a really accountable financial budget by doing the budget process that way on the House Floor."
- Gabel: "This is of extreme concern to many, many people. As you know, we've heard... we heard so many of the youth talk about their issues and what's going to happen. And they have real concerns. They're very concerned that they are going to be thrown out on the street within a couple months. So, I would

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

like to continue with this Bill and appreciate having further discussions in the future."

Bellock: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. A lot of us on this side of the aisle would certainly like to support this Bill because we want to keep this program going. At this time, without having enough time, even 24 hours, to discuss where we're going to find that \$140 million, I just say I don't feel that... I don't know if everybody else, at this time, even though I support the program, I just don't feel that at this time in the budget process that we can just start putting back in certain things that have been taken out. Because by tomorrow, we may have been put back in a billion dollars in the budget. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in very, very strong support of House Bill 3507 and Representative Gabel. I'm sure, like many of Appropriations-Human Services Committee, we were all very, very compelled and brought to tears by these youth. A lot of people in this room are foster parents, they're adoptive parents, and they're involved in the foster care system. And they have a pretty clear understanding that the ages of 18 to 21 are a very arbitrary date when it comes to children who have been in families and have been victims of abuse and neglect, who are not able to launch. Ι Representative Gabel has thought long and hard about putting this back in statute. This is... if we don't put this money and these kids in care as they need it, we will be paying for this. This money will just be shifted over to DJJ and other

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

parts of the budget. That is what we are going to end up doing is just shifting it into the correctional system and ruining the lives of these children. I encourage each and every one of you to vote 'yes' on this Bill. I know that the director is going to do his level best to try and put the program... to modify it. We've also had very, very long conversations with him about how important this is to Members of our caucus and their constituents that he's going to try and create opportunities to bring in federal funding. I have a lot of faith in him and I believe that this Bill should move to the Senate for continued discussion. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, what's the need for this legislation?

What... what kind of identified this as a need right now?"

Gabel: "The... it... this program is not included in the Governor's budget and this Bill is just simply putting these services in statute. There was the BH consent decree which required that the services be covered, and this Bill is simply putting those... some of the decisions from the BH consent decree into statute to ensure that they will be covered in the future."

Demmer: "Why do you think the funding was left out of the proposed budget?"

Gabel: "It was... it was the Governor's decision to leave it out. In the past, it has not been part of the core work of DCFS, but in this BH consent decree it was included. One of the rulings in the decree was that it provides that children receive adequate services to assist in the transition to adulthood.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

These 18 to 21 year olds is the exact group of children that we need to be serving."

Demmer: "Thank you. To the Bill. I suggest that the reason this was left out of the Governor's proposed budget is because of the financial pressure that our state's facing in all areas, not just in the human service departments, but in many areas of state spending. We had to make difficult decisions during the proposal but the budget negotiation is ongoing right now. We're meeting in working groups to talk about DCFS issues and other departments are meeting in their working groups too. All of these negotiations happen together and rely on and depend on one another. I think it's a problem to take a Bill like this that intervenes in a very specific case and kind of ignores the fact that there is a comprehensive interdependent budget negotiation happening through all the Appropriations Committees right now. So, I feel like this is... this is premature. This is the exact kind of discussion we should be having in Human Service Appropriations Committee, in the Human Service Appropriation's working group, but not necessarily through this Bill here. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "I think it's very unfortunate that we're playing politics with such an important issue. We didn't vote to give a billion-six shortfall in the '15 budget. We're having to do very serious... make serious cuts that nobody wants to make and we sure don't want to lose this program, but we need to work on this together as we work through the budget process. I think it is very disingenuous to be presenting this now and

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

to be trying to score political points with it. So I would strongly urge that all Members on our side vote 'present'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Davidsmeyer: "One of the previous speakers may have mentioned that this Bill went through Judiciary-Criminal Law. Is that correct?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "What's the reasoning for it to go through there when we have had so many deep, long discussions in Human Services Appropriations?"

Gabel: "I am not sure. I did not ask for it to go through that committee."

Davidsmeyer: "I have a picture here on my desk. I recall that... that committee meeting where these young people came and spoke to us. I was definitely affected by that. I understand that the... the hardships that these kids have gone through. We actually brought them down on the House Floor. Republicans and Democrats came together to make sure they could come down here and actually be a part of this. I think that we're doing them a little bit of a disservice. I think we're doing a little bit of disservice to the entire process by bringing up a single issue. I definitely care about this. I care about kids. And for you to put me up there and make me look like I don't care about kids is absolutely ridiculous and disrespectful. Ιf this should pass, I request a verification."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Sponsor bringing forth House Bill 3507. After all, these are our children. We are the parents. The budget that we cut a couple years ago, those were our children that we left on the streets. We did not educate them. We did not give them access to healthcare. They will be... they were ran away. We didn't go looking for them and those that we did find, we incarcerated. That is not the reason why we took them away from their parents and said we will take you in. It is our responsibility. We are under a court decree to protect these children. That's what we are supposed to do. And the Representative is merely codifying the court decree and making it law to make sure that it is implemented. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you. This one is... children."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "I do want to stand and first of all thank her for stepping into a gap that was created because we don't look at people, we look at programs and numbers. Unfortunately, there is a children's facility that, to this Bill, represents 18 to 21 year old children. Some of them who have been through unbelievable atrocities in their short lives. Some of them who would not be able to get to the next step without our support. And unfortunately, the department and the state said that we would care for them. It is our responsibility, as it is with our own children, to continue to parent them until

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

they're able to move out on their own past 21 years old. And this is what we're talking about today. This is an unfortunate situation that this Bill, I believe, is trying to correct. The cuts that were put forth by our own department left us in a situation where we had to and have to vote 'yes' on this Bill today to protect those children. And I, in my district, have a home where children in this unfortunate situation will be homeless because they don't have families. This is all that they have. So, I encourage you... I understand the dilemma that the Republican Caucus is in. But I do encourage an 'aye' vote on this and hope that we can get this budget corrected before so many other programs will do the same. And I'll just say this is closing, Mr. Speaker, that it is cheaper for us to take care of these children under this scenario than it is for us to take care of them in the Department of Corrections. Thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, there's been a lot of discussion about this Bill and I just wanted to just tell you that we want to help you and we want to work with you on this. We still have time but there have been some very reasonable, legitimate questions have been raised by this side of the aisle. And I will ask you if you could please take this Bill out of the record, give us some time, just over night, we'll revisit the issue tomorrow. But please extend that courtesy to us. Our Members, their intentions are sincere and it would be very good in this little... this chamber, which we are trying to

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

stress a bi-partisan solution to our problems. By doing that, it'll go a long way."

Gabel: "Well, I... I appreciate your efforts. I appreciate your concern. I think that this Bill is a good Bill. I think that the children who we... who are our responsibility deserve to know for sure if they're going to be taken care of or not. From my understanding, the children are very nervous. They're saying, where am I going to live, what am I going to do? I think it's our responsibility to pass this Bill and to ensure the children that they will be okay."

Durkin: "So..."

Gabel: "The ... we will continue to have discussions ... "

Durkin: "The request I've asked, if you could pull it out and let's have some discussion over it, just over tonight and tomorrow. We can revisit the Bill tomorrow. That's all the request is."

Gabel: "I understand the question and I'm not... I can't take the Bill out of the record at this time."

Durkin: "That's very disappointing and I think that sets a bad tone for the balance of this Session."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Representative Sandack."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, a request has been made by the Leader of the Republicans, Assistant Leader Bellock for one day to maybe work something out. A request was made to work in a bipartisan manner. That request is eminently reasonable, eminently reasonable. It's been made three times, because I

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

walked over to the Sponsor and made the same personal request, offline, on making it again. Should the Speaker... the Sponsor continue and persist without any... without any attempt to try to be bi-partisan, without any collegiality, I would ask my friends on our side to vote 'present', and I'm going to ask a few of the friends on the other side if this is fair treatment, if they think this is a good idea. If you do vote 'yes', I understand to the merits, but we've got one more day before a deadline. Courtesy, cooperation, some collegiality is what we've asked for, hardly onerous, hardly mean spirited. Please reconsider the process here. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Durkin, you know, I've... you know, understand your concern but I think this Bill, you know, is fairly clear in that it codifies what the current practice of the law is in Illinois, that children who are 18 to 21 are served by DCFS and given different services. So, this is a Bill that is appropriated for. It has been the mission of DCFS. And as we look toward being sure that these youth are kept safe and are not put in harms' way in the future, being sure that they have adequate funding, adequate supports, and adequate resources to live their lives, to not be on the streets, I think simply continuing that practice is a very reasonable thing to do. This is not new funding. This is not a new mandate. This is the existing status of the law and practice in the State of Illinois. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to commend the Sponsor for drawing attention to what is truly one of the least logical changes I can imagine, that these youth need us more than anyone else. It... as Representative Flowers said, these are our children. We cannot abandon them. We cannot presume that they should just belong in the criminal justice system. We cannot continue to take away and take away and take away and disregard and dispose those we deem nonessential. They are essential. They are our children. I cannot strongly enough express my belief in this Bill and in this Sponsor and in the integrity she brings to her desire to protect these children. Thank you. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you all. I know that we all have a great concern for our children and the children in the DCFS program. This Bill is simply codifying and putting into statute what the BH consent decree has said we are required to do. It was unfortunate that the Governor took these children out of the budget. And this, just by making it in the statute, is ensuring that these children will be covered and that they don't have to worry about being homeless and that they can continue to get the services that they... that they truly need. Thank you. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. Mr. Davidsmeyer has asked for a verification. Accordingly, all Members will be in their chairs, vote their own switches. Staff will retire to the rear of the chamber. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Anthony, Arroyo, Cabello, Chapa LaVia, Crespo, Franks, Hoffman, Jones, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', and 44 voting 'present'. And Mr. Davidsmeyer has asked for a verification. Mr. Clerk, please read the names of the affirmative. Members will be in their chairs."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Representative Acevedo. Representative Representative Arroyo. Representative Beiser. Representative Bradley. Representative Cassidy. Representative Chapa LaVia. Representative Cloonen. Representative Conroy. Representative Costello. Representative Currie. Representative Monique Davis. Representative William Davis. Representative DeLuca. Representative Drury. Representative Dunkin. Representative Evans. Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Fine. Representative Flowers. Representative Ford. Representative Gabel. Representative Golar. Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative Guzzardi. Representative Greg Harris. Representative Hernandez. Representative Hurlev. Representative Jackson. Representative Kifowit. Representative Lang. Representative Representative Manley. Representative Lilly. Mautino. Representative Mayfield. Representative McAsey. Representative Christian Mitchell. Representative Moeller. Representative Moylan. Representative Mussman. Representative Nekritz. Representative Phelps. Representative Reaves-Harris. Representative Representative Rita. Representative Scherer. Representative

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Sente. Representative Sims. Representative Smiddy. Representative Soto. Representative Tabares. Representative Thapedi. Representative Turner. Representative Verschoore. Representative Wallace. Representative Walsh. Representative Welch. Representative Williams. Representative Willis. Representative Yingling. And Representative Zalewski."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "I withdraw my Motion."

Speaker Lang: "The Motion is withdrawn. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 44 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Kay is recognized."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the spirit of bipartisanship, I'd like to be recorded as a 'no' on House Bill 3549."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention.

Representative Barbara Wheeler."

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

Wheeler B.: "To say that vote wasn't important to us is shameful and disingenuous. It was, however, revealing that this budget pro... how this budget process is going to proceed. Please don't insult us anymore by asking us for bipartisan support. As my colleague from the supermajority just reminded me, that's just how it goes. I'm very disappointed."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 3240, Mr. Fortner. Please read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3240, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Fortner: "Thank you Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3240 is an initiative of the Department of Natural Resources. In the previous General Assembly, we passed an overhaul of the fee structure for the department and there was an oversight in that though we raised the permit fees for construction along Illinois waterways, we did not change the penalty for failure to comply, putting us in the position where it was financially advantageous to in fact not use the permits. This Bill corrects that. It sets a maximum of two times the permit fee to be the fine and is in agreement with the Farm Bureau. Happy to answer questions."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Bellock, Hammond, Hays, Jones, Scherer. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3234. Mr. Costello. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3234, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Body. This Bill allows crossbow hunting of coyotes. During the season, you would normally be able to hunt them with a regular bow. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed...
 those in the favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'.
 The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 735. Mr. DeLuca. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 735, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 735 is in regards to how taxpayer dollars can be used when advertising. So, right now, this will establish language consistent with what we abide by with the state. There's no language currently in regards to how municipalities can do it. So, it's not preventing them from advertising, and the definition is in the Bill what advertising is, but it does prohibit the taxpayer dollars from being used. I'll be happy to answer any questions. There's no opposition. I ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Mr. Speaker, can we take this off Short Debate, please?"

Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be taken off of Short Debate."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative DeLuca, can you just walk me through the language changes in this Bill?"

DeLuca: "Yes. For example, advertising would mean any type of announcement that is purchased for promotional purposes for print in book, publication, brochure, sign, or digital media including, but not limited to, a website, a sign,

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

advertisement program, or electronic display. Advertisement does not include a community newsletter providing information pertaining to the community that is distributed to all residence of businesses within a community, a welcome... a welcome sign posted upon entering the community, or a sign located at government facilities."

Sandack: "Are you reading from the statute or from analysis, 'cause I'm trying... I'm looking at the statute itself?"

DeLuca: "I am reading from the text of the Bill."

Sandack: "Thank you. Where at, so I can follow along?"

DeLuca: "It's in the amended... in the Amendment."

Sandack: "So, give me an example, an illustration, of how this would work. And I notice that the language says you're no longer using taxpayer dollars. So, give me an illustration."

DeLuca: "An example would be if there's a community organization that's having their annual dinner and they have an ad book and they request that you purchase an ad in their ad book, and you go ahead and do so, but you're using the taxpayer funds to purchase that ad. That's currently taking place right now."

Sandack: "Who's doing that? I mean, is there someone that's actually using taxpayer dollars for that kind of an advertisement?"

DeLuca: "Oh, municipalities all across the State of Illinois."

Sandack: "Maybe in Chicago Heights, but I guarantee you they're not doing that in Downers Grove."

DeLuca: "Hey, take it easy now. Take it easy."

Sandack: "Seriously. Is there an example of some municipality? I mean, I don't want to name names, but someone's doing that?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

DeLuca: "Yes."

- Sandack: "And then, you had communications with some of these municipalities to discourage that activity. I mean, obviously, your Bill will make it no longer possible."
- DeLuca: "Yes. That's why the... the organizations that represent local governments are not in opposition to this. They recognize that no language exists right now. The language is actually consistent with what we live by as State Legislators."
- Sandack: "And so, IML doesn't take a position, the COGs didn't take a position, but you think their passivity means they're good with this?"
- DeLuca: "Yeah, well, there... there's probably going to be some folks on an individual basis that aren't too happy with it. But for the most part, this is... this is consistent, as I said, with what we're... what we live by as State Legislators and there's nothing in statute now that describes or sets limits on how this money can or cannot be used for advertising."
- Sandack: "And the last paragraph, it talks about what a vio... what happens to a violation. Is there any... other than repaying for the ad, is there any type... could this just continually happen without any... it becomes a course of conduct and they just wait to get caught and/or repay. Is there any other type of civil fine or criminal fine for habitual and repeated offenders?"
- DeLuca: "Well, though, the way we have prepared this language is you would be responsible for repaying the municipal funds that would be used and in a third violation, you could be removed from office. And the office would be declared vacant."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Sandack: "And if it's declared vacant, then whatever process the municipality has for filling the space would occur?"
- DeLuca: "That's correct."
- Sandack: "Okay. Thank you for answering the questions, Representative."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there are eight speakers on this Bill. We're going to the two-minute timer. First speaker is Mr. Hays."
- Hays: "Thank you, Representative. In kind of following up on that line of questioning, could you give me a couple of examples?

 I guess there are maybe a handful of us in the chamber that are former mayors. Do you have a couple of examples of this kind of activity that has precipitated this initiative?"
- DeLuca: "Yeah. The best example I can give, or one of the examples I could give... I mean, I could give a couple, purchasing a whole sponsorship at a golf outing. I used the example of a community organization that has their, you know, their annual dinner and they have an ad book, and you purchase an ad in the ad book for \$250, and you have your picture and your name and it's paid for with the taxpayers' money."
- Hays: "So, this would... I want to make sure I'm clear on this. So, if a municipality currently, for example, would be sending out a mailer on behalf of some not-for-profit or some celebration in the community or a holiday in the community on the city letterhead using postage from the city, from your perspective, this would effectively ban that behavior?"
- DeLuca: "No, not if it is a newsletter and you're notifying the community of some events or issues that are news worthy."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Hays: "Well, I guess my specific question is, so if a... an individual community is sending out on the envelope of the city with a postage stamp purchased by the city, XYZ celebration is coming up. There's sponsorship for \$50, \$100, \$250, \$500. That kind of activity, under your proposal, would be... would be banned."
- DeLuca: "No. I do not believe so. Based on that example, no. And I... and I did read the definition. I don't know if you're able to pull it up. If you can see exactly what the definition is of advertisement and what would be considered prohibited."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays, your com... your remarks should come to a close shortly, Sir."
- Hays: "Thank you. I appreciate... you know, I appreciate the Gentleman's Bill. I've got a couple other specific questions that are related to some practice in my community. And, Representative, I'd be happy to follow up with those. Thank you so much for your answers."

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

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

Andersson: "Thank you. Representative DeLuca, I... first off, I commend the Bill. I think it's a good idea. I am a little concerned about the language with regard to what's prohibited and not prohibited. I get the concept that if we're talking about buying a page in a dinner book of a community organization that would be prohibited or a golf whole sponsorship that would be prohibited. Those are examples where you're talking about things that are created or fund... not funded, they are sponsored by third parties. That's the

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

language I used in committee the other day on this. But the language of the actual statute doesn't really go to that question of third parties versus what the community, itself, might be a spons... you know, they might create their own event. I assume this would not prevent a community from having an event that doesn't fall into the exceptions. Because right now, the exceptions are only a newsletter, the welcome sign, and... and I guess that's it. So, my concern is that we're overly limiting what the community itself can do. So, that's my question, is how do we work with that?"

DeLuca: "I would... my impression... my opinion is that if a community is having their... let's say their... their summer festival and they advertise for their summer festival, I see no violation. I don't see any language that would consider that a violation."

Andersson: "It just doesn't appear to me that that's one of the exceptions under what isn't constituting advertisement. I guess all I would ask is... I have no objection to the Bill. I'm going to support the Bill but I'd ask as it moves forward, maybe in the Senate, that we look at some clarification of that language. Maybe, if nothing else, just including the term 'included but not limited to' for the exceptions. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sosnowski: "I understand the intent. Just a quick question. I notice that this is in the municipal code if I'm reading it correctly. Does this apply then, or is there... your intent to

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

bring an equal language for the county code or the township code?"

DeLuca: "Not at this time."

Sosnowski: "Okay. So, just to be clear then, it would just effect municipalities and villages?"

DeLuca: "That's correct."

Sosnowski: "Okay. And then a quick question. When you talk about, I guess, just clarification on newsletter... it doesn't happen a lot in a lot of communities but they have special programs, you know, whether it be through their economic development efforts, maybe a tree program or recycling that communities sometimes promote through just a brochure. Would those types of things fall under this restriction also?"

DeLuca: "No."

Sosnowski: "And can you..."

DeLuca: "That would be considered a newsletter."

Sosnowski: "Okay. So, that would fall under a newsletter. What...
what defines, then, newsletter? Just anything that discusses
programs that a city would offer?"

DeLuca: "Yeah, we don't have a definition in the text for newsletter, but it would be anything that would be going out on a somewhat consistent basis to notify the community of whatever the notification is in regards to."

Sosnowski: "Okay. And maybe there doesn't need to be any change in here but I could see some communities maybe misinterpreting that. You know, a lot do exactly what you do... you mentioned, they have a monthly newsletter, but some distribute, you know, different types of pamphlets about different programs that they offer. Sometimes there's federal funds associated with

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

those... or local municipal funds. And I'm assuming, I don't have any examples with me today, that perhaps they might have the mayor of the community, you know, as a... you know, a contact name on the bottom. So, I don't know how... when... as this moves forward if that's just something how we, you know, take care of that or how we inform municipalities. Maybe the municipal leagues will help. I don't know if you... they've been... I think you mentioned they've been open to this and they're supportive of it."

DeLuca: "Yes, and... and the..."

Speaker Lang: "Excuse me. After this, Mr. Sosnowski, can you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

DeLuca: "Yeah. And certainly the intent of this, Representative Sosnowski, is not to try and catch someone or catch a municipality on sending out, you know, a notice to the community. That's not the intent here. In the definition of advertisement, which are the most blatant violations of advertising with taxpayer dollars. That's what this is about. That's what this is about."

Sosnowski: "Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer for two mintues."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you said this won't apply to counties, correct?"

DeLuca: "That's correct."

Davidsmeyer: "Will it apply to townships?"

DeLuca: "No, it will not."

Davidsmeyer: "Will it apply to road districts?"

DeLuca: "No, it will not."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Davidsmeyer: "How about park districts?"

DeLuca: "The only unit of government would be municipalities."

Davidsmeyer: "So, not school boards?"

DeLuca: "That is correct."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Is there... is there any limit on Home Rule within this?"

DeLuca: "No."

Davidsmeyer: "And it covers municipalities of all sizes, not 100 thousand or less, or..."

DeLuca: "All shapes and sizes."

Davidsmeyer: "All shapes and sizes. So, if the mayor puts an advertisement in the newspaper that said, 'Chicago Heights supports our veterans' on Veterans' Day, is that an advertisement? Or Veterans' Day is fast approaching. Please support our veterans. Is that an advertisement or is that reminding people that Veterans' Day is coming?"

DeLuca: "I would say according to the text if it included the name and image of the elected officials, then that would be a violation."

Davidsmeyer: "If it does not include the image of the official, is that an advertisement?"

DeLuca: "Yes. Yes, it is."

Davidsmeyer: "It is. So, just the name. All right. I appreciate..."

DeLuca: "Representative, they have every right to still have that same advertisement if they want to pay for it with their campaign funds."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, I... I appreciate you bringing this Bill. I think I understand what you're trying to get at and I hope we can work on these for other different forms of governments

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

like counties, townships, road districts, park districts, school boards, and the other seven thousand different elected boards we have. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, I think this seems like a... like a good Bill. On this whole, I've got a couple of questions about it specifically. When we talk about using the elected official's name and that being prohibited, how about where the individual's name is needed to identify the location of an event. For example, come to a community meeting hosted at Alderman so-and-so's office. Would that be permitted?"

DeLuca: "I would agree that we could probably come up with a lot of, you know, variations and hypotheticals where there would be a gray area. I would just like to redirect your attention, if I may, to the definition of advertisement and that's really what we're trying to focus on. I'm sure we could come up with a hypothetical situation that, as I said, will be considered a gray area."

Demmer: "And I think another example of that might be if there's an individual's name that's included in contact information. For example, a website, an email address where citizens who may, for very legitimate purposes, need to be able to get in contact with that elected official or their office for various services. That may be prohibited under this because it includes that individual's name. Is that right?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

DeLuca: "Not if you're referring to a municipal website or municipal email address. No. That's not a violation under this."

Demmer: "Even if the individual's name is in the email address?"

DeLuca: "That's correct. This... it would not be considered a violation under this."

Demmer: "That's good. How about are appointed officials included in this legislation?"

DeLuca: "This is elected only."

Demmer: "Elected only."

DeLuca: "Elected officials only."

Demmer: "So, I think there may be an opportunity to look and see that sometimes those who are appointed to boards have the same kind of incentives or interests that we're trying to eliminate here for those who are... those who are elected. Final question is we talk about in newsletters, is there any definition to whether those newsletters can be in print, an email newsletter, something that people subscribe to via social media?"

DeLuca: "Well, as I stated earlier, there's not a definition of newsletter in the text, but generally a communication, whether it be electronic or by paper with the community on a somewhat regular basis."

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative. I think it's a good Bill."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Rep... Representative, like some of the previous speakers, I also think that it would be appropriate to use...

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

or include other units of government on this because county... county officials oftentimes do this. But my question goes to the penalties involved. It's my reading of the Bill that after a third violation the person is removed from office? Is that correct?"

- DeLuca: "That's correct. And also part of the penalty would be to repay the municipality the funds."
- Harris, D.: "Understand the repayment, but it's the removal from office that concerns me. That's a... that's a pretty severe penalty simply for publishing something and having your name on it. I mean, why don't we slap them with some heavy duty fines? I mean, other... other issues for removal from office are conviction of a disqualifying crime or moving out of the municipality or moving out of the ward. Here they're simply publishing something and if they do it the third time, they are removed from office. That's a... that's a pretty severe penalty, don't you think?"
- DeLuca: "Actually, I don't because that's... it's pretty reckless, really, when you think about it to be violating this... this advertisement with taxpayer dollars three times. And I just ran legislation this week in regards to if there's a debt owed to a municipality, the existing law was one day. If you were one day late, you were removed from office. And I ran legislation to address that. So I think violating this and, you know, three strikes, you're out, I think is pretty reasonable."
- Harris, D.: "Well, and I appreciate the answers. Just to the Bill,
 I comment that I think you could slap them with a pretty heavy
 duty fine increases several times, but the removal from

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

office, to me, seems a bit heavy duty for... for this... this type of violation. Thank you for your answers."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "He yields."

Franks: "Representative, did you know that today is William Shakespeare's birthday? It is. I think he would refer to you as DeLuca the reformer. I want you to know. I think it's... I think this is a good piece of legislation..."

DeLuca: "I thought it had a good chance until I saw you..."

Franks: "Yeah, I know."

DeLuca: "...went up on the board as a cosponsor."

Franks: "You might lose a few votes on that. But some of the other speakers have... who have spoken on behalf of the Bill, and I think it's great. I would like to see it extended. Because it's not just at the municipal level. We certainly see it at the county level and we see it at the township level. So, perhaps, this is something we can work on in the future or perhaps, even in the Senate if you may be willing to do that. Was there any reason that you chose just the municipalities to start with?"

DeLuca: "The... the information that I had had in conversations with a lot of folks was that this is the level, the municipal level, where it was most blatant."

Franks: "I... I think you're a..."

DeLuca: "That it was..."

Franks: "Yeah, I agree."

DeLuca: "...it was, you know, standard procedure."

Franks: "Yeah, it has been."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

DeLuca: "Just standard procedure."

Franks: "It has been. And if they want to... if they want to do this, they ought to be using their campaign funds or using their personal funds if they wish to do that. We had a lot of problems, for those who don't remember, with our... two governors ago, who spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in state dollars in plastering his name everywhere. Whether it be on the toll way, whether it be when you come into the state. Whatever it was, he decided to put his name on it. We had changed the law to apply to us, but it never got extended farther. So, I think this is a really fine piece of legislation, one that's overdo. And I'd encourage everyone to vote 'yes'. And, hopefully, we'll be able to expand this to other levels of government as well and maybe... maybe even in the Senate. So, thank you for bringing this."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, is there a law already on the books that
 speaks to the issue that you're bringing today?"

DeLuca: "No, there is not."

Kay: "Okay. I'm curious about the violations portion of the Bill. If public funds were used by a municipality who sent a mailer to three different locations, would that be three separate violations; therefore, throwing the official out of office?"

DeLuca: "It's not specific to that."

Kay: "Well..."

DeLuca: "The language is not specific to that."

Kay: "What's... what's your intent?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- DeLuca: "My intent is that each incident would be considered a violation."
- Kay: "So, in this particular case that I just cited, three locations get three mailers or they have three billboards..."
- DeLuca: "But remember, Representative Kay, under the definition and under the intent of this, that example would not be a violation. So, please, if I may, I'd like to redirect your attention to the definition of advertisement. And if you take a look at that, that's really what we're focusing on here."
- Kay: "Okay. Well, again, same question though. If you're
 advertising in three different cities..."
- DeLuca: "You know, we're not just looking at the Mayor's Office sending a mailer to a resident..."
- DeLuca: "No, this is... this is talking about an image... their name and an image in an advertisement that's paid for with taxpayer dollars."
- Kay: "But my... my question is if it's in three different cities,
 jurisdictions, counties, municipal... whatever, is that one
 violation or three?"
- DeLuca: "Well, this is only for municipal government."

Kay: "Well..."

- DeLuca: "One letter sent to multiple people would be one violation."
- Kay: "Okay. So then, three publications to the same town, that...
 that would be three violations in your Bill? I mean, we're
 talking about removing someone from office, I think we need
 to get the penalty part of this correct."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

DeLuca: "As I said, I'm still not viewing your example as a violation."

Kay: "Okay. Let me ask another question, which I think's pretty important. I understand where you're going with this and I'm not in total disagreement with it, but how do you handle situations like job fairs or job training or veteran's events where legitimately, the sponsor may be an official who has a stake in this and has every right to have his name out there? Is that not appropriate?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay, your time has come to a close. After Mr. DeLuca answers your question, could you..."

DeLuca: "No, we..."

Speaker Lang: "...finish your remarks, Sir?"

Kay: "Sure."

DeLuca: "We did somewhat address that with a previous speaker, and that would not be considered a violation, in my opinion, under this."

Kay: "Okay. One suggestion, then I'll close. I think it might be good to have a definition in there for just exactly what promotional purposes are because I'm not exactly clear from your Bill what that is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Breen: "Thank you. And, Representative, I certainly support the concept that you've got going on here, but I am a little bit concerned about how this Act will be enforced and by whom. So what is your preferred method of enforcement in that and I believe it Section 8-1-2.10?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- DeLuca: "This is self-policing. This would be self-policing similar to the legislation that I referred to the other day that I ran this week about debt that would be due to the municipality. That is also self-policing, whether it's the elected officials, the community, watch groups."
- Breen: "I guess I'm confused because I've heard about, and in relation to your other... you're other Bill, that municipal officials have been taken to court. And I believe it was on a quo warranto action to be ejected from office and there were complaints that these are being filed in a frivolous nature. I believe those actions can also be filed by state's attorney or the attorney general. And so, I'm wondering, is this the same sort of thing where we're opening a Pandora's Box of litigation where folks will say they'll file actions against their opponents to try to get them ejected from office for the various reason stated herein, and again, tied into that definition."
- DeLuca: "Well, that could happen now. And I would... I would argue that by creating this language, we're reducing the possibility of that happening."

Breen: "Well, I..."

- DeLuca: "We're making it clearer what public funds can be used on and what they can't be used on which currently does not exist."
- Breen: "Right. And so, I agree with that sentiment, but at the same time, we are creating a new cause of action for this. And so, I also was wondering, I mean, how do you return the funds because you can't take someone to court, as I understand it, to recover municipal funds. I believe that's solely the

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

purview of the attorney general or possibly the state's attorney."

DeLuca: "Well, under the legislation I passed this week, it would be a debt owed to the municipality. So, at that point, you would have 60 days to make payment to the municipality under your example."

Breen: "Okay. I just... I don't know..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, your time has come to a close, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Davis, W.: "So, I want to be clear about this, Representative, as it relates to local officials. Basically, you don't want them to advertise themselves using municipal dollars. So, in a case where you've got a community based organization that's having their annual gala and you have their ad book, you're suggesting that a local mayor or trustee, if it were be the case, should not advertise themselves in that book by using municipal funds to do so. Correct?"

DeLuca: "Right. They can advertise in the book. This does nothing to prohibit that, but they shouldn't be using the taxpayer dollars to do so."

Davis, W.: "They should not be using their taxpayer..."

DeLuca: "That's correct."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, how do you... how do you monitor this?"

DeLuca: "It's self-policing."

Davis, W.: "Self-policing?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Davis, W.: "So, considering that you're suggesting that, pay back the money, possibly third time removal for office, I'm supposed to admit to doing this, so to speak? I'm just asking."

DeLuca: "I didn't really hear what you said."

Davis, W.: "Well, I'm saying, you're saying it's self-policing.

So, considering in your Bill you talk about a third time I could be removed for office, so you want that local official to tell on themselves."

DeLuca: "Well, I don't think the person doing it, that would be using taxpayer dollars to promote themselves..."

Davis, W.: "Right."

DeLuca: "...on a number of occasions, it would probably be someone else that would be bringing the action against that official."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, is it possible that if the board agreed that they would advertise in a publication or in a... you know, a community based organization's ad book, if they wanted to pass their own ordinance or do something officially in that way, to say that we are going to advertise in that. Is that prohibited?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "And so, any use of the funds, even if they agree to do it totally, meaning through an action of their own, is prohibited?"

DeLuca: "They can advertise under your example, they would have to use other funds, personal or political."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

DeLuca: "Not tax dollars."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Davis, W.: "So, whether they agree to do it or not. 'Cause I get what you're, I think, what you're saying if you have a local mayor that, you know, puts him name in a bunch of books. I get that."

DeLuca: "That's correct."

Davis, W.: "But if they agree as a..."

DeLuca: "Yeah, it wouldn't... under this, it wouldn't make a difference whether the board is all in agreement or whether they're split."

Davis, W.: "Okay. All right."

DeLuca: "It wouldn't make a difference."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Please go ahead, Sir."

Reis: "Will this piece of legislation supersede Home Rule, and how many votes will this take for passage?"

Speaker Lang: "We will review that for you, Sir."

Reis: "Okay. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reis: "Representative, kind of taking off from the prior Representative's questioning, who's going to deliver the first and second warning of each violation?"

DeLuca: "As I said, it's self-policing. So, whether it's another elected official on the board, whether it's the community, whether it's community leaders, whether it's a watch dog group, as there's a lot of people watching you, here in Springfield, municipal government as well."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Reis: "So, will there be an appeals process? Will there be a trial?

I mean, is it just guilty by accusation?"

DeLuca: "Yeah, there's no appeals process that's written in the language."

Reis: "And I can understand that for the first or second violation, but the third violation you're going to have someone removed from office. You're going to reverse an election, but yet that person has no recourse, no appeal, to question any of the prior violations. So, I'm just a little bit confused how this might be implemented."

DeLuca: "Council is advising me that there will be a court action.

It's not just going to happen because a third violation took place. There would actually be a..."

Reis: "So, there'll be a criminal..."

DeLuca: "...court action."

Reis: "...there'll be crim..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis, your time has come to a close. You may complete your remarks."

Reis: "Okay. I just don't understand how this Bill's going to be implemented. And with that, Mr. Speaker, should this Bill get the requisite number of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. I would also indicate, Mr. Reis... Mr. Reis, an answer to your inquiry, the Parliamentarian advises this will require 60 votes. Mr. Wehrli for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "One of the municipalities I represent here has a dedicated fund that actually does advertising for special events in the

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

community. Some of those special events are festivals, as you mentioned previously, that are actually quite large fundraisers for some of our non-profits in town. They go on to spend the dollars on prevention of child abuse, fighting hunger, public safety, things like that. So, if that special... if that special fund is used to advertise in their books or on the back of t-shirts or things like that, and it lists the elected officials from the municipality, is that a violation?"

DeLuca: "No, it's not."

Wehrli: "How is it not?"

DeLuca: "Well, as I have said a number of times, a community event is not in violation of the definition that we have under advertisement."

Wehrli: "But it's not a community event. It's a non-profit's event that the municipality happens to be advertising for."

DeLuca: "Was that a question?"

Wehrli: "It is."

DeLuca: "What was the question?"

Wehrli: "If a municipality is advertising for an event that they are not the title sponsor of but yet they're using a dedicated municipal tax collected to do that advertising and they list the elected officials of that municipality's names on the, you know, the fliers or the pamphlets or the t-shirts, is that a violation?"

DeLuca: "Well, as I said earlier that I'm not exactly sure that I'm following your example or your hypothetical situation, but we could certainly come up with hypothetical situations, you know, all day long on this. But I would please ask, once

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

again, to direct your attention if you look at the text and the definition of what advertisement is that's what we're focused on."

Wehrli: "This actually is not a hypothetical situation, believe it or not. We actually..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli, your time has come to a close. Can you complete your remarks, Sir?"

Wehrli: "Well, I didn't get my questions answered. Thank you, Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, I was out of the chamber for a while.

So, can you just... this is municipal code so it's just dealing with trustees and the mayor. Is that correct?"

DeLuca: "That's correct. Municipal Government."

Sullivan: "We're not dealing with townships, any other potential elected official on the local level?"

DeLuca: "No other units of government."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, I've been trying to read through Section 1-1-2.10, I have not stumbled upon where we would see this adjudicated. Now, I did see Heather come down and say that potentially, if someone was removed from office that this would then go to a court system. How do we get there? Is there underlying law that would require that?"

DeLuca: "So, someone would have to bring an action upon the elected official that continuously violated."

Sullivan: "So, potentially, the violator, the mayor, advertised.

His name was in it. We know it's probably a violation. A

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

citizen, perhaps, could bring that charge to who? A court? Or an... or a state's attorney? I'm assuming the state's attorney."

DeLuca: "That's correct?"

Sullivan: "Okay. So, they would bring it to the state's attorney and then at that point, it's adjudicated. Now, the first two violations are not a removal of office. What happens within the first violation or the second violation?"

DeLuca: "The violator would have to repay the money to the municipality."

Sullivan: "Okay. And so, it'd build upon itself to go to the third violation where they potentially are... are removed from office? At that point... well... so, what if... what if in the first or second violation... and I'm getting to the point, Mr. Speaker. In the first or second violation, the violator or the one accused says I didn't do it. It was a mistake on staff. They shouldn't have done it. Is there any defense of an unintentional act by a staffer within the unit of local government?"

DeLuca: "Not under this legislation."

Sullivan: "But on the third violation where it would have to go before the courts to convict this violator and throw them from office, is that the appropriate setting where then they would, in essence, have their time or their day in court?"

DeLuca: "That would be my opinion. Yes."

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

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

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaker yields?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Bennett: "Thank you. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Sandack, please."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack for the remainder of two minutes."

Sandack: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a few more questions?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, I went back and I talked to a few members of the committee where the Bill came out of. And I was told there wasn't an illustration of what precipitated this Bill. There was no example in committee of a town that did what your Bill seeks to prohibit towns from doing. So, is there an example of a town that's... that advertised with taxpayer dollars, so we want to prohibit it and make sure it doesn't happen again?"

DeLuca: "I'm not going... I don't have an example of a... I'm not going to name a town."

Sandack: "Well, it's a public act, right?"

DeLuca: "But..."

Sandack: "And it was taxpayer dollars. Why not?"

DeLuca: "Yeah. Well, there's... there's communities in the south land that this is standard operating procedure."

Sandack: "In your district?"

DeLuca: "Some, yes."

Sandack: "Are there other..."

DeLuca: "Yes."

Sandack: "...bad actors in other districts?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Sandack: "All right. Because I was also informed by a member of the committee that this was essentially a shell Bill for a

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

while and again in committee, there was no names named, there were no examples cited. And this looks a lot like the state ethic's law or provisions of the state ethic's law. Did you borrow from our existing law?"

DeLuca: "Yes. I wanted to try and make it consistent with what we live under here."

Sandack: "And that's a good thing. And so, some of my colleagues have asked you about making it consistent for other units of government as well. Are you amenable to that suggestion?"

DeLuca: "Maybe not in this legislation, but certainly in the future."

Sandack: "So, they... we could extend the same good principles to other..."

DeLuca: "Sure."

Sandack: "...units of government."

DeLuca: "Sure. We should. It's good government."

Sandack: "And I should've asked you this. Are you aware of any other units of government, other than municipalities, again, don't have to name names that maybe engaged in this practice in the past?"

DeLuca: "I'm not. I'm not. I haven't looked at those."

Sandack: "All right. Thank... thank you for answering the question.

If I can close, Mr. Speaker, real quickly. To the... to the
Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of the
Gentleman's Bill. I think it's a good piece of legislation.

I do take him at his word that we ought to extend this concept,
this good government initiative, this reform-minded
legislation to other units of government. We have... we have a
lot of units of government in Illinois. I think one of my

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- colleagues was laying out some of them that this would also be every bit as good and every bit as important for. So, while we should vote 'yes' on this Bill, we should consider using these very same language, these very same principles in other legislation for other units of government. Thank you for the indulgence, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi for two minutes."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A majority of these questions have been asked and answered. For that reason, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi, will you indulge the Chair. There's only two lights left. We'll take Mr. Cabello and Representative McDermed, and we'll call it off there and then I'll take your Motion. Mr. Cabello for two minutes."
- Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Representative Sandack."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack, again, for the remainder of two minuters."
- Sandack: "Thank you. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. I reiterated thirty seconds ago that I support the initiative and I still support the initiative. And I want to use my time to acknowledge the Sponsor, his hard work, his due diligence, and his perseverance. What a Gentleman that's standing here, taking all the questions... Well, I've got a minute-thirty three, Mr. Speaker. I..."
- Speaker Lang: "I wasn't rushing. I was helping you along, Sir."
- Sandack: "Oh well, I... I thank you for that indulgence. I'll respectfully decline it, however. The Gentleman from Cook County, Chicago Heights, has a good Bill. I think we should

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

all diligently read it, slowly review and not just push the green button because someone told us to. But instead, in the course of our own due diligence and professional conduct. This is not a Bill that we should just take marching orders on. No, we should think it through, wonder if there's any unintended consequences, and then and only then push the green button. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've got two more minutes coming, I suspect."

Speaker Lang: "Well, you had 52 seconds of your own time.

Representative McDermed for two minutes."

McDermed: "Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to Representative Wehrli."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wehrli for two minutes, the last speaker, and then I'll entertain Mr. Thapedi's Motion."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "So, we actually have a municipality that levies a one percent food and beverage tax for the purposes of economic development and then funds public services and advertising for special events within this community. Does this Bill prohibit those elected officials from being... given notice in any advertising that may be part of that event?"

DeLuca: "No. If they are using public funds for the announcement or promotional purpose for print in a book, publication, brochure, sign, digital media, including not limited to, a website, a sign, advertisement program, electronic display that is what this legislation focuses on."

Wehrli: "I'm not sure if that was a yes or a no because it does include some of the aforementioned advertisements as you so well-articulated. So, I still don't have an answer to what I

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

consider to be a very serious question for my district. However, you also answered that this applies... does not apply to appointed officials, only elected. What if you are appointed to an elected office? Does it apply?"

DeLuca: "You are then an elected official."

Wehrli: "Okay. To the Bill. I rise in support of this Bill. It's a good Bill. I do wish it included other units of government. I will be voting 'yes' on your legislation, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Deluca to close. Now, be... be full in your explanation 'cause we haven't had sufficient debate on this one."

DeLuca: "Right."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Deluca."

DeLuca: "There... there may still be some folks unclear in the chamber, I'm sure. But, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you for your questions. I think there were some very good points. I do. Some very good points that were brought up while this Bill was being thoroughly vetted today on the floor. I think that a lot of the hypotheticals, some not hypothetical, that's not the intent. Certainly that's not the intent. We're... we're looking at folks who might be knowingly or unknowingly abusing the ability to promote themselves with taxpayer dollars. There's nothing in current law that prohibits it at this time. We have drafted this in a way that's consistent with what we live by, what we all live by here in the State of Illinois. So, I'm certainly willing to work on this in the Senate if you'd be so kind to give me your 'yes' vote and even consider bringing more units

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

of government into this in the future. So, please vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of his Bill.

Mr. Reis has moved for a verification. Members will be in their chairs, vote their own switches. Staff will retire to the rear of the chamber. 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. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are surprisingly 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And Mr. Reis withdraws his verification request. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3304. Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3304, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3304 states that the Children and Family Services Advisory Council will include one youth from each of DCFS's four major regional youth advisory boards. And it goes on to say that the Children and Family Services Advisory Council will have 21 members and will also include a previous person that... who was a ward of the state. And I know of no opposition and I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Representative, 21 members of this board. How is that determined?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Flowers: "I'm sorry, what is your question?"

Sandack: "The number of members on this committee, how is it determined?"

Flowers: "The board... I don't know how it was determined. I would assume that it was established by rules and... it was... it was originally a 17 member board..."

Sandack: "Right."

Flowers: "...and then we added on two more former members. So... and because of the region. It had something to do with the region.

But I'm sorry I cannot answer that question as far as why is it... why was it 17. But I could tell you why it is now 21."

Sandack: "Okay. Well, I'll take that. Why it is now 21?"

Flowers: "Because we wanted to add on former members of the board.

Just... just for advisory purposes only. They're not to tell

DCFS what to do. They are merely to advise the... the members

as to what is best in regards to what's going on as far as
the discussion around the state. And this will... this is the
northern regional advisory board, and there's a central
regional advisory board which also consists of three
subregions, and Springfield, Peoria, Champaign, and southern
Illinois regional boards. And they are there to... they hold
monthly meetings and... I know of no opposition to the Bill."

- Sandack: "Great. And you mentioned that and I'm... I'm thankful for that information. The... the members of the board, how were they selected? Do you know?"
- Flowers: "The Governor would select the members of the board and this... this issue came from the students that testified before our... our committee in regards to what it is that they would like to see. And that was the reason why this board was put

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

together, and that's the reason why they wanted former members as a part of the board."

Sandack: "Representative, one more question. I noticed there are two members of the Senate that are on this council but I don't... I don't... maybe I don't see them but I don't see anyone from the House of Representatives. Why is the Senate overly represented and the House under represented on this commission?"

Flowers: "Well now, Representative, I'm not aware of that but if I saw that, I would make changes as well."

Sandack: "Well, I see Julie Morrison and I see Mattie Hunter. Both are wonderful people and they're good legislators but I don't see any Members of the House of Representatives, and I'm just wondering why..."

Flowers: "Well, maybe we should talk to the Governor..."

Sandack: "...the people's House..."

Flowers: "...and maybe we could talk. You know, if we... you talk to your Governor about me and I'll talk to my Speaker about talking to your Governor about you. What do you think?"

Sandack: "That sounds like a fine idea..."

Flowers: "I figured you would like that."

Sandack: "...because the people's House always ought to be equally represented, if not more..."

Flowers: "Absolutely. And if you and I was on there..."

Sandack: "...than that snobatorian across the way."

Flowers: "...it would be more than equally represented."

Sandack: "Yes, Ma'am."

Flowers: "All right."

Sandack: "Thank you much."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Flowers: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "How did you refer to the Senate, Sir?"

Sandack: "...will reflect my comment, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Snobatorian."

Sandack: "I did."

Speaker Lang: "Is that what you... were you not in that chamber briefly?"

Sandack: "For that very reason."

Speaker Lang: "Okay. Leader Currie is recognized."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members. Please let the record show that Representative Feigenholtz is excused for the remainder of the day."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, I see that in addition to increasing the number from 17 to 21, we've removed a provision that provided for a senior citizen or someone 60 years of age or older to be included in this panel. What was the reason for removing that?"

Flowers: "I don't know the reason why the members wanted to remove someone 60 and older, but I can say to you that they wanted someone that was more reflective of what the students or the young people are going through. And they wanted someone who would be able to help transform the policies into the practices in which they actually live and have to live with and help to remove the stigma because there was negative connotation that was associated with having or living within foster care. And so, being a..."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Demmer: "I appreciate the, Representative. I would just suggest that I think that people over the age of 60 have many valuable contributions to make, and I want to make sure that their voice gets heard as well."

Flowers: "Well see, Representative, that goes to the previous speaker. I agree. I'm over 60, so if I was on that committee, I would fit. So, no it's not impossible. So, thank you very much."

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative Flowers, and I can certainly see your intent, I think it's a good idea. But one question, if you've already said this, I apologize, I didn't pick it up. It specifies the youth be from each of the, I believe, there's a regional advisory committees. How many regional areas are the regional committees? In other words, how many youth do you intend to put on this?"

Flowers: "Well..."

Moffitt: "It's going from 17 to 21. So of the 21, how many will be youth?"

Flowers: "Well, I have... according to my analysis here, it says the four major youth advisory boards are the northern regional..."

Moffitt: "Okay."

Flowers: "...board, the central..."

Moffitt: "So, it'd be four?"

Flowers: "Yes. There's four."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Moffitt: "Okay. So, four... we're adding four, and four would be the youth? We're going from 17 to 21, and four of them will be youth?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Moffitt: "And... does this... is there a definition of youth? I mean, is it up to a certain age or is there a minimum age? Or what... what is the definition of youth or is there one?"

Flowers: "There is no definition of youth. I would say some of the members that's on the board now, they're over 21. So, I would consider that still very youthful."

Moffitt: "It's looking more youthful all the time to me."

Flowers: "Pardon me?"

Moffitt: "It's looking more youthful all the time to me."

Flowers: "I agree. I agree."

Moffitt: "But probably under 21 would be a youth?"

Flowers: "Not necessarily under 21, but there's no… there's no limit. I don't know the age. There may be someone that's under 21."

Moffitt: "I appreciate your response. Appreciate what you're trying to do. And also, for someone over 60, I would like to comment on that but I guess that would be a conflict of interest. So... but you admitted to being in that same category."

Flowers: "I'm over 60, Sir."

Moffitt: "Yes."

Flowers: "And I'll state my conflict. Thank you."

Moffitt: "Okay. And thank you for what you're doing."

Flowers: "It's my pleasure."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have one very quick question. Of the members that are appointed, are they appointed by the director or the Governor?"

Flowers: "The Governor."

Sullivan: "Thank you. That's all I need to know. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Crespo, Gordon-Booth, Tabares. Gordon-Booth. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2750. Mr. Guzzardi. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2750, a Bill for an Act concerning cannabis. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is to create a study group to study the effects of taxing and regulating cannabis in the State of Illinois. Now, I would suspect that given the national mood, at some point before too long, this Body will consider the question of taxing and regulating cannabis. You may support this idea; you may oppose this idea. But however you feel about this view, I think we can all agree that we ought to have independent data, clear and knowable information that we can all agree on to base that debate around. There's going to be a lot of partisan discussion on that issue to be sure. It would be nice to have some good, independent data. So, this Bill would create... would turn over to the Sentencing Policy Advisory Council, an esteemed and

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

bipartisan group, the task of investigating how taxing and regulating marijuana would affect our state in a whole number of ways. I know of no opposition to this legislation and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "For the remainder of the afternoon, the Chair will be using the two-minute timer and strictly enforcing it. Mr. Sandack for exactly two minutes."

Sandack: "And not two minutes more. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Sandack: "Thank you. Representative Guzzardi, aren't we getting ahead of ourselves a little bit here? Why are we studying something... today, we just passed a pretty historic Bill, but we're still way down the line. Is this a good use of time, talent, resources, particularly money, now?"
- Guzzardi: "That's a great question, Leader. And just to be clear, because this is going to be handed over to SPAC, it's not going to cost us a dime of taxpayer money to do. And that being said, I think it's important for us to have this information before our legislature is asked to consider this question."
- Sandack: "Well, if it's not going to cost a dime of taxpayer money, which is music to my ears, do we need a law? Do we have to pass this? Can't they just study it on their own?"
- Guzzardi: "Another good question, Leader. Thank you. I think we need this information. I would love it if we could get it just from falling out of the sky but I think it's our responsibility to make sure that we have accurate and complete information, and therefore, we're going to constitute it in law."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Sandack: "Well, I would not want to quibble or argue with the concept, but can't we find some good bipartisan or nonpartisan research organizations and ask them to kind of look into this initiative and keep our, you know, state agencies focused on the here and now?"
- Guzzardi: "That's precisely what we're doing with this Bill. We are asking a non-partisan agency to look into this question."
- Sandack: "I know but we're passing a law to do it, and I'm wondering the propriety of passing a law. Last question. Is this necessary legislation?"
- Guzzardi: "I believe it is, yes."
- Sandack: "To the Bill. It says I've got plenty of time left up there, right? Is there a timer on or not on? I got... I got a lot of time left. There we go."
- Speaker Lang: "Well, because... because the Chair didn't show you your time, I'll let you finish your remarks, Sir."
- Sandack: "The Chair... thank you. I appreciate that. I respect the Gentleman's request. I think he's on to something except this isn't necessary legislation. We needn't pass a Bill for another test, another committee, another task force. We need to get focused on the here and now. This is way ahead of us, way down the line. I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "How is the State of Colorado not all of the study we need?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Guzzardi: "It's a great question from Representative Wehrli. I believe that the State of Colorado has many different circumstances from those we face here is Illinois. They certainly don't have a municipality as large as Chicago. They've got a number of different economic circumstances in Colorado. While I think it's strong evidence in a certain, direction, we'd like to know exactly how this will affect us here in Illinois."
- Wehrli: "To the Bill. I will be voting 'no' this because this is an example of just government doing things that it doesn't need to do. We don't need to study this because there's other examples that we can learn from, such as Colorado. This is waste of time and talent. I am glad to hear that there are no dollars being spent at least by the state side. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris, for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "First... first of all, Representative, I do want you to know you are my favorite opera singer."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative. I'm flattered."

Harris, D.: "The... the position paper that I have talks about this being a Cannabis Study Act, the important policy decisions should be data driven. It seems to me, based on that we passed earlier this year, we've already made some important policy decisions. As an example, we've set a standard for driving while under the influence, potentially, of THC at a certain level. So, the policy decisions apparently are being made

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

without the... without the policy study. Any thoughts or comments?"

- Guzzardi: "Yes, Sir. I believe the decision pertaining to driving under the influence was made as a result of extensive policy research. This particular Bill would simply add to the body of knowledge that we have and specify research about the effect of taxing and regulation on the State of Illinois, which is research that may not presently be available. And I think before we consider such legislation, it'll be important for us to have this information."
- Harris, D.: "But we already have, as example from medicinal marijuana, we already have taxation policies in place. So, again I come back and say, it's nice, perhaps, to have a study, but this... this Body has already taken action regarding taxation, regarding revenue issues, regarding testing issues that are now already in place and in statute."
- Guzzardi: "And I think we can all agree that we would all feel more comfortable taking those kinds of decisions if we had independently verified data and research to back them up."
- Harris, D.: "Well, I certainly, I guess, would like to have had that before we did all that, but I'm not sure that this is needed now since we've already taken action. But thank you again and I'm looking forward to your next opera performance."

Guzzardi: "Likewise."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "I... if you could clarify, I'm genuinely confused on how you said that the state isn't paying for it, there's no fiscal

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

impact but it's free? And why we need a law to do something that's free?"

Guzzardi: "Well, it's being conducted by the Sentencing Advisory Council which is an already extent body, so we're not going to have to pay anybody to do it. And SPAC has, in fact, has to take on this responsibility, so they don't view it as a waste of their time or talent either. I believe that there's no expense here. In fact, this is just our way of making sure that we have the information we need in order to pass well-informed policy should the matter come before us."

Batinick: "Well, you bring up an important point. You say that there's people around that want to take this on. To me, that means that they have nothing to do and maybe we're overstaffed in that department. Is that essentially what's happening?"

Guzzardi: "No."

Batinick: "Okay, I'll let the Body decide that. To the Bill. I could... I could put something out that says I want to study what the weather's like outside tomorrow... I'm sorry, I could study what the weather's like right now or I could go outside and I could see what the weather's like. We have Colorado. That's going to be better than any study. Studies are often misguided, tainted, somebody has an agenda when doing studies. Colorado's going to be our best example. I recommend that we... if we have overstaffed agencies, maybe we need to lay some people off and pay for health and human service things that we need and things like that instead studies. We... I don't know, we probably passed 50 studies so far this year. We have a lot of people doing studies and apparently not

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

enough people taking care of poor 18 to 21-year-olds. So, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "Is this an attempt to make a case for the legalization of marijuana?"

Guzzardi: "Not at all. Although, it seems that some of your colleagues are beginning to make that case by pointing us in the direction of Colorado."

Davidsmeyer: "What is... what is, and how was the Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council created?"

Guzzardi: "Let me pull up the membership of SPAC here. Rep...

Representative..."

Davidsmeyer: "I don't necessarily... I... and I'm not asking the history of that group."

Guzzardi: "Oh."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm just say where did it come from? You know, why... what are they supposed to do?"

Guzzardi: "Well, they're supposed to look into questions precisely like this, pertaining to our laws, particularly around sentencing. And again, one of the questions here is going to be about the impact of regulation on the rate of arrest, predisposition, detention, and sentencing. But they're going to look into the broader questions around legalizing, taxing, and regulation as well."

Davidsmeyer: "So, why would they look into the taxing and regulation? Why wouldn't they just be looking at the... the effects on prison population or something of that sort?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Guzzardi: "Well, I think there's a lot more information we'd like to know before undertaking this debate, and this is a very well respected policy organization that has worked in this area in the past. They are a bipartisan... nonpartisan, I should say, organization with representation from both parties as well as leading experts across the field."

Davidsmeyer: "Who... who puts these people on the board?"

Guzzardi: "I could certainly do a little digging on the exact makeup and appointment policy about SPAC, but I would say that this chamber has turned to SPAC's research extensively in the past. It's a widely respected body across both sides of the political spectrum."

Davidsmeyer: "So, is it a private group or something that was created by the General Assembly or... or the Governor?"

Guzzardi: "It's created by statute."

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

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After viewing the sponsor board, I feel obligated to ask for a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Christian Mitchell for two minutes."

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

Mitchell, C.: "I think, Will, that people are starting to get tired, and you know, maybe they're not necessarily reading their analysis. So, I want to ask just a couple clarifying questions. What you're proposing here is because we are a Body that does public policy that perhaps a well-respected agency that exists inside government would take a look at potentially... and in a very difficult budgetary time as I

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

understand it, potentially taxing and regulating the sale of cannabis. Am I understanding correctly, your purpose?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, you are, Sir."

Mitchell, C.: "And I want to also make sure because some people have named another state, and as you know it potentially made the case for legalizing marijuana. But if we're talking about something that would affect Illinois, it would make sense for a Body, that say has relationship with our Department of Revenue and our Department of Financial Professional Regulation, you know, given the fact that we're creating a unique regulatory environment in the State of Illinois, to potentially have a voice on this. Would it not make sense, Representative?"

Guzzardi: "It seems to me that it would."

Mitchell, C.: "So, to the Bill. I understand that there are a lot of diverse feelings about whether or not we should or should not take the step that could potentially happen later in the future on whether or not we tax and regulate marijuana, but all the Representative is asking for is that a body that we trust help us reduce our prison population and study this sort of stuff in a wide range of areas have a chance to weigh in. That's all the Representative is asking for. This is a good Bill that deserves our support. Let's for once lead on something. This is a good Bill. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed for two minutes."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- McDermed: "I want to go back to something you said, Representative Guzzardi, about this being free. Is... is SPAC a government agency of the State of Illinois?"
- Guzzardi: "SPAC is not... give me just a minute to get some clarity on that, Representative McDermed. I want to make sure I answer your question correctly."
- McDermed: "I'm trying to find out whether it's being supported by our... our state tax dollars and... are... are the people that work there state employees?"
- Guzzardi: "They are, indeed, and they're paid a salary. They will...
 this is the kind of work that they are precisely designed to
 do. This would not come at any additional cost to the
 legislature."
- McDermed: "If they're working on this study, then they're not working on some other study. So, what is it that we're... we're taking off their plate to put this on their plate? And is this a good use... is this the best use of our taxpayers' dollars here is the State of Illinois?"
- Guzzardi: "This is a fantastic use of our taxpayer dollars."
- McDermed: "I'm going to disagree with you there."
- Guzzardi: "I respect that, Representative McDermed."
- McDermed: "What department is this part of? Where do they come...

 I'm... I'm on State Government, General Services

 Appropriations. I haven't seen this agency. Where are they?"
- Guzzardi: "They are an independent agency enacted by statute,

 Representative McDermed."
- McDermed: "I... I couldn't hear that answer?"
- Guzzardi: "They're an independent agency enacted by statute. Their offices are next door in the Stratton building."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- McDermed: "Where are they on the budget? Where do they appear on the state budget?"
- Guzzardi: "I'm sure that I could locate that for you,
 Representative McDermed."
- McDermed: "I'm really interested because I think they're probably going to be on my budget, and I want to know who they are that they have so much time on their hands that they're free."
- Guzzardi: "I look forward to having a discussion with you..."
- McDermed: "I'm... I think that they'll be interested to hear that they're free."
- Guzzardi: "They are not... of course, they are not working for free.

 They are government employees doing government work, and this
 is a specific piece of government work that we are asking
 them to do. It will not come at any additional cost to the
 state."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin for two minutes."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Dunkin: "Representative, if I add my name up here, you think this would qualify for the trophy?"
- Guzzardi: "If you added your name to this Bill, Representative Dunkin, I have great faith that it would pass with even more votes than it is sure to pass momentarily."
- Dunkin: "I agree, and that was in my past. So, Representative, so give me some particulars. I mean, what are we going to have, like smoke sessions, smoke groups or something? How are we going to study the qualitative measure of cannabis? What do you propose?"

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Guzzardi: "I cannot speak to the way in which SPAC will be studying this issue. Although, Representative Evans is a member of SPAC, so perhaps you might ask him about his plans on studying this issue."
- Dunkin: "Oh, really? That'd be very interesting to find out because there are different grades or strands of cannabis, correct?"

 Guzzardi: "You might have to ask Representative Evans."
- Dunkin: "Oh, really? Are you implying that Representative Evans is an authority on cannabis assessment?"
- Guzzardi: "Not in the least. I'm simply implying that as a member of SPAC, he'll be involved in this discussion."
- Dunkin: "Okay. So, what about brownies or edibles? Would that... I'm trying to get, again, some sort of Epicureanistic approach to understanding cannabis and our assessment and evaluation."
- Guzzardi: "I am quite sure that this study will have a comprehensive look at all forms of legalized cannabis."
- Dunkin: "All right. Before we get the trophy, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is actually a serious Bill. It's a Bill that we actually need. We need this Bill to, of course, look at the effect of the regulation and taxation of this product... of cannabis, and what it... the effect it would have on law enforcement resources, revenue coming in, taxation levels, what type of labeling system that we would take advantage of, what are the relative health effects of cannabis, does it impact DUI?"

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

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

Wheeler, K.: "Will, I'm... I'm looking at the analysis we've got on this Bill, and let's presume for the moment that... that your

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

points about this study costing nothing are true and that SPAC is the right place to do it. My question has to do with taxing and regulation. I always assume that tax and regulation study should be done by someone with economic background. I have studied the list of the people on the SPAC board members, and while I respect a great many of them, I know some of them personally, I don't see a corresponding aspect to the economic relation which the Bill being... studying. Am I wrong in that?"

- Guzzardi: "I am quite sure that SPAC will be able to obtain the services of experts in whatever areas are necessary to conduct this research."
- Wheeler, K.: "And that leads me to my next question. Thank you.

 Would it not be a cost to someone for the services of those economic analysis?"
- Guzzardi: "These researchers are on staff, presently. They are currently employees of the State Government. So, there is no additional cost to, you know, using the services of the researchers at SPAC."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, these economic researchers will also be analyzing then the effect of a tax and how it would affect the economy or the growth of an industry within our state?"

Guzzardi: "Indeed. They are quite capable."

Wheeler, K.: "They're quite capable. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves the previous question. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Mr. Guzzardi to close."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to all my colleagues who had questions on this issue. And listen, ya'll, for a moment... Mr. Speaker, may I have a moment of the chamber's attention? I suppose not. Anyhow."
- Speaker Lang: "This is much attention as you're going to get, Sir. Forge ahead."
- Guzzardi: "All I'd say is we've had some fun discussing this Bill and I appreciate it, but at some point before too long, this issue is going to come before us and we're going to be hearing from lobbyist X and lobbyist Y and issue group A and issue group B and we're going to wish that we had independently verified statistics about this. This Bill is going to make us certain that we will. I urge, my dear colleagues, an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill... first, let me remind the Body that Mr. Sullivan has asked for a verification. Members will be in their chairs. Members will vote their own switches. Staff will retire to the rear of the chamber. I see the trophy in the back. Those in... 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? Arroyo, Flowers, Gordon-Booth, Mayfield, Nekritz, Sims. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 29 voting 'yes', 78 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Bill fails. House Bill 184. Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 184, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 184 deals with a virus known as Cytomegalovirus, and this is a... a very unknown and... and a virus that, for pregnant women, if they become infected with it, it can transfer to their... to their unborn baby and many... and women end up with children with congenital CMV, which is the leading... actually the leading cause of a hearing loss in newborns. Women don't really know about this, so this is an effort to try to get them to get the information out there to women... women who may become pregnant, women who are pregnant and... and especially women with toddlers who are especially vulnerable to this. So, I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Thank you. Representative, will you just explain the Amendment, the final Amendment on the Bill?"

Nekritz: "Sure."

Bellock: "Thank you."

Nekritz: "The final Amendment actually became the Bill. It... it described the types of information that the Department of Public Health is required to develop."

Bellock: "Right."

Nekritz: "It actually... the underlying Bill had a list of agencies and individuals for whom the... for whom the Department of Public Health was supposed to reach out and give them the information."

Bellock: "Right."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Nekritz: "This just simply says the Department of Public Health can develop rules around which they will get that information out there. And then it also includes some of the prior Amendments so that if a newborn fails two... two newborn screening tests in the hospital, the parents of that infant are required to be given information on CMV."
- Bellock: "Right. And then, so just to explain. So, the test when newborn babies are born, they're given a test that different things are tested from that test, correct?"

Nekritz: "Correct."

- Bellock: "And this will be one of those that will be given to newborn babies?"
- Nekritz: "Actually, this does not require any sort of new test."

Bellock: "Right."

- Nekritz: "This is just the standard hearing test that it... that the newborn gets anyway."
- Bellock: "Correct. So, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm in full support of this Bill. And I appreciate the Sponsor doing this Bill for us and the people that had come to testify for us before this day. This will help a lot of newborn babies to lead a full life that they wouldn't if this test was not done on them at birth. And it is something that... major test that is done on newborns, this will just be included in on that. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Anthony, Gordon-Booth. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar 1, under the order of Resolutions, appears House Resolution 375. Mr. Sims. Mr. Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read a portion."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 375, offered by Representative Sims.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we recognize and honor the 2015 Alpha Phi Alpha Day held at the Illinois State Capitol and welcome the members of Alpha Phi Alpha to the Capitol; and be it further

RESOLVED, That we designate the date of April 23, 2015 as Alpha Phi Alpha Day in the State of Illinois in honor of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Incorporated, and its continued service and impact on the communities it serves."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Earlier today in the Speaker's Gallery, there were Gentleman from Alpha Phi Alpha who were here to celebrate the passage of this Resolution. And in the State Government Administration Committee this morning, we talked about the wonderful work that Alpha Phi Alpha does in the community and working for the community. We are celebrating our 83rd regional convention here in Springfield. We started out by having a wonderful service project yesterday. The men of Alpha Phi Alpha, of which I have the great pleasure of serving as the vice president for the Midwestern region, are here to celebrate, not only the wonderful work that we're doing, but to make a legacy to con... to stand on legacy that we've set

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- before us. I thank you for the passage... or for being able to consider this measure today and asked for its favorable passage."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? No one asks for a verification? Have all voted who wish? Representative Nekritz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Ford on a point of personal privilege. The Body will rise."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a quick point of personal privilege and ask the Body to have a moment of silence for our Cardinal that was laid to rest today, Cardinal Francis."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Ford. You may be seated, Ladies and Gentlemen. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 390, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 401, offered by Representative Bryant. House Resolution 406, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 407, offered by Representative Sandack. House Resolution 408, offered by Representative Welch. And House Resolution 409, offered by Representative Bradley."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Sente is recognized."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

- Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, any member of the Small Business Caucus that is available, we're going to take a formal picture right outside of chambers on the third floor, in front of the big Indian picture. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, committee announcements. Members please listen to the committee announcements."
- Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet immediately upon adjournment. The Environment Committee will meet in Room 114.

 The Museum, Arts & Cultural Enhancement Committee will meet in Room 122. And the Revenue Committee will meet in Room 118."

 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore."
- Verschoore: "Yes. Yes. The Environment Committee is going to be in 114 and I would urge all the Members to get there because as soon as you get there, we've got one Amendment and we'll be able to get out of there. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, the Chair's had a long day today. Can someone buy you a beer pretty soon..."
- Speaker Lang: "Black Hawk's at 8:30, Sir."
- Zalewski: "All right, Sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good work today."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, when we adjourn 'til tomorrow, you all know tomorrow is deadline day. The more cooperation we have and the faster Members are ready, the faster we'll be out of here. And now, leaving Perfunctory time for the Clerk, Mr. Franks moves that the House stand adjourned until Friday, April 24, at the hour of 9:00 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned until Friday, April 24, at the hour of 9:00 a.m."

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on April 23, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill Representative Lilly, Chairperson from the Committee on Museums, Arts, & Cultural Enhancement reports the following committee action taken on April 23, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 263. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on April 23, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3128. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 9, offered Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 13, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 47, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 51, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 57, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 140, offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 159, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 202, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 274, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 344, offered by Representative Lilly, a

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 398, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Senate Bill 417, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 507, offered by Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 508, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 563, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 621, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 625, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 627, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 669, offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 688, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 740, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 750, offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 760, offered Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 781, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 785, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 800, offered by Representative Poe, a Bill for an Act concerning sweet corn. Senate Bill 844, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 874, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue.

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Senate Bill 993, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 1146, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1229, offered by Representative Smiddy, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1236, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1252, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1268, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1271, offered by Representative Walsh, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1340, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1376, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning digital assets. Senate Bill 1400, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1427, offered by Representative Sente, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1455, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1465, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1482, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1487, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1505, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1518, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill... correction. Senate Bill 1526, offered by Representative Walsh, a Bill for an Act concerning

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

revenue. Senate Bill 1539, offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 1547, offered by Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1548, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1560, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1561, offered by Representative Hays, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1562, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1564, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1595, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1608, offered by Representative Wehrli, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1641, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. Senate Bill 1665, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1680, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Senate Bill 1683, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 1732, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1735, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1746, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1761, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 1775, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Senate Bill 1803, offered by

37th Legislative Day

4/23/2015

Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1805, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Senate Bill 1820, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1833, offered Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 1854, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1859, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1866, offered by Representative Mitchell, Christian, a Bill for concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1877, offered Representative McAsey, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1882, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1898, offered by Representative Davis, William, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."