82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "Good morning, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at your seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Shaun Lewis, who is the Illinois State Director of the Capitol Commissions serving the political leaders of all of Illinois. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all electronic equipment and pagers and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Shaun Lewis."
- Pastor Lewis: "Please bow with me in prayer. Father in heaven, thank You for establishing a government of representation. Each of our lawmakers has the responsibility to effectively represent their constituents and the greater responsibility even before You. Pray that they would use this day wisely making the most of their time here in Springfield. Give them strength during this week of Veto Session. May they do what is right, though not always popular. Comfort each one here while they're away from home, away from family, and friends. And may they find the joy of salvation as well. In Jesus' name we pray, Amen."
- Speaker Lyons: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by the Burkes, Kelly and Dan."
- Burkes, Kelly and Dan 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 Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, Democrats."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absences of Representatives Howard and McGuire."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader. Michael Bost, GOP."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Mathias and Rose are excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 113 Members answering the Roll Call; we have a quorum. We're prepared to do the work of the people of State of Illinois. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on November 09, 2011, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate Bill 1538; and 'do pass as amended Standard Debate' for Senate Bill 1617. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 611, offered by Representative Roth."

Speaker Lyons: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if the Members could take their chairs, and if the staff could retire to the rear of the chamber. So if the Members could please take their chairs. Today we're honored to have a very special guest, the Consul General of Mexico in Chicago. Mr. Eduardo Arnal was appointed as the Consul General of Mexico in Chicago by President Calderón and ratified by the Mexican Senate March 24, 2011. The Consul was educated in Mexico City. He once served as a member of the Federal Congress in Mexico and tells me in a private conversation that he's

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

anxious to resume his elective activities sometime in the near future. In the meantime, why he is the duly appointed representative of the government of Mexico to Chicago, Illinois and other sections in the Midwest. And he's come here today to offer remarks in terms of the relationship between our great state and the Country of Mexico. Let me give you Mr. Eduardo Arnal."

Eduardo Arnal: "Thank you very much. The best way to predict your future is to create it. Abraham Lincoln. Honorable Speaker Michael Madigan, distinguished Representatives of Illinois, Ladies and Gentlemen, in this, my first visit to Springfield, it's a great honor to have been invited to address the floor of the House of Representatives in this magnificent building in the capital of the great State of Illinois. I was appointed Consul General of Mexico by President Calderón and ratified by the Mexican Senate in April of this year and formally took office on May 16. For me, it is an honor to lead the second largest Mexican consulate in the world. This is my first visit to Springfield. It will not be the last. My goal is to visit each of the 128 counties that are under the consulate's jurisdiction, 61 of those counties are in Illinois, 10, of which, I have already visited. There are over 2.5 million Mexicans in Illinois, and my commitment is that wherever there's a Mexican, the consulate will be there. Mexico is the second most important trade partner of the United States, second only to Canada. Last year, Mexico bought \$163 billion worth of American products, which was more than the combined total purchase by the U.K., France,

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Netherlands, and Belgium, also, was more than China and Japan together. Mexico is also Illinois's second largest trade partner. We are purchasing over \$4.3 billion worth of products. There are over 112 thousand jobs in Illinois that directly depend on Mexican exports. This is why I have come here today to tell you that we want more products and investments from Mexico in Illinois and more products and investments from Illinois to Mexico. In the last 10 years, my country has undergone a large transformation. currently live in a real democracy. Our economy is as domestic product has stronger than ever. Our gross increased by a rate of 5.4 percent. Our annual inflation rate is 3.5 percent, and our public financial deficit is at 2.5 percent of the GDP. On the other hand, we are aware that there's a legitimate concern about security and organized crime in Mexico. Nevertheless, let me assure you that we are actively confronting a hard battle against organized crime. We are convinced that no one is above the law. And I can assure you that we'll not back down until criminal groups understand that they should submit to the authorities and to the rule of the law. In the past few years, we have arrested major drug kingpins and extradited them to the United States to face justice. We have also transformed our law enforcement and security forces by incorporating honest young men and women with values. And have reformed our judicial institutions, and have shifted from a written trial system to oral trials, similar to the system found here in the United States. We also cannot ignore the fact that the challenge to our security

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

has roots on both sides of the border. As President Calderon' has stated in his address to the U.S. Congress in 2009, we have moved from the suspicion and the move for recrimination of the past to the cooperation and mutual understanding of the present. I want to take opportunity to commend this chamber for always being open to adverse, relevant issues like this recently approved Illinois Dream Act. We hope that the spirit of openness and compromise continues for many years in this Legislature. I am a part of a new generation of Mexicans who believe that we not only can but almost also must transform our society in order to create a better country for our children, one that is better than we inherited from our parents. We believe that the cost of the democracy is not negotiable. We believe in the power of hope to renew our institutions. We believe, as the (unintelligible) says, if we have to choose between freedom and justice, we will choose freedom in order to continue to fight for justice. Mr. Speaker, distinguished Representatives, Ladies and Gentlemen, Mexico and United States are neighbors. We're also partners and above of all, friends. It is in our hands to strengthen and renew the relationship between Mexico and Illinois. I would like to extend to all of you an invitation to visit our consulate but of course, our country. But I must to warn you, once you've been to Mexico, you will always want to return. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The Consul will be available down in the well to greet those of you who wish to say hello to him. Thank you."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hays, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Hays: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Hays: "Please welcome in the gallery to my right the mayor of the community of Danville, Illinois, Scott Eisenhauer is with us, a beautiful community and a perfect place for a casino."

Speaker Lyons: "Welcome, Danville, to your Capitol. Great to see you. Keep an eye on that guy, Black, that supposedly still lives there. For the record, Representative Lyons in the Chair. Representative Kosel, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Kosel: "For personal privilege, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Leader."

Kosel: "I'd like to announce that we have students from Southern Illinois University Dental School with us today. They're over in the side of the gallery up there, and I'd like to have a warm welcome to those who will take care of our teeth in the future."

Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol, students. Glad to have you here. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're prepared to do a Death Resolution. I'd ask all Members to please be in their chairs and staff to the back of the chamber or off the floor. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 485."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 485, offered by Representative Hammond.

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are saddened to learn of the death of United States Army

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Staff Sergeant Tyler M. Martin of Littleton and Colchester, who passed away on July 12, 2011; and
- WHEREAS, SSG Tyler Martin was born on August 13, 1985, in Macomb; he graduated from Rushville High School in 2003; and
- WHEREAS, SSG Tyler Martin entered the United States Army in 2004 and subsequently served tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan; during his stint in the military, he traveled throughout much of the world, having visited 15 countries during his tenure; one of his travel highlights was enjoying dinner on the top floor of the Eiffel Tower; and
- WHEREAS, SSG Tyler Martin was a member of the Industry
 Assembly of God Church; in his younger years, he was active
 in the Royal Rangers; and
- WHEREAS, SSG Tyler Martin was an alumnus of the Illinois High School Rodeo and competed in the National High School Rodeo in 2002 and 2003 in Bareback and Saddle Bronco; he also loved animals, repairing and driving anything with wheels and a motor, and making people smile; and
- WHEREAS, SSG Tyler Martin is survived by his parents, Donella (Nell) and Jurl Southerland and Mike and Marce McGovern; his grandparents; Don and Pat Martin, Jurl and Peggy Southerland, Patricia McGovern, and Don McGovern; his brothers, Dowell Southerland, Justin and Erica McGovern, Cody McGovern, and Dylan McGovern, his niece; Alexandria McGovern, and his many aunts and uncles; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn, along with his family and friends, the

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

passing of United States Army Staff Sergeant Tyler M. Martin; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of SSG Tyler Martin as an expression of our sincere sympathy."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Norine Hammond."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you to the Members Hammond: of the House of Representatives for joining me today to honor Staff Sergeant Tyler Martin. Once again, we join to honor one of our servicemen and women that have paid the ultimate price. I didn't have the privilege of knowing Tyler. I sure wish I had. I love to watch the rodeo, and I would have loved to have been able to see him in person. That was one of his many loves, along with working on machines and certainly his family. We're joined today with his mother now, his father, Jurl, and his brother, Dowell up behind me in the gallery. And I want to thank them. I know this is a very difficult time for them, as it is for many families that have loved ones serving in our military. Tyler was just 25 years old. He was one month shy of his 26th birthday. He was one week shy of coming home to his family and his loved ones, but he accomplished so much in the time that he was in the service. When he joined the army in 2005, he went on to have a very illustrious career. He was awarded the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Iraq Campaign Medal, the Campaign Star for the Global War on Terror Service Medal, the Army Service

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Ribbon, the NATO International Security Assistance Forces Medal, the Combat Action Badge, the Mechanic Action Badge, and after his death, he was awarded the Army Commendation Medal. In his short lifetime, Tyler accomplished so much more than any of us will ever accomplish or could hope to accomplish in a lifetime. And I ask you to join me now in a moment of silence for Tyler and for his family and loved ones. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, Representative Hammond moves for the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, it's unanimously adopted. May the soul of Sergeant Tyler Martin rest in peace. Amen. Ladies and Gentlemen, to do some of business the now at hand here. Representative Dugan, on page 3 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 40. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 40, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendments 1, 2 and 3 were adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Frank Mautino, I believe you have Amendment... Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 40."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd ask at this time for Representative Dugan to handle Amendment 1 and move for its adoption at the approp... excuse Amendment 4 and move for its adoption at the appropriate time."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dugan on Floor Amendment #4."

Dugan: "Yes. I would like to have Floor Amendment #4. This is an issue addressing our National Guard and also Military Affairs and the Department of Veterans Affairs. Issues that need to be taken care of to make sure our National Guard is paid. It creates the new Illinois National Guard State Active Duty Fund. It also provides for the transfer at the request of the Adjunct General of the Illinois National Guard for federal money that's in one fund that we want to be able to transfer to another to make sure our National Guard is paid when they are called to active duty. And it does also suspend the Veterans' Health Insurance Program. It's due to sunset in January of 2012. Of course, that's a program that allows health care benefits to our veterans, so we'd like to see that continue. And I certainly can answer any questions. This passed out of committee unanimously."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4. Representative Franks, do you have a question on the Amendment, or do you want wait 'til it's on Third Reading?"

Franks: "I can wait 'til Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Let's wait and we'll put it on Third Reading. Seeing no one seeking recognition, all those in favor of adoption of Floor Amendment #4 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 40, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. Again, I can answer any questions.

I think I kind of went over the four points of this

Amendment to address some needs we have for our veterans to

make sure things continue and our National Guard. So, I'll

certainly answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I think I get what you're..."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Thank you. I think I get what you're trying to do here. There's no state funds we're using. It's all federal pass-through funds, isn't it?"

Dugan: "Yes. That's correct. We just want to have the opportunity to transfer it in."

Franks: "Okay. So that'll save the state some money."

Dugan: "Correct."

Franks: "That's great. Now, I want to ask about the in grace transfer of two National Guard armories in Salem and Mt.

Vernon to their respective communities. What would this Bill do for those two armories?"

Dugan: "What it does is it actually... these facilities are required to be transferred to townships or cities via the statute, but we have to approve the transfer of those armories to the local municipalities who are wanting to have them to be able to use in their communities. This is

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

something that we do with a lot of our old armories that will also save the state money because right now the Department of Military Affairs is responsible to continue taking care of them and that's at a cost of about 50 thousand a year. So this would..."

Franks: "So it'll be transferred to the communities that accept them."

Dugan: "Yes. It will be transferred to the communities."

Franks: "And those communities are requesting those buildings?"

Dugan: "Yes. They would be happy to have them."

Franks: "It's a great Bill. Thank you."

Dugan: "Why, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dugan to close."

Dugan: "Yes, again, I would just ask for an 'aye' vote on this to make sure that we continue forward with our military and our veterans. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 40 pass?' This Bill will require 71 votes for passage. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received an extraordinary Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following action taken on November 09, 2011: recommends be

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

adopted Floor Amendment #3 for House Resolution 550; referred to Order of Resolutions is House Resolution 611; and the following floor Amendments are approved for consideration: Floor Amendment #3 for Senate Bill 1226, Floor Amendment #2 for Senate Bill 1715, and Floor Amendment #9 for Senate Bill 2147."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Watson, on page 10 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 170, Senate Bill 170."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to accept the Governor's Veto on Senate Bill 170, which basically just makes some minor changes to a fund that was established with private funds for scholarships for the students at the School for the Deaf."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Watson, I believe... inquiry of you. It's a Motion to override the Amendatory Veto?"

Watson: "No, accept."

Speaker Lyons: "Motion to accept the... the Veto?"

Watson: "Correct."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Representative Watson has moved to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 170. This Bill will require 71 votes for passage. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its... seeing none, all those in favor of agreeing with the Resolution... with the Motion... Representative Watson moves to accept the recommendations of the Governor. All those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? take the

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority... Supermajority of the specific recommendations of the Governor as to Senate Bill 170 are accepted. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, on page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 92. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 92, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments have been adopted. Floor Amendment... Amendment #2, offered Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie on Floor Amendment #2."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Can we adopt the Amendment and then explain the Bill on Third Reading?"

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's Motion to adopt Amendment #2 and we'll discuss it on Third Reading. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 92, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Currie on Senate Bill 92."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Last year we adopted legislation permitting the electors in a

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

township to abolish the... the road district and return those responsibilities to the township supervisors in general. What we failed to do, however, was to make sure that there were an opportunity for the township levy to increase to the extent permitted by property tax caps in property tax capped jurisdictions. This measure all it does is to say that the levy adopted by the township in a tax capped area can include the levy for the road district, also with respect to that tax cap. So, I'd appreciate your support for this cleanup proposition that is now the only thing that is in Senate Bill 92."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Ed Sullivan."

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

Sullivan: "Representative, we... we passed a Bill, in essence, that lets the electors decide whether they want highway commissioners? But what we're trying to say is, there was a levy to help fund the road program and so, if they still have this need, we want them to be able to tap into that resource. Is that generally what we're trying to do?"

Currie: "Exactly. But... but the line... the legislation that we adopted didn't provide for the increase to go to the township if it were permitted under the tax cap."

Sullivan: "So, what we want to do is do a one-year exception to allow this levy to move over to the general town fund, in essence..."

Currie: "And it would be..."

Sullivan: "...without going through the normal...

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Currie: "...except that it would be no higher..."

Sullivan: "Right."

Currie: "...than what would have pertained had we kept... had those two governmental..."

Sullivan: "Right."

Currie: "...units remained separate."

Sullivan: "And... and that was the point I wanted to make is we're not... this isn't a hit to the tax cap. This is saying there's no going to be... no additional revenue. It's existing revenue, but because of our laws, we have to make a smooth transition from one end to the other on a Bill, in essence, to reduce costs to township government."

Currie: "Precisely."

Sullivan: "Okay. I wanted to just make sure that was clear for the Body. And they can choose not to take the full levy amount if they want."

Currie: "Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. Entirely up to the township board."

Sullivan: "And the electors within their jurisdiction."

Currie: "Exactly."

Sullivan: "So, it's a local government issue and if they want to actually reduce the size of government, they can make that choice."

Currie: "Absolutely."

Sullivan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "I think you understand the issue. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "Question is... the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 92 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This will require 71 votes. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 71 Members voting 'yes', 43 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Supermajority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pat Verschoore, on page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 165. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 165, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, put that Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 165, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Verschoore, sorry for... for detaining you from the business at hand, but we appreciate you coming back to the floor for the Bill, Senate Bill 165."
- Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. All this is a TIF extension for the City of Moline. It's in its 23rd year and they want to extend it to a 35-year thing.

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

It's very important that we get that; it's a very good tool for us. And I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation of Senate Bill 165. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its adoption signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This will require 71 votes. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Reis, Mulligan, Hernandez, Dunkin, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 98 Members voting 'yes', 14 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Supermajority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brady, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Brady: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Dan."

Brady: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would you join me in welcoming from my district in Normal, Illinois, the Knights of Epiphany Grade School, the eighth-grade class, their teachers, students and their chaperones up here to my left. The Knights of Epiphany Grade School from Normal, Illinois."

Speaker Lyons: "Knights of Epiphany, proud to have you. Enjoy your Capitol, glad you're here. Mr. Clerk, on page 4 of the Calendar, Representative McCarthy has Senate Bill 634. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 634, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. And read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 634, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Kevin McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 634 is a compromise that Senator Crotty worked out and it was... passed the Senate 54-1. This has to do with the township treasurer of schools in the Bremen Township area. And it allows for the school districts that are in that area to each appoint a member to the township treasurer board and... and to also phase out the elected members of it by... they will serve the terms out that they've been elected for, but at the end of those terms there will be no more elections in Bremen Township. It only affects Bremen Township and... and addresses some of the problems they've had there as far as the decisions made by the board. So, I'd appreciate your favorable consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, I'm not sure I'm familiar with this form of government."

McCarthy: "Not too many people are."

Franks: "Yeah."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

McCarthy: "But we... we abolished it like in Orland Township and there's quite a few townships... it's only in Cook County.

And it's only and of course, outside the City of Chicago.

And it's kind of an archaic thing that's been out there for a lot of years and..."

Franks: "So, why don't..."

McCarthy: "...and Orland Township a lot of you helped me abolish it a couple of years ago."

Franks: "Yeah."

McCarthy: "But the..."

Franks: "Why... why aren't we abolishing it now? Why do we need this level of government that actually seems to be advisory?"

McCarthy: "I think that the local school districts there have such a... a warm relationship with the current treasurer that the board has hired and has been there for many, many years and seems to be doing a good job. My contention is that the board members could probably do it... their own business manager could probably be doing it, but some of them where they have a real loyal following want to... want to keep it alive. So, Senator Crotty... I had a Bill actually to abol... give them a referendum to abolish it, but the local districts asked me to hold back on that and worked with Senator Crotty then she came up with this appointment process. Now I will say that there's a... the one that's right next to Bremen, Bloom Township, they've actually had some school districts from outside their area. Their... their treasurer is so respected that they've asked him to invest their funds. So, I guess if it... if it's really working well

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

it can go on, but in this day and age I really don't see a need for it. And I've abolished it where I live..."

Franks: "Right."

McCarthy: "...but... but here we're going to let the local school board members take over that board gradually as the elected members are phased out."

Franks: "As... as you said, though, you got rid of yours because it's archaic. And you know, we just passed a... a law recently and you were one of the cosponsors I believe that helped set up a local consolidation commission for our... for our areas and how we can streamline government. And I know that Lieutenant Governor Simon is also working on a... on streamlining the schools. It seems to be antithesis to be doing this because they have a warm relationship or a cozy relationship. I just don't see why we would perpetuate another level of government when it doesn't seem to be necessary."

McCarthy: "Well, it comes back from the time when most of these districts were much smaller..."

Franks: "Right."

McCarthy: "...and pooling all of their funds in order to get a better return was probably a real advisable thing to do."

Franks: "But they can still do that?"

McCarthy: "They... they do do it under the current law. I mean, they hand over their funds and they basically, they invest their funds and they do payroll for them, is the two fun... the two functions I can understand. I promise you when we abandon... abolished it in Orland Township no one missed a beat. Our... our school districts are still doing very well,

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

but as I said, these districts worked with Senator Crotty. They made it clear to me that they didn't want to abolish the office. So, I pulled back on my Bill and I agreed with Senator Crotty if she got it out of the Senate that I would handle it in the House. So, that's what I'm doing."

- Franks: "I appreciate it. And... to the Bill. And I appreciate the honesty there. And I... I can tell that you probably don't agree that this should be perpetuated, but I understand there's a compromise that's been worked out by Senator Crotty. In all due respect, though, I don't think that's a good enough reason to vote for the Bill. I think that we ought to be streamlining government and not having duplication of services. And you had passed a Bill getting rid of it in your area. And I think we have to change the mindset in Illinois. And instead of simply perpetuating government as its been and this is a real question of self-perpetuation. Instead say, no, this is low hanging fruit, folks. This is not something that we should be voting for. I'm going to ask for a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking further discussion, Representative McCarthy to close."
- McCarthy: "Thank you. I think the debate has gone on and I would ask for your vote. It did pass the Senate 54-1 and passed unanimously out of committee yesterday. So, I'd appreciate your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 634 pass?' This will require 71 votes for passage. All those in favor of its passage signify by saying... voting 'yes'; those opposed vote

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ramey, Mayfield, Gabel, Dunkin, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 94 Members voting 'yes', 19 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... a Supermajority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, Representative LaShawn Ford, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 1377. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1377, a Bill for an Act concerning health facilities. 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 Lyons: "Third Reading. And read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1377, a Bill for an Act concerning health facilities. Third Reading of this..."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative LaShawn Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1377 amends the Emergency Medical Service Systems Act, the Hospital Emergency Service Act and the Long Term Acute Care Hospital Quality Improvement Transfer Program. This Bill was passed out of committee unanimously and it passed the Senate unanimously. And I look for the adoption here in the House today. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Senate Bill 1377. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1377 pass?' This Bill will

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

require 71 votes for passage. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Rose, Brady. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 111 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Harris, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

- Harris, D.: "Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a lull in the action. I'd like to take just a moment and rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, David."
- Harris, D.: "I'd like to put into the record recognition of one of the sports teams of one of our state's premier educational institutions, the University... Northwestern University men's soccer team won the Big 10 Soccer Championship over the past weekend. And I'd simply like to reflect that in the record."
- Speaker Lyons: "And we all wish Northwestern University congratulations on that accomplishment. Thank you, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, on page 3 of the Calendar, Representative Acevedo has Senate Bill 1587. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1587 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Acevedo, Senate Bill 1587. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1587, a Bill for an Act concerning the State Police. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1857 (sic-1587) waives the collegiate educational requirements for applicants who have been awarded a medal for military service in Afghanistan and Iraq. Currently applicants of employment with the Illinois State Police must have at least two years of college, associates degree, before he or she is qualified for employment in the Illinois State Police. This also has hiring preferences of those who have been honorably discharged from the U.S. Armed Forces; however, individuals must still meet the educational requirements. Under this Bill, applicants who have been honorably discharged and were awarded an Afghan or Iraqi campaign medal are deemed to meet the collegiate educational requirements notwithstanding the Department of the State Police Merit Board rules. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation of Senate Bill 1587. Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Riley."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Acevedo, this is an admirable Bill, but
I'm just wondering why a distinction is being made to those
who have served in a particular theatre and not if they've

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

served somewhere else and were honorably discharged? And if you'd also explain the opposition with the VFW, too?"

Acevedo: "I... I don't... I don't see... at this time, I didn't even know we had an opposition."

Riley: "Yeah. My analysis, it says that the VFW of Illinois is opposed."

Acevedo: "I... I think actually in Afghanistan and Iraq those... those are the two different areas where men are actively in combat. And I believe the Illinois State Police does have an age limit. So, if you served in the Vietnam War and the Korean War I don't think you're going to be eligible to take the Illinois State Police exam anyways."

Riley: "Okay. Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "I'd sure like to... I like the intent of your Bill.

I'd just like it cleared up whether or not the VFW is an opponent or proponent. Our analysis says they support it; that they're a proponent. Could we get that cleared up just to..."

Acevedo: "Yeah. At... at this point, I... I did not see any opponents whatsoever."

Moffitt: "The last speaker indicated he thought they were opposed and I just... it's... be nice if we can get that cleared up before you advance it. Would you consider... that we could just make a call and get that cleared up?"

Acevedo: "Okay. I'll take it out of the record."

Moffitt: "Thank you very much."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take this Bill out of the record on the request of Representative Acevedo. Representative Acevedo, do you wish to recall the Bill?"

Acevedo: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, let's recall Senate Bill 1587. The Chair recognizes Representative Acevedo."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in Acevedo: response to the Representative's question, I believe the VFW were opposed to it and I don't know if that's the VFW in Illinois, but I know there's one certain VFW that was opposed to this for the fact that he had stated committee that he thought that maybe even if you're a cook in the Army that you'd be able to pass up the... the twoyears requirements. I will tell you this, regardless, whether you're a cook, whether you're a gunner, whether... whatever part you play, you're still part of the Iraqi and Afghani War. But this specifically and both... all of them should be respected, both men and women, for any job they do in the military because just being away from their families is quite an experience. But this specifically states an individual who has been in combat and who has won an honor... a medal, I should say. So, in answer to your question, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Moffitt, follow up?"

Moffitt: "Yes. I want to thank the Representative for taking time to... to make that clarification. It specifies that they have received a medal for this and that you're not sure, it might be just one VFW not speaking for the state then."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Acevedo: "Yeah. I... don't... the individual that testified yesterday was not on behalf of the VFW of Illinois."
- Moffitt: "Okay. I appreciate that. And thank you for your courtesy of... of getting that clarification. Appreciate it very much and intend to support your legislation."

Acevedo: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative David Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lyons: "He awaits your question, Sir."

- Harris, D.: "Representative, as I read this legislation according to the... the synopsis, if an individual has received either the Afghan campaign medal or the Iraqi campaign medal that waives the requirement that is currently in law that says someone has to have an associates degree or equivalent course work, three years of continuous full-time service as a police officer, an associate degree, three years continuous full-time service as a police officer or a bachelor's degree. It waives those educational requirements, correct?"
- Acevedo: "Well, just like the Chicago Police Department and...
 and the Illinois State Police you have to have at least two
 years of college or an associates degree."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Acevedo: "It waives those requirements."

Harris, D.: "Yeah. But the… as I read the legislation though, the current law, you have to have an associates degree specifically in… in law enforcement or criminal justice

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

experience. And how does one receive the... the Afghan or Iraqi campaign medal?"

Acevedo: "I... I don't think that's necessarily true as far as the two years of college. I know the Chicago Police and the State Police does not require you to go to a... into criminal justice or any law enforcement background. You can have any kind of degree as long as you have served two years of college or you have an associates degree. So, that's not necessarily true."

"Right. Well, what this Bill says is that the Harris, D.: Illinois State Police Merit Board requires candidates... all applicants have these responsibilities. And to the Bill. I respectfully disagree with... with the intent here because simply serving in Afghanistan or serving in Iraq will get you the campaign medal. You don't have to be in combat, simply service in that theatre will get you the campaign medal. The requirements, the educational requirements are specifically related to law enforcement. So, I'm not sure how simply they award or the campaign an elimination of these... medal translates to educational requirements. I'd ask the Members to look at that before they vote on the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if you take a look at this legislation the Representative has brought forth a very positive piece of legislation, strongly supported by the Illinois State Police who is the agency involved here. You

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

still have to have your high school diploma, your service in the military in itself I think is highly commendable. Very, very often law enforcement agencies will requirements such as that the associate degree specifically apply to law enforcement. In this particular case, what we are doing is recognizing the service of our young men and women. They still must pass a background pertaining to their honesty, their integrity, their loyalty. If they get in the military, they certainly are trainable and a law enforcement officer, be it the Chicago Police Department, the River Falls Police Department, the Illinois Police, the Merit Board is saying with this legislation in place, yes, that young man or that young woman is eligible to become a State Trooper. While someone else was going to college, they were serving their country in a far off country... in a far-off land. I think this is highly meritorious legislation. I've asked the Gentleman to put me on the Bill as well. I think this is a Bill that there should be everyone of us greens on the board in support of this legislation and support of the young men and women that... that serve our country. Thank you for your Bill, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mary Flowers."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Flowers: "Representative, these men and women that you're

talking about, would they have had served in combat?"

Acevedo: "Yes."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Flowers: "Okay. If they did not serve in combat, would this Bill be applicable to them as well?"
- Acevedo: "Representative, you... you had to specifically serve a tour in those countries, which would be Afghanistan and the Iraqi War."
- Flowers: "So, everyone that served in those countries have served in some form of combat, am I correct?"
- Acevedo: "Yes, those... those are considered... those..."
- Flowers: "But, if you just served in the… one of the Armed Forces, you're not qualified…"
- Acevedo: "No, you..."
- Flowers: "...despite the fact that you wanted to go, but you were not called upon for Afghanistan, for Iraq. So, you would not be qualified for this, am I correct?"
- Acevedo: "Right. And you're... you're talking about, you said in a combat zone. Okay. Someone... say someone is in Afghanistan and Iraq but does not enter a combat zone because the whole country is not a combat zone. There are certain areas that are considered combat zones. That individual is still eligible for the requirement."
- Flowers: "Well, see... I'm... I'm... well, you kind of confused me on your last answer, but let me just say this. I applaud the men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice and went to all of the wars so that we could stand and be as we are today. That's number one. I also applaud the men and women who made the sacrifice of signing up for these various armies, whether or not they saw combat or not. But to say specifically that these would be for the men and women who just saw combat, to me it sends a negative connotation as

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

to the type of people that we want to be on the roads and streets. So, protecting us because their job was to fight and be combative. And that is not the purpose of our law enforcement here in the United States or the State of Illinois, not our law enforcement. Now, if you're in the Army, that's what you do. But when you are a police officer or a State Trooper you're supposed to serve and protect the public. So, I think that you're doing a disservice to the other men and women who sacrifice time away from their families, time away from them being able to go to college, the jobs that they may have lost only because they did not actually... they was in a part of Afghanistan or a part of Iraq that did not see combat. So, I respectfully disagree and I would encourage everyone to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Watson."

Watson: "Will the Sponsor yield? Sorry."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Watson: "Representative, the... I think I'm... this is for clarification. The... what you're saying here is if you have served and been honorably discharged in Iraq or Afghanistan that that will meet the criteria which is equal to an associate's degree. Is that correct?"

Acevedo: "Yes, Representative. And I want to stand corrected because the question was asked to me as far as I said, certain areas are combat zones. I've just been informed by a veteran as well as you should know, if you're in the theatre the whole... the whole country is a combat zone."

Watson: "Right."

Acevedo: "So, yes. To answer your question, yes."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Watson: "So... so, this would merely say to... to the State Police that right now we have a requirement, an educational requirement of, I believe, it's an associate's degree, and if somebody has been honorably discharged after serving overseas in Iraq or Afghanistan, that we will look at that as equally preparing them for... for what... whatever... it... it meets that same requirement?"

Acevedo: "Yes. Representative, it could be the same thing like when someone wants to go back to college, one of us, and we're given lifetime credit hours for..."

Watson: "Right."

Acevedo: "...for what we've done or what we've learned."

Watson: "Exactly."

Acevedo: "It's the same thing."

Watson: "So, it's an option?"

Acevedo: "Yes."

Watson: "Okay. Thank you. I... and I support your Bill. Thank you."

Acevedo: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Michael McAuliffe."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman awaits your question, Sir."

McAuliffe: "Yes. First of all, Representative Acevedo, I applaud you for this legislation. I filed this years ago trying to make this go forward and I'm hopeful that we'll be able to pass it today. As being a former police officer, I was thinking there's always a moment of truth and with all the training and all the exercises you can get in a

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

college classroom is great, but do we really know what the moment of truth is until it's faced upon you?"

Acevedo: "You... you never know the moment of truth at that time."

McAuliffe: "And I would believe that the instructors would say, even with all your training, how do you know how you're going to react at the moment of truth? And I would think you'll never know until you're at that moment of truth. And I believe that these combat officers that have... are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan have gone through the moment of truth probably on a daily basis. So, I think through their experience and through the lives that they're living and serving in our military... in their military experience that they would be exceptional state policemen. Do you agree?"

Acevedo: "Yes, I agree."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Carli."

Carli: "I just wanted to say that being in law enforcement presently, some of the best policemen out there are military. So, I commend you on this Bill and I support it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank... thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. There's been a lot of debate here, I don't know what the mass confusion's about. Twenty-five percent of our homeless people today are veterans. The... the Department of State Police is trying to do something great for veterans, that they don't have an opportunity to become... they can have the opportunity and not skip all the training, just some

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

training that's relevant to what they've been trained on the inside. Our forces, we pay a lot of money, the Federal Government, to train our men and women in uniform. The training is superb. You cannot get that on the outside, what we are trained to do. I think this Bill is phenomenal. I think we should support it whole... as a whole for the General Assembly. And... and it's important for our veterans that you guys understand that there are total families that are veterans, their wives... the wife that's a veteran, the children that are homeless. This just gives them a bit of hope that this state really cares about them and this country really cares about what they've done and training they've received. Representative Acevedo worked very hard over the years on trying to look at other MOS's that can translate into college credits that will save dollars and... and help our servicemen and women get into the paths of careers that they deserve, that they deserve, Gentlemen and Ladies. So, I... I support... I support this strongly and I hope that you as... as fellow General Assembly Members do also. I want to commend the... the Gentleman on this piece of legislation and thank you in honoring me and placing me as one of the Sponsors on it. Thank you, Representative Acevedo."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative Acevedo, what is being taught in an associate's degree that people feel is needed for you to be a State Police officer? What are some of the courses that

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

are being taught that is now a requirement for you to be a State Police officer?"

Acevedo: "Well, first of all, to get an associate's degree that's up to the university on what... what classes are required because not every university has the same requirements. As far as what requirements you have to have for an associate's degree to become a law enforcement officer, there is no requirement."

Davis, M.: "But there are requirements."

Acevedo: "There are requirements from different universities to get an associate's degree, but as far as law enforcement is concerned, it doesn't say that you have to come in with an associate's... that it's an associate's in Criminal Justice or some other..."

Davis, M.: "Well, for example... well, I know, for example, Marine Valley College has a list of courses that one should take if they're interested in being a police officer. So, maybe they're not the same as being a State Police. But, my concern, Representative, and maybe you can answer this for me is, how does the training in Iraq and Afghanistan equal what one has learned in obtaining a two-year associate's degree? How do those two relate? Are we comparing apples and oranges here?"

Acevedo: "Well, I... I think that the best experience you can get is actual living... life... life experience. And... and... and I will tell you this, you're taking the whole concept the wrong way. An associate's degree is general studies; there's no requirements. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, please, this is not... this is not about someone coming back

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

from Iraq after serving two tours and putting them on the streets. I, myself, had to take law enforcement training for six months through the Chicago Public... the Chicago Police Academy. Illinois State Police go through the same process; they have to learn. People coming off the street who want to become police officers, there's a process. You have to pass the test, you have to... you have to go through weapons training. You have to go through all these requirements that deal with being a Chicago Police officer, that deals with being a State Police..."

Davis, M.: "But you feel the… the associate's degree is not needed? So, maybe it's not needed for anyone?"

Acevedo: "That's another subject."

Davis, M.: "I mean, if you... if you think this group of individuals in order to be State Police officers in Illinois do not really need this two-year associate's degree then maybe it should be removed for all the citizens. Maybe just a high school diploma and the State Police training will be sufficient."

Acevedo: "Well, Representative, I'm not going to address that because this Bill does not address that. If you care to enter that legislation at the next Session, you're more than welcome to, but this has nothing do with that."

Davis, M.: "Well, you know, I appreciate what... you want to honor those who served in the wars. We do want to honor them. We want to give them medals and we want to make sure that when they come home they are treated fairly and with the respect and not those who become homeless. But I have a great concern if we decide that because you've been to Iraq

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

or Afghanistan that now you are qualified for this position or that position without what the rest of the population is required to do. That gives me great concern. I do respect and honor the sacrifices these families make and I think that the Veterans Administration should give them all the awards and the necessities that they need and the resources to make them good family people when they return to Illinois, but I have great concern if we would think that the combat that you associated with in these foreign countries is equal to what you're going to need when you patrol the streets in the State of Illinois. It's comparing apples and oranges. I personally don't want to encounter a combative State Police officer who... who didn't anything about human relations or who didn't learn about the language that we speak or the language that you may speak. But I think it's so important that we recognize that when we set standards for groups that we don't decide because we want to honor people they don't have to meet those standards, but we expect them to be as qualified as the person sitting next to them. I urge a 'no' vote, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect to our honorable servicemen, we just shouldn't do that in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Berrios."

Berrios: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. To the Bill. I don't know if everyone is understanding the gist of this legislation. All we're doing is we're allowing them to meet the requirement to apply to be a State Police officer. It doesn't mean they're automatically going to be State Police officers. They still have to go through all of the

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

training. All this says is that it's another requirement as... another option to fill the requirements to apply. I urge an 'aye' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Acevedo to close."

"Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the... Acevedo: the previous speaker had mentioned that we shouldn't allow this just because a person or individual is a veteran to be qualified as a police officer. It's not about qualifying, it's about eligibility. And just think about it, Ladies and Gentlemen, in the State of Illinois we already have veterans preferences. Veterans are able to get to a certain percentage up a higher grade because they've served in wars or they've served in the military. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're not throwing someone into the fire. What we're doing is we're making them eligible to take the test like everyone else. These brave men and women go overseas; they fight for our country. Two years later, three years later they come back, college tuition has gone up. You're not going to be serving in the military, Ladies and Gentlemen, believe me. Let's give these people an opportunity. Let's show them... it's... it's not about going to combat and then you're going to come be... you're going to becoming a... as a Chicago Police officer or a State Police officer and come in camo fatigues and that. You have to take the training. As far as human relations, that's a lifelong relationship that you're going to continue learning about. I want to continue learning about human relations. And something you learn on the street, how to get along with people. Think about those individuals, think about the

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

people who are serving in Iraq and look at some of the photos that you see where the soldiers are actually having relationships with these individuals. The little boys and the little girls at Christmastime, they're given out or at Halloween when they're passing out trick or treat. That's about relationships. It's not about relationships just in our country; it's about relationships in foreign lands. These brave men and women deserve this opportunity. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1587 pass?' This will require 71 votes for passage. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Cunningham, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 111 Members voting 'yes', 3 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... a Supermajority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Randy Ramey, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Ramey: "I need, Mr. Speaker, to change my vote. On Senate Bill 92, I would like the record to reflect that I was to be a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes, Representative."

Ramey: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, you have, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 1640. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1640, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill, as amended, does one thing and one thing only. And that is that, as we, in the first week of the Veto Session, transferred authority for appointing the director of the Illinois Power Agency from the Governor's control to the Executive Ethics Commission, this measure says that that agency has the authority to appoint an acting director for up to 60 days and may make a temporary appointment at a time when the Senate might be in recess. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I think this is a sensible proposal and I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Senate Bill 1640. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1640 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This will require 71 votes for passage. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... a Supermajority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jack Franks, on the Order of House Bills—Second Reading, on page 3 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3865. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3865, a Bill for an Act concerning the public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. And read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3865, a Bill for an Act concerning the public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We introduced House Bill 3865 to put a stop to specific abuses within the Illinois Teachers Retirement System. There was some interesting headlines that I thought I'd share with our colleagues. The Chicago Tribune said, 'Sub for a Day, Teacher Pension for State Journal-Register, 'Pension Life'. ploy by lobbyists is outrageous'. The one I like best was the News-Gazette on October 25, 'Politicians keep pushing envelope'. It says it's not easy to shock citizens in Illinois where elected officials and political players routinely misbehave. Our state's political landscape is so littered with scandals that they've become the rule and not the exception. Still, some kind of misconduct are so outrageous they make even the most cynical citizens gasp. Get ready to gasp. But with this Legislature... with this legislation we are closing an obscene loophole that harms Illinois's hardworking teachers. This type of gamesmanship has contributed to the widespread demonization of our public sector employees and has put Illinois's retirement systems further into debt. Although these prior teaching or administrative individuals had no experience, two IFT lobbyists managed to capitalize on a

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

window t.hat. allowed entrance t.o the Teacher Retirement System as well as the ability to apply their previous years of union employment. They are teachers nor administrators and should never have been part of the TRS. Now, importantly, these individuals have a fiduciary obligation to protect their members' retirement benefits, but instead they did just the opposite. They self dealt for their own interests and harmed their members. We must protect our rank and file teachers from this blatant abuse. Substitute teaching for a single day permitted the lobbyists to become participants in TRS, thereby affording them millions, millions of dollars in pension benefits, now while the average teacher takes home less than \$3,600 per month and they get no Social Security check. Now, certainly the General Assembly bears part of the blame for creating openings like this, but it's outrageous. It's an insult to real teachers. It's also an assault on our taxpayers. This legislation will immediately remove them from the Teachers Retirement System and require the state to refund any money they have already paid into the program. For Members concerned about the act of removing individuals Illinois Pension System, we sadly have precedent for this action. We did it with Governor Ryan and we're poised to do it now with former Governor Blagojevich. When we see such blatant abuses, we have a responsibility to the taxpayers of Illinois to act. Though this should never have occurred in the first place, the General Assembly has the ability and the obligation to make sure moneys paid in by teachers and administrators are funding their retirement not those

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

of the lobbyists. Those trying to game the system at the expense of their members should be ashamed and they should be reprimanded for such abuse. I urge you to vote to make a statement that such abuses will no longer be tolerated in the Illinois Pension System. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Morthland."

Morthland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to say that as a rank and file member of the union that this swirls around and as the husband of a rank and file member of the union that this abuse was perpetrated upon, I want to thank Representative Franks. I fully support him. Obviously, my name is also on this Bill. Thank him and I ask for a favorable vote. Let's put this thing away."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kevin McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I stand in full support of the Gentleman's measure. But I do want to point out, as I did in committee yesterday, when the reference was made to others that we have gone back and the GARS Board has turned down pensions for two individuals that he referenced in his remarks, there was criminal activity at that point. And I want to make sure that... that what this is meant to... to prevent and to stop from happening in the future, that neither of these individuals is accused of any criminal intent. So, I just want to make that clear I think is the honorable way to go. that And I'm Representative Franks would agree with that."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Jack, a few words to close?"

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Franks: "Well, I... I appreciate the... the support on this. And Mr. Morthland, I very much appreciate you helping me get this drafted and... and work on it. I'm... I'm sorry that we have to file Bills like this and to pass legislation to require people to do the right thing and not to cheat the people who they're supposed to be watching out for. It's really a sad day in Illinois when this is commonplace and I hope that someday that we won't have to pass Bills like this anymore. It's... it really is depressing that I have to ask for your 'aye' vote on this type of Bill, but that's what I'm doing. Please support this measure. And let's send a very strong message that we will no longer tolerate these abuses. And that the abuses that happen in the past will no longer occur in Illinois."

Speaker Lyons: "This Bill will require 71 votes. You've heard the Gentleman's explanation, all those in favor of the passage of House Bill 3865 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Jerry Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Supermajority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 09, 2011: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #5 for Senate Bill 72

82nd Legislative Day

- and Floor Amendment... Floor Amendment #3 for Senate Bill 1538."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status on... Supplemental Calendar #1, Ladies and Gentlemen, the House Calendar Supplemental #1 is Senate Bill 1617. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1617, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Gordon, we have some Resolutions, we're going to start off with yours. Representative Gordon, on page 10 of the Calendar, you have House Resolution 450. Jehan on House Resolution 450. It's... it's... we're ready, just for your explanation, Representative. This is the Resolution and the Motion to accept the Resolution."
- Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 450, I worked on this legislation with a number of entities: Pfizer, Chamber of Commerce, Humana. Essentially, what this Bill will do is, it asks the Department of Insurance to do a study on specialty tier drugs. Initially, there were a number of opponents to this Bill and we came together in a commonsense fashion to work on... to work on some language that will allow the entities that were opponents to work with us so that we can have the Department of Insurance do a study on the cost of specialty tier drugs that folks with chronic illnesses are having to

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

grapple with at this point in time. And I'd like to open up for any questions at this point."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on House Resolution 450. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 450 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bost, Leitch, Jerry Mitchell, back row. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And House Resolution 450 is adopted. Representative Mayfield, on page 10 of the Calendar, you have House Resolution 466. Representative Mayfield, House Resolution 466."

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill deals with Hirschsprung's Awareness. Hirschsprung is a disease that attacks young male children within the first couple of months of life. It is prevalent in those children with Down Syndrome. What this Bill would do is just raise awareness of the need to have your child tested and not take simple symptoms for granted. If a child is diagnosed within the first two weeks of birth, this disease can be rectified and there are method... medical methods in place that can sustain that child's life. However, should those symptoms go unchecked or should home remedies, which is the current form, be used, the guara... the prevalence of death is that much higher. So I would just ask for an 'aye' vote as this just raises awareness of the need to make sure that

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

our children are receiving proper medical treatment as opposed to home remedies. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on the Resolution. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of its adoption signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 466 is adopted. Representative Jack Franks, you have House Resolution 487, on page 10 of the Calendar. House Resolution 487, Jack."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This was a Resolution brought to me that would make November 17, in the State of Illinois, as Children's Grief Awareness Day. Florida and Pennsylvania have already declared that day for the Children's Grief Awareness Day to support those grieving children. The initial folks who brought this to me was Willow House which is a nonprofit organization that provides services to children and families of those who have suffered the loss of a loved one. Since then, I've learned of many other entities that do this. I would be happy to answer any questions and ask for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any questions to the issue? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 487 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 487 is adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Keith Farnham for a point of personal privilege, Representative."

Farnham: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. To my left we have a group of students from district... School District 300 in

82nd Legislative Day

- Carpentersville. They represent the sixth largest school district in the State of Illinois; 4 counties, 15 communities. I would like the floor to recognize them."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome, Carpentersville School. Glad to see you down here. Enjoy your Capitol. On Supplemental Calendar #3, Representative Roth has House Resolution 611. House Resolution 611. Representative Roth."
- Roth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... House Resolution 611 is... congratulates the students at Nettle Creek Elementary School, District 24 in Morris. They have on their outstanding Illinois Standard Achievement Test results over 99 percent of those students passed, either met expectations or exceeded expectations, and I would like to designate November 15 as Nettle Creek School Day in the State of Illinois. They were all here yesterday; however, we started late and they had head back to Morris."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's motion for the adoption of House Resolution 611. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 611 is adopted. And congratulations to those students. Sorry we couldn't recognize them yesterday, Representative. Is Representative Cunningham on the floor? Representative Bill Cunningham, on page 4 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 1226. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1226, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee.

82nd Legislative Day

- Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cunningham, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cunningham on Floor Amendment #3."
- Cunningham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment basically addresses the effective date of the Bill. It would make it effective immediately."
- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Put that Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1226, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cunningham on Senate Bill 1226."
- Cunningham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1226 concerns a high school in my district, the Chicago High School for Agricultural Science. It's a very unique school, nationally recognized and a... because it's a school that provides city kids with an education based on agricultural sciences. It's also unique that it was created in part by state statute and the statute that originally created the school capped the enrollment at 600. My Bill will increase that... the cap from 600 students to 720 and will also increase the proximity zone for students

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

to attend the school. I'd be happy to any... ask any questions. And I ask the chamber for their support."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Mary Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm proud to say that my daughter is a high school graduate of the agricultural school. And I would like to know, will the Gentleman yield? I have some questions I would like to ask."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman yields."

Flowers: "Representative, this Bill, does it set boundaries that will keep students who do not live in that vicinity, does it set boundaries to keep students from attending that school?"

Cunningham: "No, it actually does just the opposite. It expands the existing boundary. Right now, the boundaries, it's a magnet school, the boundary is set by drawing a two and a half mile ring around the school. Because of the location of the school most of that ring includes suburban communities instead of city neighborhoods. My Bill would push the boundary further east that will open up the proximity pool, the more students, and also increase the diversity at the school."

Flowers: "So, once again, there are no boundaries and no cap as to the diversity of the school?"

Cunningham: "No, there's no... no cap on diversity."

Flowers: "Okay."

Cunningham: "But..."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Flowers: "I just want that to be said for the record. And under those circumstances, I support your great legislation."

Cunningham: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Don Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, this is one of those ideas that comes along every once in a while and it's such a good idea, wonder why somebody didn't think of it sooner. I commend you for advancing this. The good things that I've had and heard about the Chicago High School for Agricultural Sciences and I want to ask you a question or two, but I think we need to frame this in the context that agriculture's the number one industry in the State of Illinois, and your legislation really expands or increases the opportunity for more people to perhaps pursue a career in agriculture. Would that be correct?"

Cunningham: "That is correct. And it also has the added bonus of increasing awareness in the City of Chicago about agriculture in general in our state. And I think whether the students go on to pursue careers in agriculture or not, they have a newfound respect for a very important industry in our state."

Moffitt: "And it's one of those things... we want to keep ag the number one industry in the State of Illinois, and one of the things we can do is to be sure that we're preparing young people for career opportunities in agriculture. And

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

that's your objective here, isn't it? Raise the awareness and give them the skills needed to access..."

Cunningham: "Abs... absolutely. And one of the added benefits of this Bill, if it's passed, in increasing the number of students we'll be able to increase the number of faculty and will open a new discipline that is not currently taught at the school and that's agricultural education. So, they will produce students who can go on to teach other students about agricultural sciences."

Moffitt: "And we're talking preparing for a career that's here, it's number one now, and there's growing opportunity... increasing opportunity in agriculture and you're trying to help them prepare for that."

Cunningham: "That's right."

Moffitt: "You know, it's unfortunate that there are people that sometimes attack public education when we have some real success stories, but they don't always get told. What's the graduation rate of the high school ag academy in Chicago versus maybe other school districts or even Chicago? It's..."

Cunningham: "Sure."

Moffitt: "...is it much higher?"

Cunningham: "Yes, the ag school graduation rate is 89 percent which compares very favorably to the Chicago Public School system-wide graduation rate that is at about 57 percent."

Moffitt: "Okay. But it's 89 percent graduation rate?"

Cunningham: "That's correct."

Moffitt: "And you're trying to get more oppor... more students to have the opportunity to get into that success school..."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Cunningham: "That's right."

Moffitt: "...and pursue careers in the number one industry?"

Cunningham: "That's correct."

Moffitt: "I think it's a great Bill. Thank you for pursuing this, presenting it. I'm possibly the only former high school ag teacher in the General Assembly, but it's really opening up doors for individuals. Great Bill. Thank you for bringing it forward."

Cunningham: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cunningham to close."

Cunningham: "I would like to thank the chamber for their support. Before I do that, I'd also like to thank Representative Pritchard for his support on this Bill and his backing for this school over the years. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1226 pass?' This will require 71 votes for passage. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brauer, Phelps, Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... a Supermajority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Naomi Jakobsson, on page 5 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 1750. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1750, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson on Senate... on Floor Amendment #2."

Jakobsson: "I move we adopt Floor Amendment #2, please."

Speaker Lyons: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Put that Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1750, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Naomi Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1750 as amended makes changes to the Procurement Code for public universities. These changes address the unique challenges that universities face when attempting to procure items for academia and research, and they reflect an agreement between the universities and the chief procurement officer for higher education. They, in particular, exempt several types of procurements from the Procurement Code that give the chief purchasing officer for higher education the ability to waive the registration certification and hearing requirements for certain procurements. And further, they give the Executive Ethics

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Commission, upon the recommendation of the chief purchasing officer for higher education, the ability to waive the prohibition on awarding a contract to a person who assisted with a bid or contract related to a grant."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Senate Bill 1750. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its passage should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This will require 71 votes for passage. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bost, DeLuca, Kosel, David Leitch, Jerry Mitchell, back row Repubs. Mr. Clerk, take the record. this Bill, there are 82 Members voting 'yes', 30 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ford, on page 10 of the Calendar, you have House Resolution 550. Representative LaShawn Ford on House Resolution 550."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Amendment #3."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Resolution 550. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House... and Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Representative Ford on House Resolution 550 as amended."

Ford: "Thank you very much. Members of the House, I move to adopt HR550. It simply creates the Firearm Public Awareness Task Force."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 550 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Pritchard. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Resolution, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. And House Resolution 550 is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to do something we don't do very often, but the House is going to stand at ease until the hour of 1:30. Going to make a promise to you, you're all coming back. We'll stand at ease... the House will stand at ease until the hour of 1:30. The House will come to order. Representative Dan Beiser, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Beiser: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention briefly. It's my sincere pleasure to have up to my district today, a group of ladies and their coaches who have made our hometown, my hometown, very proud and our entire Metro East area very proud. It's my sincere pleasure to introduce to you, to this Body, the Alton Marquette Catholic High School Ladies 2011 Class 1A state soccer champions."

Speaker Lyons: "Congratulations, ladies and welcome to your Capitol."

Beiser: "As they are up in the Speaker's Gallery taking it all in, I just wanted to also mention that, obviously, the

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

dedication of the head coach Rob Moginot goes without question, and we want to thank him personally. And a person that also helps coach them, coaches the goalies, is someone known to all of us and that's Mike Walters. Thank you guys for being here and thank you for bringing the ladies with you. Good safe trip home."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative LaShawn Ford for personal privilege."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Please join me in recognizing a not-for-profit from our area on the west side that serves homeless people, and they do it even with all the budget cuts. Representative Turner, Representative Lilly and myself, we all use the services. They're all over the north side and they've been nationally recognized. They're husband and wife for A Safe Haven, Kelly... Neli Rowland and Brian Rowland. They're both in the gallery. Could you please recognize them."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol, glad to have you here today. Mr. Clerk, on page 3 of the Calendar, Representative Mautino has Senate Bill 72. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 72 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Put that Bill back on the Order of Second Reading. And are there any Motions pending?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Frank Mautino on Floor Amendment #5."
- Mautino: "Thank you. I would ask adoption of Floor Amendment
 - 5. This is a technical correction. The Amendment was

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

explained in committee and this would put the unemployment insurance Bill in its final form for passage. So, I'd ask its adoption."

Speaker Lyons: "On the Motion of the adoption of Floor Amendment #5, all those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #5 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 72, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Frank Mautino on Senate Bill 72."

Mautino: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I bring you Senate Bill 72, and this is the compilation and the work of the agreed Bill process and it deals with the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. I've had the opportunity to work this summer with Representative Sullivan, Representative Roth, Representative Bradley, and we had convened the members of organized labor along with the business groups throughout the State of Illinois, the Governor's Office, and we met every week from August until As a brief description of what the problem is that Illinois is facing, is Illinois is expected to end 2011, this year, with a \$2.4 billion outstanding loan from the Federal Government which covers the UI benefits for the people of the State of Illinois, and this is due to the prolonged recession and a lot of people drawing on those benefits. Currently, and under the current law, we're

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

charged 4 percent interest by the Federal Government and under the current law, we would have to pay this through the General Revenue Fund. To give you an idea of what we're looking at is, 2012 there'd be \$82 million estimated interest payments from General Revenue Fund, which we don't have, and the total federal interest liability projected under that would actually be about 240 million during very difficult times. In addition, federal penalties would eventually total \$1.2 billion, and that would kick in starting 2012. And what that does, and I think this is important that everyone understand, that without any action in this self-correcting system that would raise taxes on all employers in the State of Illinois about 30 percent over what they would have paid on their this is unemployment. Even those, and especially important, who had not laid off a single worker throughout this... this structure and this problem that needed to be dealt with. And so, by way of negotiations throughout the summer, I'd like to present the solution to this which has been agree to by the Governor's Office as well as business, labor, and all four caucuses. The trust fund will reach solvency which is to get to a zero balance that we owe the Federal Government in 2018. By doing this, over \$400 million in tax savings for employers will be realized throughout this period. So they will receive a tax cut of There will be a significant reduction in \$400 million. taxes for those employers with no history of layoffs, and by the way, that is 50 percent of all the business in the State of Illinois, as a result of this agreement, will

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

receive a reduction in what they pay going forward in the unemployment insurance benefits. Next point. There would be no additional reductions in benefits through 2019. way this works is when business takes tax increase, labor takes benefit cuts, and the one speed bump which would be the spring of 2011, the benefits would be reduced from 26 to 25 weeks. There will not be any further benefit cuts during a great time of need. This also significantly reduces the state's interest liability by utilizing and expanding our bonded... our ability to bond and the bonding authority to pay off these funds. What that means is, for the \$2.4 billion balance, we will issue the bonds and cover them, utilizing the fund building rates at... and this would be borne by the businesses while still achieving a savings. As a state, the benefit to us is we save the interest cost from 4 percent penalty we pay the feds down to basically about one point, so 1 percent. From that, we'll realize a savings in this structure and a non-hit to GRF which is very, very difficult money to come by in these times. In addition to that, there has been some reforms and changes put in place to help with the fight... keeping the integrity of our unemployment insurance program. The treasury offset program, Department of Employment Securities can currently recoup improper employment insurance payments from state tax refunds. This will allow them to go after the federal tax refunds for those who were improperly paid. liability, in that area, the department would mirror our Department of Revenue and allow for personal liability. So, when business officers or employees willfully evade the

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

system, then there would be remedies for that similar as we do with any of the other tax laws. There are substantial rest stops that have been placed along the way. And what a rest stop is, that means we look and monitor how the fund's doing, and at that point in time, labor and management are brought back together, and from that point we see if there are any changes in law to be made. So there are a number of very important things that will happen as a result of this Bill. And I wanted to actually go to Representative Sullivan for comments on the process itself and the Bills, and I want to thank him for his and Representative Roth's participation in these meetings that went on every week through August, September, October and up until we got the agreement last week. So, I'd like to ask if he could make some comments."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This has been a long process over the last summer of all sides coming together. I will point out that all business entities are in favor of this Bill. All labor entities are in favor of this Bill. This has been an agreed process that has been worked out very carefully over the last several months. I don't have too much more to add other than many of us have campaigned that we want to help business out put jobs and get our economy back together. Well, here is your Bill. Because if we do not vote for this Bill, you'll see over a billion dollar increase in taxes to employers. And it's not just one employer that might have a lot of problems with unemployment, it'll be the employer that has never

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

laid somebody off. So, by coming together, working out the structure, we will lower the business tax hit by over \$400 million. Inside... and in addition to that, you will see 50 percent of the businesses because of how restructured the unemployment experience factors, have you had layoffs or not, if you have not had any experience of layoffs, 50 percent of the businesses in the State of Illinois will see reduced unemployment insurance costs. This is a great Bill to help your business community out. Your labor community will also applaud this because there will not be reduction in the benefits after next year, and you do have some reforms to the form of you hear about In this Bill, we allow the IDES, fraud. Department of Employment Security, to go after people that have fraudulently claimed benefits. This will be a positive effect on the trust fund. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a good product. I think we should vote this out and send it over to the Senate. I urge an 'aye' vote. you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Karen May."

May: "Thank you, Speaker. I have a great deal of respect for the Sponsor and what he's done with the Bill, but I do rise just to point out that this agreed Bill process left out one very important segment of our population and that is the discrimination against seniors in the Social Security offset. Illinois is discriminating against seniors and we need to repeal this law. I have introduced House Bill 96, and 45 of you have sponsored this important measure with me. We brought it forward to be discussed as part of the

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

negotiating process, but we're only allowed to give written comments. Illinois and Louisiana are only two states that discriminate against seniors in this way. And I just want to call attention to the Body, while we are doing something important about unemployment insurance, there is a very important element that discriminates against our seniors that still needs work in the future because we reduced by half the unens... unemployment insurance by half of their Social Security income. So, if someone receives \$300 a week in Social Security retirement benefits, they would see their unemployment benefits reduced by \$150. Believe me, in this day and age, many seniors are working because they have to, to make ends meet. So, I want to call attention that 45 of you are Sponsors of this important Bill. This particular portion of it was not part of the agreed Bill process. We have work to do to make sure that we are not discriminating against our working seniors. When Virginia passed it this year, they said it would cost only 64 cents a day per employee to pass this. So, we still have more to do, and I want you to be aware, while I'm going to vote for this Bill, that there is much more that we need to do to end the discrimination against our seniors who are working to put food on the table."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Thank you very much. I appreciate the Lady's comments. There is in the body of the Bill a task force which will look at the issue which, I do agree with her, needs to be addressed. It carries a cost factor of about \$50 million, and a potentially... additional tax increase to

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

businesses about 75 million. We will work on that; it's addressed in the Bill. To the actions within the Bill itself, I do support this legislation. I want to thank Representative Roth who did a tremendous job this year throughout the course of the summer, Representative Sullivan, Representative John Bradley. In addition, the Senate had their Members placed in and participate in the negotiations. From that, we came out with a Bill which solves the devastating problem facing the State of Illinois with a trust fund. It does so in a manner that over half the businesses in the State of Illinois that have not, and this is important, that have not laid anyone off are going to be receiving a cut in the amount that they pay. We have saved the State of Illinois about \$1.2 billion in FUTA penalties. We have reduced our interest costs. We have not cut the benefits for workers in the most difficult economy that we have traced, and we have solved the problem. It took a lot of people a lot of time to do this. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 72 pass?'

This Bill will require 71 votes for passage. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... a Supermajority, is hereby declared passed. Representative

82nd Legislative Day

- Colvin, for what purpose do you see recognition, Representative?"
- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that the General Assembly would join me in welcoming one of the mayors of south suburban Cook County, the Mayor of Lynwood, Gene Williams is here and he's also joined by the Executive Director of the south suburban Mayors and Managers, Mr. Ed Paesel, and the Executive Director of Chicago Southland Convention and Tourism Bureau, Mr. Jim Garrett. Why don't you give them all a round of applause."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol gentlemen and ladies, we're proud to have you in Springfield. Representative Turner, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Turner: "Thank you. I'd like to take a moment to ask the chamber to acknowledge a group of students from Charles Sumner Elementary. It's a school in my district on the west side of Chicago. They're here visiting on their eighth-grade trip and trying to figure out how laws are made here in Springfield. So welcome them. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to Springfield, enjoy your day.

 Representative Naomi Jakobsson, what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Naomi."

82nd Legislative Day

- Jakobsson: "I would like to ask the House to give a nice warm welcome to the mayor of the City of Urbana. Not only is she the mayor of the City of Urbana, but Mayor Prussing was State Representative here, so let's give a nice warm welcome to Mayor Prussing."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mayor Prussing, welcome home. Glad to have you in Springfield. Mr. Clerk, on Supplemental Calendar #2, Representative Chapin Rose has Senate Bill 1538. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1538, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Rose, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rose on Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1538."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for the Amendment 3 to be adopted and then we can debate it on Third, if that's acceptable to the Chair."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill. Hold that Bill on the order of Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

82nd Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 612, offered by Representative Riley. House Resolution 613, offered by Representative Sente. House Resolution 614, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 615, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 616, offered by Representative Pritchard. House Resolution 617, offered by Representative Senger. House Resolution 618, offered by Representative McAuliffe. House Resolution 619, offered by Representative Brauer. And House Joint Resolution 49, offered by Representative Saviano."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. On page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 2147, Representative Mautino. What's the status on that Bill, Mr Clerk? Senate Bill 2147."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2147 has been read a third time, previously. It's on the Order of Consideration Postponed. Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Put this Bill on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of the Amendment. And the status on that Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Frank Mautino on Floor Amendment #7."

82nd Legislative Day

- Mautino: "There are a number of Floor Amendments that need to be adopted to this Bill to put it in its final form. I place... ask and move to adopt Floor Amendment #7."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Floor Amendment #7. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #7 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Mautino."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mautino on Floor Amendment #9."
- Mautino: "Thank you. I would ask for the adoption of Floor Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 2147."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman moves for the Motion... Floor Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 2147. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #9 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2147, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a third time previously."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Frank Mautino on Senate Bill 2147."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2147 addresses the issue of the regional offices of education, the ROEs. Earlier this week I brought an Amendment which would make some changes requested by Members of this Body. The problem we're facing is that,

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

we, as a General Assembly and in the course of our budget process, have funded the ROEs. We placed them in our intent that these are people who perform functions and services for the State of Illinois and they should be The actions of the Governor reduced that funding funded. to zero, and so we found ourselves in a situation that 44 regional superintendents of schools have been, since they took office on July 1, working without compensation, which is an embarrassment to the State of Illinois, and it needs to be corrected. In the course of the last Bill that I brought up, it contained not only the offices of the regional superintendents and their pay, but it contained the clerks and recorders fees and stipends. At the request of the Members of this Body, I have taken those out. That lowers the dollar amount by \$806 thousand. So now we're talking about \$13 million, basically twelve-eight in that range, would be an impact on the Personal Property Replacement Tax. In addition, in order to assure that the superintendents get paid, I have placed a sunset in this Bill. This is this year and this year only. As of June 30, the funding stops. Another Member... and that is included in the Bill. So, it is a one-year hit of less than one percent, less than a penny on the dollar, in order to correct and fix this injustice which was not created by us, but must be resolved by us and it must be resolved today. The third item asked for, by a number of Members of the Bodies, is what should be the future of the regional offices of education? So built into the Bill itself, is a task force which must report back in 2012, on what... how

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

many ROEs should there be? What should be their function? And will answer many of the questions on whether we need further consolidations and also, how are we going to pay for this office which was created by state statute and has a group of very dedicated people who are doing the work we have told them to do and find them in the positions that they cannot be paid. So those are the three items that were requested. Those are the three items which are in the Bill at this point. Now, let me tell you why it has to happen Last night at midnight, the ability to override the Governor's Vetoes on this item in addition transportation, in addition to the Medicare, and the hospital cuts, timed out. They can no longer be called for a vote. As we sit here today, there is no supplemental appropriation Bill, though the committee Members in our appropriation committees are working diligently to get that This has an impact on their negotiations. And most likely we'll be dealing with a supplemental Bill sometime in the future, if not within the next two days. likely not within the next two days. So the reality is, that for the people who have now worked for five months and have shown up every day to work, have provided the signatures which allow your schools to open, who have done the criminal history background checks, who have certified your teachers, who have made sure the buildings are safe is limited to one year and quaranteed by law that it stops. Limited in the fact that it is only them, there are no other offices, no other diversions of CCPRT in this Bill and limited to the fact that we will have to address what

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

the future will be of these offices. Those were the requests and that's what's in this Bill. We have to act today because an override is no longer an option. if we do not, the next time we will meet will be in January and they will not have been paid for seven months. a Body of great strength. It's interesting. I figured out now that I've been here... I walked into this chamber 38 years ago, 38 years ago when my father was elected and there were 177 Members. Tremendous people have served in this Body, both sides of the aisle who dealt with problems that came up and dealt with them immediately. understood and understand as we do that there are choices that have to be made for the good of the state but also to sometimes correct injustices. And we should be ashamed of the position that the Governor's Veto has put us in, that a group that we recognize do things for our schools for our communities and provide those services, were funded in our budget, left no option. So today, I ask you to support this legislation for a fix for some people who need to get paid who show great honor and integrity by showing up to for five months, possibly seven months, without compensation as a result of no action left to us other than what we do here, what we do now. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pritchard."

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

Pritchard: "Representative, this Bill is changing some from what the earlier Bills were, and the dollar amount has

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

changed from what we heard the other day. What dollar amount of transfer are we talking about?"

Mautino: "Correct. Correct. The other... the Bill which included the clerks and the treasurers, had an impact of 806 thousand more than the current Bill which is 13 million. That is the salaries of the ROEs, their salaries and benefits and their operating funds alone."

Pritchard: "Okay. And their pension and other benefits are a part of that, correct?"

Mautino: "As that cost, yes."

Pritchard: "In that cost. So also, we were looking at this being a short-term solution, and again, this sunsets when?"

Mautino: "June 30, 2012."

Pritchard: "So we're just trying to get through this budgeting year. But the task force that you're setting up with this Bill doesn't report until when?"

Mautino: "'Til 2012. So, it can be August of 2012 or sooner."

Pritchard: "Okay. And what kind of responsibility are you giving that task force?"

Mautino: "They will have to go in... they're going to have to look and evaluate all of the ROEs that are out there. They will look at what their role is. They will look at the geographic area covered by them. The specific duties... they will look at the geographic area, the educational service region, and look at how we would divide up or what duties should remain with the ROEs, which should go to the State Board of Education."

Pritchard: "As you understand it, the Governor vetoed this portion of the budget and said that we ought to eliminate

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

this position or at least transition it. Do you have any ideas from the Governor's Office what he's looking for, for a plan?"

Mautino: "I think they assisted us in working with this new compromise language. His intention I believe earlier was that it is a local function. I don't know that I agree with that. I would much rather have a different structure, but I find myself in this situation... to answer your question directly about the Governor, I don't know what their response is. I do know they will sign this."

Pritchard: "Okay. That's what I was leading up to."

- Mautino: "They do… if you wanted to ask directly, will they sign this legislation? Yes, they will, is my understanding. And that then brings about an end to a crisis that has been created and… on their part."
- Pritchard: "Yeah. It's my understanding that the Corporate Personal Property Replacement Tax receipts are anticipated to be down this year. Do you have any information as to how much that is going to be reduced?"
- Mautino: "I believe... and this number fluctuates; there are different highs and lows. I think the high was \$1.4 billion in 2010; projection from this year is \$1.287 billion that will be there. The impact of this item within that budget is less than one percent."
- Pritchard: "Okay. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to this Bill.

 Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we find ourselves in a predicament where a Constitutional Office has been zeroed out of the budget, and yet their duties continue, their responsibilities to our students continue, and we need a

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

plan for transitioning, if we're going to change the system or reaffirmation by this Body if we want this expense to continue as a part of our General Revenue Fund. I regret having to take these dollars out of the Corporate Personal Property Replacement Tax, but I think we have little choice. And I think units of local government are sympathetic to the problem we're in, and will give us leeway for one year to study this issue and then to continue paying it hopefully out of a state responsibility since it's a state mandate. I would ask for your support of this legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Frank, first of all, I applaud you for all your work that you've done on this Bill. From its initial inception to now, and for as much as I applaud you, I express great frustration with the Governor for what he did to a constitutionally elected position. Ladies and Gentlemen, our ROEs are an extremely valuable asset to the education of our Illinois students. They are an extremely valuable asset to all of our teachers, our substitute teachers. Simply put, about all aspects of education. That being said, having been caught in the quandary we're in, and I find it so perplexing that the Governor would choose to eliminate the ROE position when the Governor is from Chicago and I don't think he has a total concept of what the rest of the state is like educationally. We, in this Body, certainly recognize that the City of Chicago school

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

district is run by the mayor. I have no problem with that if that's what they want to do, but don't put a mandate on the rest of the state based on how Chicago does it. And as much as I tried to get an understanding of why he did what he did here, very clearly articulated by my good friend Bob Pritchard and certainly Mr. Mautino, we have found ourself in a untenable position where we must pay these very valuable assets to the Illinois educational system. I deeply regret that we had to cut this back to one year. I had spoken at length with my municipalities, my local governments throughout the five counties that I represent, they weren't happy with the replacement tax being taken from them, but it is one-tenth of one percent. In fact, I'd be correct in stating that now it's even less then that. Correct, Frank?"

Mautino: "Correct."

Sacia: "That being said, we truly have an obligation to get these folks funded, to get the task force in place, and hopefully midsummer of next year being able to totally fix this problem. Ladies and Gentlemen, all of us need to support this. It's very, very important for our ROEs which is a tremendously necessary function of Illinois education. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Representative… would… would the Sponsor…

First of all, an inquiry of the Chair. Does Amendment 9

become the Bill?"

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, an inquiry on Amendment 9. He can't give you the information on the content of that, so we'll ask Representative Mautino to answer that Representative..."

Eddy: "Because we adopted Amendment 7 and 9 and..."

Mautino: "And 9 was a gut and replace, rolled in all the provisions. It also fixed one purely technical error in the Bill itself. So it contains everything that I talked about in the sheets that we..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Mautino: "...have handed out that said Amendment 8."

Eddy: "Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we had everything in there and you just said that we do. A couple of... a few days... about a couple of weeks ago we stood on the House Floor and I think we discussed this issue, and we received feedback from our colleagues on the House Floor related to this. And Representative, I want to make sure everyone understands that the process works when we do listen to Members who bring us their concerns. One of the concerns was that by shifting this permanently we would be, in effect, for the future transferring what a lot of people in here believe to be state mandated requirements to local governments on a permanent basis. So, the way you fix that is to make this for one year. Is that correct?"

Mautino: "That is correct. There is a sunset... sunset in it ending June 30 by action of law."

Eddy: "The second thing that I heard on this side of the aisle and I hear from individuals across the state, constituents, has to do with, do we really need the ROEs? Is it duplicative? Are there inefficiencies? Are there ways to

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

deal with that? And your response to that, and I think that is important to note, is it contained within the language of the Bill is that you set up a formal process to try to answer that question before we commit to out years of funding from any source."

Mautino: "Yes. There is an 11 member commission which is set up. It will work in 2012 and it has all the appropriate appointees to that that can answer the question, what should there be as a function, how many should there be as regional superintendents and what role does the state have to take and what is the local role?"

Eddy: "Yeah. Those two very reasonable concerns by House Members I think have been addressed very well in your Bill, and I think it's fair to answer those questions and this is nothing more than kind of a Band-Aid on the issue until we can give it the proper study. And I think that's what a lot of people thought about this. We're rushing into this because a Governor made a decision that did not have a plan to back up that decision. I mean, it's pretty simple. Most of the time if you're going to do something like this, you would actually have a plan. We didn't have one. I like your plan. Your plan is to look at this in a commonsense way and decide whether or not this is a necessary expense, if it is, where it should be paid for, report back to the General Assembly in a manner that is researched analyzed and planned and not flying by the seat of your pants by just zeroing out a line item and then later trying to figure out how to deal with it. I like that approach. I hope my colleagues on the House Floor will join us in

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

supporting a commonsense approach to this issue and restoring that pay, one penny on the dollar. I think the other thing this last two weeks has give us the opportunity to do is to explain to taxing bodies that this is not all of their CPPRT, this is not a tremendous amount of their CPPRT, this is one penny basically on the dollar. as you had, for the Body to support this. Let's move this out over in the Senate. We know that in the next couple of days we have some difficult decisions to make regarding the budget. And once this issue is resolved, we can better make those decisions with any available revenue that there asking you, based on the be, changes Representative Mautino has made to the Bill, to vote 'aye' and send this over to the Senate so we can have this resolved. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, I commend you on all your effort as some others have said, thank you for your good work. I agree that it's an important part of the educational delivery system. I do have a couple questions for you. If we do not properly fund ROEs and have an office in place and someone in charge, are school districts required by law to have their buildings inspected?"

Mautino: "Yes, they are."

Moffitt: "So, would they have to go to some other source as it...
and be an added expense, if we don't keep things in place?"

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Mautino: "Most likely an engineer or a licensed architect in that provision as provided by statute, yes."

Moffitt: "Which could be a significant cost if we do not continue to fund the ROEs?"

Mautino: "My guess is architects probably get a pretty good dollar."

Moffitt: "And then GEDs, an important program, they have to be operated... issued and tested under the authority of a..."

Mautino: "Yes, I believe there's 20 to 25 functions under the statute..."

Moffitt: "Yeah."

Mautino: "...these guys have to do."

Moffitt: "Yeah. But GEDs..."

Mautino: "The school districts..."

Moffitt: "...building inspections..."

Mautino: "...would have to pick up. Incidentally, the school boards association is in favor and is in support of this Amendment which they just told me, so they are in favor. They haven't seen it 'til now, so I got their thumbs up. School Management Alliance is the correct group."

Moffitt: "Good. One final question, Representative. On school bus drivers, their license and they also have to have fingerprints for bus drivers. Is it the ROE that takes care of the bus driver's license and that..."

Mautino: "Yes, they do the bus drivers as well as the fingerprinting and they do the criminal history background check, and oddly enough, the only line that survived in the budget, I think, was the bus driver's line. So, we took out their pay, their operations, their offices, their

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

ability to do criminal history checks, but we allowed them to license the bus drivers."

Moffitt: "But for the safety of the students, we need those functions, the building inspection, the license. So, thank you..."

Mautino: "Yes, they do."

Moffitt: "...for advancing this. Good Bill. We need to show our support and vote for it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks. Jack. You have your light on, Representative? You wish to address the issue?"

Franks: "I do, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay."

Franks: "First of all, I'd like to commend the Sponsor because it's a... certainly a better Bill than what we saw a few weeks ago, and I appreciate all the work that he's done on it. But I, nonetheless, reluctantly rise in opposition. I don't know how many times we're going to have to keep cleaning up the mess that our Governor is making. This is a mess that he's created and he's asking us to fix it. We shouldn't do that for him. When you're the Governor of the State of Illinois, you ought to have the ability to have a plan. And if he didn't think that the regional offices of education were necessary, then he should have had their duties transferred to the State Superintendent of Schools, but he didn't do that. And I'm also very concerned, even though that the Sponsor has put together the idea to have a commission put together, I want you to know that everyone in this chamber voted for our law that the Governor signed to create a consolidation commission so we can look at ways

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

to save moneys on the local level, but he has failed to the people who are going to be part of commission. There's nothing in here compelling Governor to actually convene this commission or to put Members on the commission. And I don't believe that he'll do it because past is prologue. He hasn't done it when we've already passed laws that he's signed. I can tell you, in McHenry County we've been without our regional office of superintendent for three months, he quit. His successor didn't even take the job; he said forget it, he left too, which is pretty strong evidence that other areas can pick up the slack, and I think that we ought to look at options here because certainly it's worked in our county. Now when the Governor decided to zero this out, what he didn't zero out was way... were other things that he could have that could have funded this temporarily or given more money to the regional... I'm sorry... to the state superintendent in order to take these additional services. For instance, there are boards and commissions that haven't met in years that he continues to pay. There's one, the Hate Crimes Commission that haven't met in almost three years and I think the executive director is making over \$100 thousand a year. We have the Toll Way Commission where the members now are getting paid \$36 thousand a year. We have other commissions that we see where members meet for just a few hours a month and make \$47 thousand a year each. So it's a question of priorities and it's a question of saying, when is enough, enough? I think we should make... hold the Governor accountable here. Please vote 'no'. Let's make

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

this go back to the drawing board and if he wants us to put this on the regional... he wants to move the regional office to the state superintendent, that's what he ought to do. But I don't think that we should give him a mulligan here. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Simply, to the Davis, W.: Bill. I certainly rise in support of this particular Bill. As chair of the Appropriations Committee, we all had to make tough choices, particularly in my committee as well as the others, and this was certainly one that we debated quite a bit. Now, I would have to agree in the sense that the ROEs obviously serve a particular function, and it was made very clear to us, in our committee meetings with the State Board of Education, that the state board was in no way capable of performing any of these functions, at least in this particular year. Now maybe we can look at it next year shifting those functions to the State Board of Education, giving them an opportunity to prepare for it, but right now we're faced with a dilemma. Many of you who live in the districts where... that are represented by these ROEs will probably argue that they are a necessary function, a necessary part of the continuum of education, whether it's performing life safety functions, bus driver training, and a number of other things. So that's why I think it's important that we support this Bill to at least make sure in this one year, that they are paid so they can perform the functions that they have been tasked to do. Yes, we've given them these responsibilities, these are

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

elected positions that we don't necessarily control, that we're just being asked to pay their salaries, I get that, but I think it's important in terms of the function of education in all these communities that we must pay the individuals their salaries. CPPRT, I know, apparently is kind of one of those funds. It's there, it's out there, and many of our other taxing bodies take advantage of it. But that saying, we're told that the amount of money that's being taken out of the fund is miniscule in comparison to the functions that are performed by the regional offices of education. So, I appreciate the Gentleman's willingness to maybe look at it for a year and then we can come back and examine it and then we can make some decisions about the future of ROEs. But I think because of our short window now and all of the functions that they perform, that we must move forward with this Bill so that we can pay these individuals so they can continue to perform necessary functions for the schools and the school districts in which they're located. And again, next year, let's take a good look at them. Again, maybe these functions do belong at the State Board of Education, maybe that's where they should be. Now mind you, if they remove them there, they're not currently equipped with staff to handle it which means that we're going to have to talk about maybe providing them resources SO they can perform the particular functions. But until we get to that discussion, I think it's important that we do this. And again, for those of you who live in those areas, while this may be a tough vote, but I think it's a tough vote that you have to vote

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

'yes' on. You have to take this vote and you have to make sure that these functions can be performed by the individuals who've been tasked to do so. So regardless of what your political positions are, whether you have races coming up or any of that, if you believe in the functions of ROEs, then you must vote 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mautino to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Mautino: I'd like to thank those who joined in support and their comments and would also like to point to a situation brought up in the debate where a superintendent had resigned, and those functions were still being done. Please understand they were done because the neighboring ROEs for that... for that county and region stepped in and did that at no cost. That can't go on forever. There's a point of responsibility and that speaks to the content of their character. There is one issue, one, one issue, that this is the day at this time where no override is available and that another appropriation Bill will not come 'til January that we must deal with the situation now that had been handled badly, improperly, but allows us an option to address it with a one year fix with a lower cost and with an examination of what to do with these offices in the future. It is right. There is a question of how long do you allow these people to continue to show up every day and do the work we've told them to do without getting paid. They need your help today and we need, in this Body, to correct something that has been a wrong, an injustice and we have an opportunity to do that now. Please vote 'aye'."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "This Bill will require 71 votes. And the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2147 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take record. This Bill, having received 70 votes voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', the Bill fails. The Chair recognizes Representative Karen May."
- May: "Yes. I filed the Motion to reconsider the Senate Bill 72. I would ask for an immediate vote, if you have the paperwork, please. 2147, yes."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, I believe 2147 is what you meant to say."
- May: "That's the one."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should we reconsider Senate Bill 2147?' It's a 'yes' or 'no' vote. You'll be recorded to reconsider the Bill, and then we'll run the Bill again. Those in favor to reconsider the Bill vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. The Motion to reconsider the Bill. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there are 76 Members saying 'yes', 25 Members saying 'no'. And the Motion will be reconsidered. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2147."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2147, the Bill's been read for a third time, previously."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Frank Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 4... 2147 is before you. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2147 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. You think it's easy up here, huh? This Bill, having received 74 'yes' votes and 36 'no' votes, and received the Constitutional Majority, a Supermajority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Acevedo."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Eddie."

Acevedo: "Speaker, earlier, there was a vote on House Resolution 550, and for some reason I was... my vote was 'no'. I'd like to be recorded as a 'yes'."

Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request.

Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "I rise for a moment of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Proceed, Representative."

Gordon: "Ladies... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is a gentleman in the gallery by the name of Dr. Gerald Brookhart. Dr. Brookhart is one of the longest serving ROEs that we have in the State of Illinois, and he serves us very well in central Illinois. Dr. Brookhart, thank you so much for all your hard work and years of dedication to education."

Speaker Lyons: "Dr. Brookhart, proud to have you here. Enjoy your day at the Capitol. Representative Patti Bellock."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Patti."

Bellock: "This is regarding... I have the deepest respect for all the people on the Human Service Committee that I've worked with for the last couple of years. But what I'm asking you today, Mr. Speaker, is I've filed a Motion to Discharge House Resolution 593 from the House Human Service Committee. 593 is currently in the Human Committee. Under House Rule 58(a), any Member may move that a standing committee, or a special committee, be discharged from consideration of any legislative measure assigned to it and not report it back favorably. discharge Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move to Resolution 593 from the House Human Service Committee and be placed on the appropriate Order of Business. The reason being is House Resolution 593 addresses the issues that we've been addressing for the last year and a half on the Medicaid reform. That was a Bill that we passed in the Lame Duck Session last year, and it had 15 major reforms in it to save \$1 billion. The \$1 billion is to address the fiscal crisis that we're in now. When that went to the federal CMS, we were rejected on the two major reforms that we had, on the income verification for one month's income and on the residency. So, this Resolution was going back to what President Obama has now asked the Committee of 12 in the Federal Government to cut Medicaid by \$72 billion, Medicaid and Medicare. So, in this Resolution, we are asking the committee of 12 to give our state and other

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

states flexibilities on our Medicaid program so we can move forward and pay our providers, pay the people that need to get paid, and provide the services to the people who need these services in Illinois. Mr. Speaker, next year we are going to have \$2.4 billion of unpaid medical bills. '14, we are going to have \$5.4 billion of unpaid medical bills. We are looking for a way to work on our Medicaid system in Illinois to be cost efficient so that we can pay and provide good health care services and access to health care for the fragile population that needs that. So, this is why I am asking for this Resolution to be discharged because it was a bipartisan effort that led the charge on these Medicaid reforms. The President now is looking to cut numbers in his own budget, which we understand, but we want to be able, in the State of Illinois, to have our Medicaid system dictate what we need to be dictated, and not the Federal Government come in two years from now, and cut us... add to our population of Medicaid, but then cut what they're going to give to us on that. That's where I'm standing."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cole."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Sandy."

Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the discharge of House Resolution 593. In an attempt to control escalated Medicaid costs and improve coordination of care for the enrollees within Medicaid, Illinois acted on comprehensive Medicaid reforms in 2011. This was done in a bipartisan manner, and it included changes to require

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

applicants to submit a month of income data, and also Illinois residency when applying for Medicaid coverage in the State of Illinois. As we struggle to continue to find moneys for our Medicaid program, I support this Resolution and I support its discharge from the Human Services Committee. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hays."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of the discharge of House Resolution 593. So many terrific and well-meaning Legislators worked on very difficult legislation to move us forward in terms of Medicaid reform not because they do not care, but because they care deeply about those who are most in need and in the margins of our society. We cannot move forward with \$2.4 billion hole in Medicaid that will grow to \$5 billion by the end of 2013, cannot agree to implement commonsense reforms. Things as simple as you must live in Illinois participate in the Illinois system. Things as simple as, you must ver... verify income to participate in the system. We have needs that are broad and resources that are narrow. It is incumbent upon us to make sure that those who are truly most in need have access to limited dollars. I have had the privilege my entire professional life to work for an organization whose mission is building communities of healing and hope. We have reached out with programs to seniors, to children. Twenty-three percent of the patients who came to the hospital where I work participated in Medicaid, another 10 percent were uninsured. The highest portion of the bad debt were people who were functionally

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

uninsured. We get it. We have to be able to move forward. This notion that we cannot pick the lowest hanging fruit, and it's really not even low hanging fruit, this is fruit that's on the ground, is absurd. I urge you to discharge House Resolution 593. It's the right thing to do, and I think in the spirit of the cooperation of the commission, who courageously drove us forward with these first baseline reforms, I think we owe it to the good people who spent weeks, and weeks, and weeks putting this together to allow us to implement it. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Roger."

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, I... I know we have made changes in the last year in the Rules so that we wouldn't actually have the opportunity to vote on Motions to Discharge, but this... this particular Resolution was something that both sides of the aisle understood as ... as recent as the spring budget problems, as something that would help us as we went forward with the tremendous costs, increases, that have occurred in the Medicaid system. We know how very, very difficult the budget process was last year because we're not even finished with that. There are meetings ongoing to try and find small amounts of money to direct to line items that everyone has an interest in, and most people could take just about any one of them and make a good case for. This is a commonsense approach to trying to resolve one of the issues related to Medicaid so that we would not have people who don't deserve have the benefit, receiving the

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

benefit, because of income problems and... and the lack of a good verification system. That's all this does. This is a Resolution. We have agreements around here. We talk about budget; we talk about how difficult it is. We had a very good process in the spring, a bipartisan process, that resulted in, for the first time in many years, the House establishing a cap, sticking with a cap, and us not spending any more money than we had available. The issue going forward is going to be those pressures are going to be even more. And if we're not willing to go down the path least supporting a Resolution that commonsense direction for ... for trying to get a handle around the cost of this program, we're going to continue to see all other programs in the state erode because we don't have... we don't have the ... the kind of bipartisan approach necessary to at least make people verify their income on some type of basis that's real and ongoing so we don't continue to spend money on a program in areas we shouldn't spend it. Everyone should be for this. What's very disappointing about this is the fact that we can't even get a Resolution on the House Floor so that we can agree on a Resolution that was part of an agreed to budget process. That's all this is. It's a Resolution. This is not... this is not consistent with the type of bipartisan collaborative approach that we saw in the budgeting. This is back to the... to hide the truth. Don't let it out. Let's not talk Let's not go down the difficult path. about it. just ignore it. I'm going to tell you, you ignore this, it's not going away. We start talking about FY13, it's

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

going to get tougher. If we're not willing to verify incomes, if we're not willing to... to put in place some commonsense approaches, all other human service areas are going to suffer in the future. Education's going to suffer, and we're going to circle back around and Representative Bellock's Resolution is actually going to be something we take up, because we're going to have to. The reason we're not it today, I don't know. Control. Let's... let's hide the truth. Let's try to... let's try to not face what our reality is. That's no way to run a budget. That's not what we did this spring. We should have that Resolution out here. We should be voting on it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion. I'd like to enlist my Republican colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, and the Medicaid Reform Committee, and the Medicaid Advisory Committee, and this committee, and that committee who meet about six hours a day, on average, to try and tackle these issues and I think everybody who participates in this knows who I'm speaking with. There is a huge, huge effort afoot to address this issue. We are all rolling our sleeves up and making very, very tough decisions, which sur... so this Resolution surprises me a little bit. And in some ways, I'm a little concerned that the work we're doing may not be sufficient for you. think we are making incredible strides with the director of HFS to address the issue of Medicaid reform in Illinois. We are moving forward on income verification. moving forward in discussing optionals. We are making some

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

very, very, very painful decisions. However, I believe that this Resolution is overreaching. I think a blanket exemption is a scary place to go. I think we could do a better job when we put our hearts and minds together and take a look at the unique populations here in the State of Illinois, and we do it very carefully. We've been spending the last two days doing some very, very careful thinking, haven't we? And I... I think that this Resolution goes a little too far. I think that our judgment here, on our committees in the State of Illinois, is a little bit better than what the Federal Government might decide, and I'd like to be able to do it with you. We don't need to do this Resolution. Let's keep working. We will get to the solution."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much. I'm really disgusted by the last speaker's statements. Nobody deserves support for a Resolution on Medicaid more than Patti Bellock. This is not a partisan Resolution. The Bills that we've been passing here in this chamber over the last several years would save in Medicaid over \$1 billion a year if the administration had simply pursued them, accomplished and achieved them. This is a... should have every vote in this House on this Resolution. And we should be passing it, and we should continue to work together to straighten out one of the biggest, most important, financial problems that we have in this state. So, I would urge you all to come together with us in a bipartisan fashion and get this Resolution adopted. Thank you."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Greg Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the earlier speakers talked about what is the truth of what's going on here, and as chairman of the Human Services Committee, I'd like to just tell you the truth from the way I see it; as somebody who was in the committee meeting, my view of it, and why I voted against this in committee the way I did. And this is something I've discussed with Representative Bellock. I think each and every one of us would support a Resolution asking for the Maintenance of Effort relaxation on those things that the Medicaid task force and that we all voted for. This simple fact of the matter is that those of us who voted against this Resolution in committee believe that it was drafted in an overly broad fashion. Each and every one of us, I think, believes that we need to do everything we can to rein in abuse and fraud, and we would support that. If this Resolution had been better drafted to reflect those things that had been in the report of the Medicaid task force, and that those of us who had voted for the Medicaid reform Bill, if that was what was in the Resolution, I think you would've had our support and I would go so far as to say I would cosponsor a Resolution with the Representative, if it were that... drafted in that way. So, this is not a rejection of past efforts the House has made. This was because the Resolution was overly broad and asked if the... asked the Federal Government for a waiver of any and all regulations, in my view, of any and all regulations as it applied to our Medicaid program that would allow us to make changes that could take children off

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

of Medicaid, that could take people with disabilities off of Medicaid. I... I just think it was overly broad. So, this is the truth as I see it, Representative. I'm sorry it's caused this kind of discomfort, and if you wish to do another Resolution that focused on those things that we all mutually agree on, I'd be happy to work with you on that."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapin Rose."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

"...and to this debate about House Resolution 593. previous speaker said something to the effect of we know better than the people in Washington and quite frankly, that's what's so interesting about this. This original Bill passed here after months of work. There were a couple different versions in a couple different Bills, actually, going all the way back to last Christmastime, and last December, when Members of the Medicaid reform group began meeting in... in the Chicago area. They had culminated in a bipartisan Bill supported by... by both sides and... of the Legislature in the House and the Senate, signed by the Governor, and contained a lot of reforms. Now, the reason reforms and, frankly, flexibility are so important is when the Federal Government tells you you have to provide a service but only reimburses the state taxpayers 50 cents on the dollar to provide that service, that's a huge, huge issue. And when you have to provide it and you're given no choice by the Federal Government, at the end of the day you have to manage those costs through having flexibility. That is what the Medicaid task force sought to do. It

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

sought to do a number of commonsense things and... and let me just give you one example. With respect to the providing one month's worth of pay stubs, and the fact that you actually live in Illinois, not from out of state, the Federal Government's action is so silly on its face that if someone drove up in a Lexus to the Public Aid office, then their spouse drove up in a Porsche and walked inside, and signed up for Medicaid, the Public Aid worker looking outside and seeing the Lexus and the Porsche couldn't say, well, what do you mean you don't have any income. You just drove up in a Lexus and a Porsche. That's how stupid the Federal Government's actions were. I mean, who says that the taxpayers of Illinois don't have a legitimate, vested interest in making sure that only those who legitimately entitled to the benefit receive the benefit. I mean, are we supposed to ignore common sense that if someone shows up in a Lexus or a Porsche, we can't even ask the question about source of income. Of course not, that's silly. It's silly on its face. But I think what's even more... what's even more ridiculous than that is the fact that this was bipartisan. Both sides of the aisle worked very hard on this reform. And to be slapped in the face by the Federal Government and told we can't manage with... and... and try to control costs in a responsible way, a responsible way that both sides of this chamber, and the Senate, and the Governor's Office thought was responsible when it was passed and was signed into law, and to now say somehow that the feds know better than we do. Frankly, that's more silly. I mean, to come in here and suggest on

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

one hand the feds know better than we do, but then to vote for the Bill. Come on. Come on, people. Why on earth would we not want to retain the right, as a state, to administer the program and make sure that only people who are lawfully entitled to the benefit are receiving the benefit. That's just common sense. Mr. Speaker, I don't know why this Bill wasn't supported considering virtually all the people that didn't support it voted for it the first time around. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jil Tracy."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

"Continuing on with the efforts to discuss House Tracy: Resolution that was brought forth by Representative Bellock, it... it seems that I've heard in this debate that we want to protect the children, and the seniors, and those who are eligible under the laws of our Illinois Medicaid. How can we do that if we don't have the money and when we aren't preventing fraud and abuse? And the ways to do that is just by going back to the procedures that we tried to do when we enacted, in a bipartisan fashion, the verification of residency. How can we look at an eligible Illinois child and tell them there are not funds available, that we are not paying the doctors, that there are not doctors available who will take Medicaid, that will not be paid by our Medicaid programs? What will we tell the Illinois child because there's a child from Wisconsin coming to avail themselves of services because they can be done so ...

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

so easily in Illinois, services such as dental and optical. Services that they don't have in Wisconsin, but we have in Illinois, that we need to be providing to Illinois seniors, and Illinois children first. The truth is our budget does not have the money to provide Medicaid services for all residents of surrounding states. We need to verify income. Two pay stubs was what we agreed on and that was what we We need to make a statement to the Federal Government that we in Illinois are trying to get our fiscal house in order, to try to pay our Medicaid providers in a timely fashion, so we can best serve the children and the seniors of Illinois. That's our first obligation. So, I would urge all of us to reconsider how important this Resolution is to get us back to the step that we made in the January Session last year of Medicaid reform. We will not have Medicaid reform unless we do this."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would oppose this Motion and if there is a vote taken, I'd ask for a Roll Call, please."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you. I want to correct what I said. I would like to ask for a verification."

Speaker Lyons: "So, Representative Patti Bellock, to get back to the issue at hand here. Were... are you making a Motion to suspend Rule 58(b)? Everybody rose on personal privilege. So, we need a formal Motion by you, if you so want it... if you so choose to make a Motion over... to suspend

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Rule 58(b). Is that your Motion, or do we just want to leave this at conversation level?"
- Bellock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I filed it under 58(a). Oh, is that wrong? Is that wrong?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Patti Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Under 58(b), I'd like to suspend the Rules, so... of the Calendar."
- Speaker Lyons: "So, Representative Bellock moves to suspend Rule 58(b). And the question is, 'Shall the House support... shall the House suspend Rule 58(b)?' It will require 71 votes. All those in favor of suspension vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chapa LaVia, Crespo, Ford, Franks, and McAsey, would you like to be recorded? Chapa LaVia. Franks. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On the Motion, there's 53 voting 'yes', 59 vote... voting... voting 'no'. The Motion fails. Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We leave home, and at home we have great family and a great staff and today, back in Chicago, Tiffany Moy, who works in my district office, is celebrating her 24th birthday. And I'd like for us to give her a Springfield shout-out, a happy birthday, Tiffany."
- Speaker Lyons: "Happy 24th, Tiffany. Have a great year.

 Representative Dunkin, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege. I'd like for our..."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Dunkin: "...I'd like for our chamber to recognize my staff from Chicago: Anthony; my chief of staff, Donna, Miss Gloria, Miss Jessica. Can you all rise and give them a round of applause."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin's staff, God bless you.

You earn every penny you get. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 09, 2011: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 for Senate Bill 1830, Floor Amendments 4 and 5 for Senate Bill 1865, and Floor Amendment #3 for Senate Bill 2458."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brady. What purpose do you seek recognition, Dan?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since we're in the partial business today of congratulating and wishing staff happy birthdays, which I think is great, I'd like to introduce from my Bloomington office, my intern, who is down in Springfield today, Miss Chelsea Kennedy, who's standing right back here in the corner. If you'd all give her a big round of applause and welcome to Springfield, my intern, Miss Chelsea Kennedy."

Speaker Lyons: "Chelsea, welcome to your Capitol. Glad to have you here. Representative Rich Brauer. For what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"

Brauer: "Point of personal privilege."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, many of you remember that we had a moment of silence for the protestors for Occupy Wall Street, and there is a letter, and you're going to find this tough to believe, but it was on FOX BUSINESS, and I was watching, but it was from Jeremy, and it talked about how tough it was, and I quote his comment. He says, 'It's tough protesting. You get there at 9 a.m.; the rich bankers you want to hurl insults have been at work for two hours already. And then when it's time to go, they are still there. I guess that's why they call them the one percent. I mean, who wants to go to work those kind of hours? That is the power of greed! I just wanted the Body to know how tough it is protesting."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Al Riley, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Riley: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Al."

Riley: "Just wanted to tell the House about some information that maybe many of you know that occurred to a former Member of the House. I think everybody, especially those who have served here a while, remember State Representative Manny Hoffman. Really good friend, former mayor of Homewood, and he served this Body very well. On July 18 of this year, he lost his wife Judy, and it was a blow to us out in the south suburban region who had dealt with the Hoffmans for a long time and, you know, Manny's work, both in local government and down here in Springfield, is legendary, but maybe, you know, not a lot of people knew

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

about what his wife did. She was just a superb humanitarian. She cared a lot about people, and she advised a lot of us and served on a lot of boards out in the south suburban region. Her passion was dealing with this... one... a number of the cancer centers out in the south suburbs, and she touched an awful lot of people. And it was not only a big blow to Manny and his family, but really to the whole south suburban region in general. We honored Judy in memoriam on a number of occasions throughout the south suburban region. Manny Hoffman came back from Florida and he accepted a Resolution that we presented him from Rich Township. So, I just wanted to let everybody know that Judy Hoffman had indeed passed, but she was extraordinary person, and she definitely will be missed, and just in case you didn't know, I wanted you to know that. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Riley. Please let the Hoffman family know that we… we mourn their loss. Representative DeLuca, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"

DeLuca: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Anthony."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just wanted to take a second to reflect on a great American athlete that we lost yesterday. Joe Louis, at age 67, died of liver cancer yesterday."

Speaker Lyons: "Close, but no cigar."

DeLuca: "Joe Louis..."

Speaker Lyons: "Not Joe Louis."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

DeLuca: "... also known as Smokin' Joe."

Speaker Lyons: "Joe Frazier."

DeLuca: "Right."

Speaker Lyons: "Joe Frazier."

DeLuca: "What did I say? Joe Frazier."

Speaker Lyons: "Smokin' Joe Frazier."

DeLuca: "Joe Frazier. Joe Frazier. Also better known for a deadly left hook, and for his three fights with Muhammad Ali. Joe Frazier... what'd I say, Joe Louis? Joe Frazier. Smokin' Joe. He dealt Muhammad Ali his first loss in their three fights together. Their war of words outside the ring was as strong as the wars that they had inside the ring. And one of the greatest calls in sports history came from those three battles, as you boxing fans might remember, from Howard Cosell. Down goes Frazier. Down goes Frazier. Down goes Frazier.

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Toni Berrios, do you rise on a point of personal privilege?"

Berrios: "I do. I do. I am just wanting to let everyone know that on November 18 the Illinois Legislative Latino Caucus Foundation is hosting its ninth annual conference. We will be hosting it at the Rosemont Convention Center, and everyone is welcome to join us. There are going to be five concurrent sessions going on during the day and we are giving away 25 scholarships to needy Latino students. So, please join us if you can. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Representative La...

LaShawn Ford, on a point of personal privilege?"

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Ford: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to congratulate the Republican Party on Herman Cain, the 999 man. I just want you guys to do a good job, and we welcome you and you... celebrate your success with him. Herman Cain for the Republican Party."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Watson."

Watson: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

Watson: "You know, we sit here today after a decade of control by one Party. If you think that we have time for those types of comments, Representative, there's nobody here throwing flames... bombs like that. It's absolutely, absolutely ridiculous. We went from seven and a half billion dollars in long-term debt to almost 30 in 10 years. We have unpaid bills at unprecedented levels. You want to talk about Herman Cain? Why don't you talk about what your Party's doing? Why don't you talk about unpaid Medicaid bills? Why don't you talk about seven facilities that are going to be shut down? Why don't you talk about regional superintendents that can't get paid? Ridiculous."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mell."

Mell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I don't want to speak for Representative Ford, but I'm pretty sure he was responding to Representative... talking about the 99 percenters and the Occupy... Brauer... and so, it kind of started there is what was my impression. So, if you're going to go after people who are in the middle class and who are struggling, I think, you know, everything seems to be up to fair... fair game right now. Thanks."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We can't seem to manage the budget, and we have meetings later on to do that and we really are in crisis."
- Speaker Lyons: "Rosemary, wait a minute. Ladies and Gentlemen, please bring the noise level down. Please. Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "We're trying to work together to manage an unmanageable budget, which we don't have enough money for. I think we could find some better things to do than to sit back and forth. And as far as how we treat the middle class, I don't think this side was the one that proposed an income tax increase, and is proposing another one, and is pretty much shortchanging the unions in Illinois."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 09, 2011: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #3 for Senate Bill 1849."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on page 5 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading is Senate Bill 1865. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1865, 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. Floor Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been approved for consideration."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie, we got a whole bunch of Amendments here."

Currie: "Yeah."

Speaker Lyons: "What's your pleasure, Representative Currie?"

Currie: "First, I'd like to suspend the one-hour posting requirement so that we can consider Amendment 4, which was approved by the Rules Committee a little less than an hour ago."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves for the suspension of the Rules.

Any objection? Seeing none, all those in favor say 'aye';

those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
'ayes' have it. And the Rules are suspended. Amendment
#4, Representative?"

Currie: "First, I'd... I'd like to withdraw Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 5."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, we're going to withdraw Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 5."

Currie: "Oh, okay. Oh, okay. All right. Never mind, never mind...

Speaker Lyons: "Representative you have..."

Currie: "...never mind. 2... 2, 3 and 5, not 1."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, Amendments #2, 3 and 5 will be withdrawn, and we'll address Amendment #4."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker and Members of the House.

This Amendment becomes a trailer Bill to the automated speed camera legislation that will also be discussed by the Members of the floor. This makes three changes to the underlying Bill and this only becomes law if that Bill also becomes law. It would provide, first of all, that among

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

the purposes for which revenue derived from speeders caught by the automated enforcement system, most of that money would be spent on increasing school safety, and increasing safety in traffic enforcement around schools and parks, but a portion of it also could go to after school programs. addition, in the original Bill, the idea is that any speeding above 5 miles an hour, in a school or park zone, could... could garner a ticket of \$100. What this provides is that those who are found by an automated enforcement camera of speeding more than 5 but less than 10 miles an hour, that the price of that ticket will be \$50, not \$100. And finally, there was some concern about when the cameras would apply in school zones, this changes it so that in school zones, on school days, the... the measures would apply between 6 a.m. and Monday through Thursday 8:30 p.m., which is curfew in Chicago, and on Fridays 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. provision affecting parks, which is to be... to be enforced one hour before parks open and one hour after they close, that would remain unchanged. So, there are three changes in this: a reduction in the fine for those who are caught speeding by the cameras of more than 5, but less than 10 miles an hour, expanding the purposes for which revenue can be raised, and limiting the hours that have to do with school, so that school... only on school days does this apply and only between the hours of 6 a.m. and curfew. be happy to answer your questions and I'd sup... appre... appreciate your support for this language that would become a trailer Bill to the underlying proposition."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4. There's two lights on. Would you prefer to... would you prefer to wait 'til we put this on Third Reading, and then ask your questions, Representative? Representative Flowers, Representative Kosel, we'll discuss it on Third Reading, if it's okay? Thank you. So, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #4 is adopted. Is there anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. And read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1865, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Again, this is exactly what I described in the Amendment stage, with one exception. I misspoke. The \$50 fine would apply to speeding violations between 6 and 10 miles an hour. So, the \$100 kicker would not happen until someone is driving 11 miles past the speed limit. So, again, otherwise it's identical to what I just told you. So instead of repeating myself, I'll just ask you if you have any questions. And I will solicit your support for passage of Senate Bill 1865 on the… this Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Representative Kosel."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Kosel: "Can you tell me if all the parks and schools in the City of Chicago are marked so that someone coming into the city would actually know when they got within a quarter-mile of the schools or parks?"
- Currie: "That's a good question, Representative and really, it has to do with the other Bill that we haven't yet begun to address. But in fact, every park, every school, where there is this kind of automated speeding enforcement system, will be clearly marked and will have to be listed on the city's website."
- Kosel: "And so if someone were to get a ticket, and those areas were not marked for some reason, because of vandalism or something else, the ticket would be null and void?"
- Currie: "It would be a defense against the imposition of the...
 of the ticket. There is a... a system of appearing officers
 at administrative hearings, and this would be admissible
 evidence that the... the tickets should not have been
 written."
- Kosel: "And that leads directly to my second question is, should a ticket be issued incorrectly? Does that system already exist for the red light cameras? Are they going to use the same one? Will they be using a different system of adjudication?"
- Currie: "It'll be the same system currently in place for the red light cameras. And again, that really has to do with the other Bill that we haven't yet begun to discuss. This is really a trailer Bill that just deals with the hours around schools when automated speeding enforcement can apply, the purposes for which any revenue collected might

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

be spent, and the... the third issue was the question of the size of the fine, if someone is speeding less than 11 miles an hour above the posted speed."

Kosel: "So, let... let me understand this. You're talking about
 a trailer Bill to a Bill that we haven't passed?"

Currie: "You got it. But this..."

Kosel: "Wow, that's a first."

Currie: "...this trailer Bill does say that this only becomes relevant if the other Bill passes."

Kosel: "Still, a little unusual. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Deb Mell."

Mell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in strong support of this Bill. Many statistics have shown, over and over again, reducing speed, reduces accidents, increases perception time and... you know, I had an unfortunate situation this... this last summer, where I was driving, I saw someone get hit by a car and... and it's not a pretty sight, and just... you know, all you got to do is drive around in Chicago, and you know that we drive too fast. And if we can slow down around schools and parks, and if we need this incentive for people to do so, I... I think it's a great idea. I commend Mayor Emanuel and Commissioner Gabe Klein for putting an emphasis in our city more on pedestrian safety, bicyclist safety. And it just, you know, it makes for safer for our fellow Chicagoans. So, thank you, Leader Currie, for bringing us this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Sacia."

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

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Leader Currie, I... I'm somewhat perplexed here. Why are we the General Assembly making a decision for Chicago? I... I listened to Representative Mell, and she makes perfect sense. I understand why the city perhaps wants it, but... but why isn't the city then making the decision?"

Currie: "Under this Bill, the city will make the decision but without this Bill, the city is preempted. There's no way the city can decide to go ahead with automated speed enforcement programs. We have to change the law. But we... and... and remember this is the trailer Bill, this is not the basic Bill, but in that Bill, we do provide some limitations on what Chicago can do and so what we're trying to say is that you can only do it around schools. You can only do it around parks. But without some action by this General Assembly, the city is precluded from taking action to protect our school children and park users."

Sacia: "Thank you very much for that explanation, Leader. I... I guess the question I have, is the argument could easily be made then that we're creating a slippery slope. If they do it in... in Chicago, then maybe they're going to want to do it in Rockford and Moline and on down the line. You know, again, I respect the fact that Chicago wants to do this, perhaps Cook County, but I'm really troubled that we have to create the mechanism in order to do that, and I think..."

Currie: "So..."

Sacia: "...you've given me a good explanation that it's an Illinois law, we have to create the mechanism for them to pass the law."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Currie: "Right."

Sacia: "However, I'm... I'm troubled by that."

Currie: "Well, I believe in local control, Representative, and if you, like me, believe in local control, then the only way we can provide that control for the City of Chicago, or one day perhaps the good citizens of Rockford or Moline, is by changing the State Law to give them permission to do that which they cannot do today."

Sacia: "All right. I appreciate that, Leader Currie, very much, but I guess that I... I come back to the big brother thing and you know it was hard enough for me to get on board with red light cameras and now we're going to do it on speed. I guess, where does it end? And maybe that's an unanswerable question, so..."

Currie: "Well, this is only the trailer Bill, Representative and it doesn't actually lift the prohibition that I just described."

Sacia: "Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just two comments on this. I find it interesting that we're doing a trailer Bill before we do the Bill. If I had to think about why some of the reasons we might do it, one of them will be to get a Roll Call on this Bill to see how strong we're going to be on the second Bill. And the second one is something that I've complained about repeatedly. The statement up there says Metro Water Reclamation District. I put in a Bill, I've talked about this for years, it seems our counterparts in the Senate can always change what it says under that

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Bill to make it sufficient for what is actually in the Bill, and we keep on doing this year after year. There's a number of reasons why that's a bad thing to do. Number one, it turns up on mail pieces that you voted for something that you never voted for because they use that. And number two, it's disconcerting to both the people in the gallery and to those of us sitting on the House Floor, that may have been distracted for a moment, to go back and think that maybe we're voting on something for the Metro Water Reclamation District. I do not understand, since it seems we're quite creative here in what we do on a lot of things, that we can't seem to make the headline on the autotron, or whatever you want to call it, sufficient to what's in the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She awaits your question, Sir."

Eddy: "Representative... Leader, I... I guess I would like to have some explanation. It's been brought up that we're doing a trailer Bill. By its very definition, we would expect to see after we know what we voted for in the underlying Bill, and we're doing it..."

Currie: "This is not unusual practice, in fact, my recollection is that we did it just two weeks ago, and I think the reason for doing the trailer first, is to show people who might have been reluctant to vote for the underlying Bill, that, yes, the changes they want are in this measure. For example, this significantly reduces the time that automated speed enforcement will be in... in action around schools and

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

it also reduces significantly a fine for exceeding the speed limit but not exceeding it more than 10 miles an hour. So, I think the idea is to show the earnest…"

Eddy: "Okay."

- Currie: "...of our good intentions for those who might be willing to support with some changes, we're showing them that the changes are, in fact, being made."
- Eddy: "And... and those couldn't just be written into the original Bill because of the placement and the time factor so that we're not doing..."
- Currie: "It... it just seems sensible to try to adopt the Bill already approved by the Senate and do the changes in a trailer Bill."
- Eddy: "Okay. I... it... it's just confusing to some that we would do that. I wanted to kind of clear that up."
- Currie: "Right. I appreciate that."
- Eddy: "Now, let me... let me get to a concern that... 'cause I don't know if this is a good Bill or not, but if you're probably not for red light cameras, you're probably not for a trailer Bill that helps... unless that's what is going to turn you. So those... those individuals who don't like what red light cameras do, what they stand for, they've been against red light cameras. They're probably not in favor of a trailer Bill. A few weeks..."
- Currie: "Well, I... I would think that the fact that we're talking here about speed enforcement around schools and around parks where children play makes the point that it really is about school child safety, and that to me is a very compelling reason to support..."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Eddy: "Sure."

- Currie: "...this proposition. But again, Representative, that proposition, the automated speed enforcement cameras, that's in another Bill."
- Eddy: "Right. My point is, if you're not for that type of enforcement 'cause there's another way to enforce school zones. You could patrol them. You could have real people there and those individuals could write tickets based on... you know, there is another way to patrol. Maybe this is an easier way, and obviously one that will cover more territory. Maybe it's more cost-effective."
- Currie: "I would say a lot more cost-effective. I would say in the city, like Chicago, to have a police patrols stationed at every school from 6:00 in the morning until 8:30 at night and around every park would be cost prohibitive."
- Eddy: "Let me just ask a basic question that I've always had a concern about, when I drive in Chicago and there's a red light flash that goes... what is the due process for an individual who happens to receive a ticket with a... with a camera patrol?"
- Currie: "We have a... a program of... of administrative adjudication that is already in place for parking tickets also for violations of the red light camera. And there are clear defenses; for example, if the car was stolen. For example, if you can show that the license plate picture does not match your own, there are defenses that are available in that administrative hearing."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, does that require, for example, someone that happens to be in the city for a short period of time, isn't

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

familiar with the neighborhood, and maybe was... would they have to come back to Chicago to..."

Currie: "You can... you can do it... you can do it by mail as well.

You don't have to have a physical presence in the city."

Eddy: "Does this legislation simply enable the Chicago City Council to actually enact legislation? We are not enacting red light cameras here."

Currie: "That's exactly right. Now this... the Bill we're talking about right now doesn't do that, but the next Bill will do precisely that. We are not... we're not creating automated speed enforcement cameras in the City of Chicago. We are giving permission to the City Council and the mayor of the City of Chicago to do that because without this legislation they can't..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "...but there are provisions in the legislation that we are offering that would curtail the opportunity."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "So we're not giving them blanket permission to do automated cameras across the City of Chicago. We're specifying that it has to be within an eighth of a mile, basically a city block, of a school during school days, and essentially during school hours and again, an eighth of a mile of a park. We're not saying you can do it downtown. We're saying it can only be used in this fashion."

Eddy: "So, it's limited..."

Currie: "But we're not doing it; we're giving them the authority that they currently lack to do just that."

Eddy: "And that's in the Bill that's coming?"

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Currie: "That's Bill what's coming."

Eddy: "Okay. And I've... I've heard that confusion that we're voting for red light cameras to be placed in Chicago. We're not in this Bill, I understand it's a trailer Bill, but even in the future Bill, we're not voting to do that. We're allowing the City Council the opportunity to vote those on a limited basis."

Currie: "You're exactly right."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. I just wanted to clear up a couple of things having to do with the fact that we're doing this ahead of time. And I just want to… you know, we had 'buttongate'. We don't want another 'buttongate' here on… on a trailer Bill. So, we might want to watch our switches."

Currie: "Thank you. I appreciate your clarification."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Brady: "Leader, just a couple points of clarification as we asked in committee the other day, in Executive Committee. But with... with the cameras, there's... there's different types of cameras and there's in... in this situation, I'm assuming that the type of cameras that will be limited, if it was enacted by the City of Chicago, if it was... will be limited into those safety zones we're talking about, would also be the type of camera that not only would snap shot license plate per say, but in a situation were Chicago is indicating that they have a higher percentage of traffic fatalities than any other major U.S. and global city, in

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

fact, 68 percent higher than New York's, that the camera would also be the device that would be able to show, if not a license plate, a vehicle description, video wise that maybe had caused personal injury or fatalities. Is that the type of camera we're talking about here?"

Currie: "Yeah, I... I think that's right. I think it's the same kind of camera as we currently use with the red light program."

Brady: "Okay. All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Well, she... the Lady yields."

Kay: "The Sponsor, I'm sorry. Excuse me, Speaker."

Currie: "I didn't mind. You could call me Speaker again; it would be okay."

Kay: "Working your way up. Leader, and I think... Leader, I've got that right. I have a 8- or 9-page document that was provided to me yesterday with all kinds of information. There's some basic information I think it's missing, so I'm going to ask you about it. I'm curious about whether the City of Chicago owns or leases this equipment?"

Currie: "My understanding is that they lease from the... the people, from a supplier who gives them the red light cameras, and I would imagine that they would do the same with the... with the automated speed enforcement. I don't know that for a fact."

Kay: "Is... is the... the company that the equipment is being leased from an Arizona company?"

Currie: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Kay: "Yeah. Pardon me. Is the company that the lease is let
 with or you have the contract with an Arizona company?"
- Currie: "I don't know. I can tell you that it isn't a commission fee, that whatever company it is is paid. It's not like piecework; they don't get paid by the number of catches they make."
- Kay: "Okay. Have you reviewed the contract between the company
 that supplies the cameras in the City of Chicago?"
- Currie: "Sorry. I... I got the last part but not the first."
- Kay: "Okay. I'm... I'm sorry. Have you reviewed or has anyone reviewed the contract that exists between the City of Chicago for the lease arrangement?"
- Currie: "I have not. But I can tell you that under this legislation the idea of piecework or a commission pricing is specifically prohibited. In addition, there is language that makes it clear that the calibrations that are done, to make sure the cameras are working accurately, is done on a regular basis and have... has to be done according to Illinois State Police standards."
- Kay: "Okay. One final question, Leader. I'm always curious,
 and I've never asked this question, and I don't mean to
 be..."
- Currie: "I... I misspoke. I... I'm told now that the city does own the red light cameras. I don't believe that the city operates them, but I'm told, I had thought that we leased the whole thing, but I'm told now that we own our red light cameras."
- Kay: "I see. Okay. I... I'm curious about the... the evidence
 aspect of cameras. And I really don't know much about it,

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

but the question comes to mind about evidence. We have criminal courts, we have civil courts, now we have administrative courts, and my question is, if a mistake is made, this goes to an administrative court?"

- Currie: "It does and there is a... a right also of appeal from an adverse decision before the administrative law judge. Currently the way our parking tickets operate, currently the way our red light camera violations operate."
- Kay: "Okay. Just to cut to the point I'm trying to get at. There has been and have been in my district, people that travel to the Chicago area who have had bad experiences with cameras. And the administrative process, as you know, doesn't allow this particular person who has, or they think has been inappropriately ticketed, to confront their accuser. Is that not correct?"
- Currie: "I think that's right, but you... but you... a policeman, retired or active, has to verify the results of the automated camera and while that person is not someone that's going to come before the administrative law judge, if there's evidence that the person who's got the ticket can show that they were not in Chicago at the time that happened or if the time was not proper, it was not accurate, then that becomes evidence that the administrative law judge will use."
- Kay: "But, Leader, isn't it true that the information that comes from the tickets and then the follow-up, so-called evidence is sometimes a week or two or three weeks later coming through the mail and so it requires the person who receives the ticket and the penalty to try and attempt to

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

recall what happened sometime after the fact and therefore their memory not... might not be the very best. And furthermore, then they can't confront their accuser because that's a camera, that we're not..."

Currie: "Right."

Kay: "...really dragging into an administrative court."

Currie: "Well, let me just say this, that my understanding from the city is that they get more complaints about improperly ticketed parking meter violations than they do red light cameras. And I think the explanation is pretty obvious, cameras tend to be pretty accurate, whereas a parking meter person may well punch in a wrong number, and so somebody could be caught up in a parking meter problem, no matter what city you're...

Kay: "Right."

Currie: "...talking about. And the experience so far in Chicago, with the red light cameras has not led to a deluge or barrage of people who come in and say that couldn't have been my car; I wasn't there. I've never left the... the outskirts of Monee, Illinois."

Kay: "Leader, just one final question. I think it's a constitutional right for everyone to be able to confront their accuser. Is that not correct?"

Currie: "Yes."

Kay: "And..."

Currie: "This is not a criminal proceeding however, Representative..."

Kay: "Well, but..."

Currie: "...this is a civil proceeding."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Kay: "Right. I... know, I... I understand that, but do they still not have the right to confront the person who is sighting them for a violation?"
- Currie: "You... we... there's a right to contest. And you can take an action to Circuit Court if you are... are not given the remedy you hope for before the administrative law judge."
- Kay: "I think my concern with this is that technology, what it is, there is a timing issue here, and my concern is that you... you can't question or cross-examine a camera. And I understand that and your... your answer to me is good that there are police verifications. But I think we have an issue here, and I think it's a constitutional one, and for that very reason I'm going to have to vote 'no' for this, Leader. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Speaker Lyons. And based on the response a little bit ago, may I... will the... will Speaker Currie yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "She can be occasionally Speaker Currie. She doesn't come up here too often, but she can fit the bill when she has to, Representative Moffitt. Please proceed."
- Moffitt: "Thank you. Just, Leader, for our discussion, I haven't actually heard this... you say this, but a ticket under this provision it... it would not go on a per... person's record, would it? It would be considered an administrative ticket as opposed to a moving violation."
- Currie: "That's exactly right. It will not go on the record.

 The only problem one could encounter, when it comes to driving privileges, is that if there are five outstanding

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

tickets. If you haven't paid tickets, and you got five of them, then ultimately you could lose your driver's license but this is not a criminal penalty. And in fact, the amount of the fine is a whole lot lower than it would be if a police person stopped you in a school zone and found you were speeding 8 miles an hour above the speed limit, or 11 miles an hour above the speed limit."

- Moffitt: "Has there been an increase in accidents in school zones that's led to..."
- Currie: "Yeah. And we do know as... as I think one of the other people mentioned, the problems in Chicago, we have a fatality rate from crashes, from vehicular problems, 68 percent higher than New York City's. So, 84 percent of all Chicago pedestrian crashes, doesn't count vehicles, occurred within a quarter of a mile of a school or a park, and... during that... this was during a crash study from 2005 to 2009... and during that same time there were 861 crashes involving children during school arrival and dismissal times within a quarter of a mile of the school. So, we know there is a big problem out there, a big problem."
- Moffitt: "So, it's direct response trying to address a safety issue of school children in school zones?"
- Currie: "That's exactly what this... this whole bill is all about that."
- Moffitt: "The only other thing, you've basically responded to it, because we have a lot of ques... concerns, we have a lot of constituents come with a... with the traffic tickets, where, you know, they might not have even been in Chicago. It's not their make of car, their model of car. We

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

certainly don't want that kind of inaccuracy on a... on a program like this. You're... you're convinced that because it's electronic, it's a clear picture. It would be a correct..."

Currie: "I'm told by the city that the complaints they get, a legitimate complaint, that that wasn't my car. I mean, sometimes the complaint is that I wasn't there, but it turns out my kid was driving the car."

Moffitt: "Yeah."

Currie: "But the legitimate complaints, this was not the car, are actually far lower than are the complaints that a parking ticket went to the wrong person."

Moffitt: "Okay. Well, I think this is a serious issue. We need to address it. I want to... anytime we've had a parking ticket, when we talk to lobbyists with the City of Chicago, they're always anxious to help us address it and get it taken care of, and I appreciate that. When I come up on the tollway, I know there's cameras there that are watching traffic and making sure that laws are enforced. So, legitimate concerns have been raised, but I think public safety is so very important in our school zones and therefore, I'll support it. Thank you."

Currie: "I appreciate that."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapin Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. Will the Leader yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Lady yields."

Rose: "Thank you. What year is this, Representative?"

Currie: "This would be the year 2011."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Rose: "So, Orwell was only off by 27 years when he wrote his book in 1984, which happens to be my favorite book.

Representative, we have a pretty long and not so good history with cameras on the tollway. Is that correct?"

Currie: "I... I'm really not familiar with cameras on the Tollways. I think our history in the City of Chicago with red light cameras is pretty good."

Rose: "Well, let's talk about cameras on the tollways. A few years ago they spent four years without sending out any violation notices at all, and then they send out hundreds of thousands of violations in... in a two to three week time span, leaving hundreds of thousands of citizens from all over the United States of America with no way to defend themselves for something they supposedly did years ago. much so, that the State of Minnesota's Attorney General actually reached out, threatened to sue us, on behalf of their citizens in Minnesota. You know, the tollway has the camera that operates at about 99.9 percent efficiency. Sounds pretty good, doesn't it, 99.9? That's against 400 thousand snaps a day, which means it takes 400 bad snaps a day. Four hundred bad snaps a day times a year is over 140 thousand false accused people getting tickets. Now, those of us in downstate Illinois, and unfortunately Bill Black's no longer here, have gone through this time and time again, where we get phone calls from constituents who gets tickets from Chicago. I'll tell you what, I got a guy right now from Arcola, Illinois, that unfortunately his license plate is the same as some other guy that's got the same number, but it's an environmental plate, and the tollway can't tell

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

the difference between his car and the environmental plate But once a month, whoever owns that environmental plate car runs the tollway, and my poor guy in Arcola, Illinois, gets a ticket. And I don't know how many more times we're going to do this. Representative Kay mentioned constitutional issues with respect to confronting your I'll give you another one. This is taxation without representation. You're going to have the City of Chicago City Council authorize this, and who's going to end up paying this use tax, everybody else who goes to visit. I don't believe that these things work. In fact, it's not a belief. I know these things don't work. Every... I can't tell you how many times people call my office. A little old lady... I had a little old lady who hadn't been to Chicago in 50 years, and here she is having to call me because she got some ticket from the city. Just look at the statistics from the Tollway. Look at how badly they botch their cameras. A hundred thousand-plus wrong snaps a year. With all due respect to the Leader, you know, at some point in time this is exactly what Orwell warned about. know, a... a benevolent dictator that everyone comes in the name of, you know, magnamous, oh, we're here to save the children. By the end of the day you lose all freedom. lose all freedom. If these cameras worked, okay, maybe they don't work. They don't work. Ask any downstaters who had to call the city and explain to them that their guy had never been there in 50 years. They just don't work."

Speaker Lyons: "Our final speaker will be Dennis Reboletti, and then Representative Currie to close."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

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

Speaker Lyons: "Leader yields."

Reboletti: "Leader, when this is for public safety issues, how does it help public safety when a person could run through those cameras, get the ticket and it doesn't go on their abstract? They can rack up 10 of those tickets, as long as they pay \$50, or \$100, there's no additional penalty to them. If a police officer was sitting in that school zone, isn't it correct that the punishment would be different if it went to court?"

Currie: "The punishment would be different if there were an active duty police officer catching that individual. penalty would be far higher. And I would imagine that if we find that there are many people who are doing what you suggest, that there will be efforts at those locations to add police officers. If there is revenue generated, by virtue of the use of the automated speed cameras, there will be enhanced safety activities precisely where the problems are worse. Now if you look at the red light camera experience, the experience is clear that people don't want to get tickets; they're not happy to get all those tickets and pay them and pay them. In fact, there have been very significant reductions in red light running at the intersections in Chicago where the red light cameras are in operation. Let me just say, that... that looking at... there's been a 77 percent reduction in red light running from the two years before and the two years after the red light cameras were installed. There's been a 60... 60 percent reduction in fatalities in a two-year period

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

before and the two-year period after those cameras were installed. And finally a 73 percent reduction in pedestrian fatalities from the two years before to the two years after. The reality, I believe, is that people are reasonable people and when they discover that in fact they've been speeding and endangering the lives and the safety of our school children, they'll wake up and they'll do the right thing. They will slow down."

Reboletti: "Well, I can appreciate that, Representative. I'm not sure if the motive is... is public safety and I'll... I'll discuss the revenue issue for the City of Chicago, I guess, on the first Bill, as we're discussing the trailer Bill first. But I can also tell you, as I serve on some of these task forces, as some of my colleagues have suggested that we should get rid of enhancements of penalties when it concerns narcotics delivery within a thousand feet of a school or a park because they have concerns about that and they want to remove that. But here we are, now we want to put more public safety for schools and at the same time we're talking about removing these other thousand feet protected areas. It's sort of a... it's sort of a mixed message. And so, I... I have some general concerns on that, but I'll address the revenue side. One of my concerns 'and to the Bill' is that if you were to get a ticket from a police officer in Chicago and you went to court, you would not be eliqible for supervision. You'd get a conviction on your record. You'd be looking at suspensions of your driver's license, but all this will do is give you a ticket, and as long as you pay it within the certain time

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

frame, nothing happens to your driver's history. Nothing happens to you at all except you had to pay 50 or 100 dollars. So, my suspicion is that this is more of a revenue generator than it has to do with public safety. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you. A reminder, this is the trailer Bill. reminder, also, that unlike the Illinois Toll Authority, Chicago will be required, if they're going to send tickets out, they'll be required to do so within a fairly narrow time frame. So the option of sending out thousands of years old tickets would not be available to them under this Bill. Second, it's a balance, a balance between the fact that it isn't a police officer who can swear it was you who was speeding through the... the special safety zone and making sure that we're encouraging people to slow down and make our streets saner and safer. But again, this is the trailer Bill; this specifies hours of operation around schools. It says that among the oth... the items it can be used with revenues from the program, after school programs will count, and it says that if you're speeding under 11 miles an hour above the speed limit the ticket will be \$50 rather than 100. I urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1865 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this issue, there's 63

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Members voting 'yes', 50 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Now, for something completely different. On the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, Leader Currie, you have Senate Bill 965. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 965, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Currie on..."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker..."

Speaker Lyons: "...965."

Currie: "...and Members of the House. We've pretty much discussed this Bill when we were considering the trailer Bill, but I will just reiterate that this is a Bill that is required for us to adopt if the City of Chicago, City Council, and mayor want the opportunity to protect children in parks and in schools by virtue of using automated speed enforcement cameras. We do limit the opportunity for the City Council to do that, an eighth of a mile from schools, an eighth of a mile from parks. We restrict how revenues can be used. We require frequent calibration using Illinois State Police standards, but we know all the studies show us that when you have strong enforcement, when you have strong enforcement of the speeding laws, guess what, people slow down. I gave you statistics just a moment ago about what happened after red light cameras were installed in Chicago. The same... the same can happen if we permit the speed... automatic speeding enforcement cameras, we can protect our children. We can show a significant

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

reduction in speeding, and that will lead not just to fewer fatalities, but it will lead to a lot less serious injury along the way. There are good statistics from the National Safety Transportation Administration. You can reduce crashes 20 to 25 percent for fixed speed cameras; 21 to 51 percent for those that are mobile. The idea of using revenue, to make the school zones themselves safer, seems to me to be a very strong one. Again, I would reiterate, we... Chicago can't do it unless we lift the prohibition. This is a very carefully crafted Bill that I think will improve safety for our youngsters; improve safety and sanity on the streets of the City of Chicago. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your strong 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Eddy: "How many votes are necessary for the passage here? Does this preempt home rule at all? It's not... it's not a gun Bill, so I... I think I know the answer, but I'm just kind of wondering."

Speaker Lyons: "I'm advised by the Parliamentarian this Bill will require 60 votes."

Eddy: "What's the effective date of the Bill? Is it immediate effect?"

Speaker Lyons: "July 1 of 2012, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the City Council could... to the... could I... the Speaker yield for some questions?"

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "The Speaker yield... Leader lead... Leader Currie yields."
- Eddy: "Well, I was just following the lead of several others on the floor. It's just a little confused. Now... so, the City Council of Chicago couldn't take this up until next July 1?"
- Currie: "It... they... it would have to be in Jul... be July when the City Council would consider implementing the permission.

 The reason... this is not a preemption, this is lifting the preemption."
- Eddy: "Right."
- Currie: "And you don't require extraordinary Majorities to take away preemption, it's only when you preempt in certain kinds of ways that the extraordinary Majority is required."
- Eddy: "Doesn't restrict, it expands. So, I... I get that part.

 I just wanted to check on the effective date and they have time to work that... Now, do they have a similar process? We have JCAR here, Rules and Regs, will... will that... the details of this related to the due process portions be worked out in their Legislative Body?"
- Currie: "In the City Council, I don't believe they have anything comparable to JCAR."
- Eddy: "But... but they will... the due process portions of this are their responsibility."
- Currie: "Yes. They... they would have to pass an ordinance and the mayor would have to approve the ordinance."
- Eddy: "Okay. Okay. Well, you know..."
- Currie: "And... and again, what... what we have here are limits.

 We curtail what they can do, but it may be they want to do

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

a lot less. So, for example, we say an eighth of a mile of a school or a park..."

Eddy: "Yeah."

Currie: "...they could reduce that further. We say 100... \$50 for violations up to 10 miles above the speed limit, a 100 beyond that. They could go lower. They could say 25 for the first..."

Eddy: "Right."

Currie: "...snap and 50 for the second."

Eddy: "Well, Representative, I... I got to tell you on this Bill I'm very conflicted because I generally don't like the fact that we use cameras for enforcement. I generally don't like that. However, I have, in over 30 years, witnessed countless individuals absolutely ignore school safety zones, countless times. And the truth is, especially at during certain times of the day, we're not talking about being on the interstate, and being in the wrong lane on an I-PASS, and getting a ticket sent, or we're not talking about being... We're talking about restricting it to an area where we should do everything we possibly can to protect students who sometimes do things they shouldn't do, aren't paying attention. We can we can do everything we can as far as having patrol people there, try to direct kids to the right way, but the fact of the matter is, unless motorists slow down to 20 mile an hour in those zones those students are in peril, even at 20. So, my... I want people to have proper due process. I don't want individuals from my area or the City of Chicago to be in a situation where they receive a ticket and they don't have a proper way to

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

appeal it but on the other hand, this may be the only thing that works. I was thinking about my own school. And I was thinking about the school zone in front of it and if there was a sign, and by the way, will there be signage? Is it required that they'll be signage warning people?"

Currie: "There will be signage. It's required under the statute. All of these places will also have to be posted on the city's website. But there will have to be clear signage at every place where there is an autom. an automated..."

Eddy: "So, somebody comes up on a school zone, there's a sign that say's there's a school zone, and we are also taking pictures of you if you speed through this school zone. And then if you speed through the school zone, you deserve to get a ticket and..."

Currie: "Absolutely."

Eddy: "...and you deserve it because we're talking about protecting children here."

Currie: "Absolutely right."

Eddy: "So, that's the part, I want to make sure on the due process, but I certainly support that. And in our area, in rural areas, I've asked for increased patrols. I've asked for people to... but they don't have enough people to come out and patrol those areas. I put up a sign that flashes the speed of the individual truck that's coming through. We purchased that to try and give people a subtle reminder that you're going 'x' amount of miles over, slow down. Now, while some are a little startled by it, once they realize it's just a sign that tells them it's going over

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

and there's nothing else to it, most of the time those people are going to speed through school zones ignore that. Maybe they won't ignore it, if it's going to hit them in the pocketbook. And I know this may... this may produce revenue for the City of Chicago. I don't think there's anything wrong with that. I... I also think that by limiting the use of that revenue and having people provide input for after school programs and some of those things at least it's directing it. So, I'm... I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate, but as someone who is concerned about the safety of children, I just hope we get to the point where we can get the attention of those individuals who speed through school zones. And if it takes whacking them in the wallet to do it, maybe that's what we have to do. I just want them to have due process too."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill, if I may?"

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

Franks: "Thank you. I have great respect for the Sponsor, as well as the mayor, who's putting this forward, but I rise in opposition to this Bill. And the reason I do is because a few years ago we passed red light cameras and they were sold to us to really be for a safety measure. And I voted for it at that time and I regret that I did because it's proven that it's not really helped safety. All the empirical analysis shows that it doesn't make hardly any difference at all. In some areas, there was actually more accidents; a few, it went down, but in most it didn't make

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

any difference. But what... what we did see, though, was that it was a huge money grab for the municipalities that instituted them. I do not believe that this Bill is about public safety. I believe that this Bill is a way to stock our taxpayers with more penalties and simply to raise revenue. If it... it really is a question of public safety and there are questions in the school zones we could ask our police, we could even bring State Police in to do what there's known as 'wolf packs', and to set up stings, and to do these types of things, but this to me is a blatant money grab. And understand that this is not something that's going to be like a hotel tax, if someone coming in from out of town from, you know, Indiana or something for one of our conventions, this is going to hit local taxpayers in their own neighborhoods. And it's going to hit them repeatedly. And we've heard before that there are many, many mistakes with these cameras and I think it's a nightmare that if we open up and allow this. I think we will rue the day that we start having this type of cameras dictating who's going to get a penalty and who isn't. There has to be discretion. We ought to have our law enforcement present. This is just a rotten idea that if it passes we're going to be coming back here trying to have it repealed. I encourage everyone to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jil Tracy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Tracy: "Leader Currie, could we go over the timeline for which violation... notices of violations will be mailed out to the transgressors?"

Currie: "It has to be sent out 30 days after verification of the owner of the vehicle."

Tracy: "Okay. So, that is in... within this very specific statute?"

Currie: "Right."

Tracy: "And then, also, is there anything in there that prohibits violations under this statute being used in other types of litigation?"

Currie: "No. It should not."

Tracy: "So... so, there's this... a violation under the statute could be used in other litigation?"

Currie: "Yeah. No... no. It is not... this will not be admissible in other kinds of litigation."

Tracy: "It will not be. Is that specifically within the language?"

Currie: "Sorry, the language does not address that."

Tracy: "Okay. So... so, one... so, I'm assuming then, of course, that they could use it in other litigation. Now going back to the timeline we just discussed about the 30 days, is that from the time that the vehicle is identified or from the date of the..."

Currie: "Thirty days after identification, but in no... in no case later than 90 days after the violation."

Tracy: "After the picture?"

Currie: "After the picture."

Tracy: "Okay."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Currie: "After the violation."

Tracy: "The date it was... the picture was taken."

Currie: "The day of the violation."

Tracy: "Okay. Thank you."

Currie: "So, the example we earlier heard can't happen."

Tracy: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Randy Ramey."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Ramey: "Thank you. Leader, at least listening to this discussion, you were speaking specifically of school zones and by parks. Is that correct..."

Currie: "That's right."

Ramey: "...where the cameras will be placed? Okay. And the speed limit in a school zone is?"

Currie: "I think that may vary. I don't know what it is."

Ramey: "Twenty miles an hour."

Currie: "Well, okay. Twenty miles an hour."

Ramey: "But that... not around a school... but not around a park."

Currie: "I believe that is right. I... I don't actually know."

Ramey: "Okay."

Currie: "But... but the idea is that within an eighth of a mile of a school, an eighth of a mile of a park there would be the opportunity, should the City Council want to do it, to establish an automated speed camera."

Ramey: "So, but on a school zone speed limit sign it also says, 'On school days when children are present'."

Currie: "Right. This would..."

Ramey: "Is that defined in the Bill?"

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Currie: "...this could... and the City Council could decide to do it that way. This instead says from 6:00 in the morning until Monday through Thursday 8:30 at night, which is curfew, and on Fridays 6 a.m. to 9:00, which is Friday curfew, then this will be enforced. We have... we have lots of after school programs in the City of Chicago, a lot of kids playing sports. This would not apply on nonschool days. So, holidays, Saturdays, and Sundays are not covered, but on school days we have a larger window."

Ramey: "They're not covered by the camera?"

Currie: "Right. Right. The cameras are only in operation on school days between the hours of, as I say, 6 'til 8:30 or in the case of Friday, 6 until 9."

Ramey: "But the school zone limit is only in effect from 7 a.m. 'til 4 p.m.. So, you're saying they're going to go outside of those parameters for the cameras to be working so... but there will be different school... I mean, speed limits for those hours."

Currie: "No. No. No, no, no. All I'm saying is that whatever the speed limit is the enforcement could happen on a school day from 6 in the morning until curfew, only on school days, not on Saturdays, not on Sundays, not on holidays."

Ramey: "Right. That's when children are present. But the...
here's what I'm getting at, Representative."

Currie: "Well..."

Ramey: "Having worked in the Secretary of State's Office for 13 years, people are not quite sure what 'when children are present' means. Do they have to see them or do they have to be in school that day? Does this Bill clarify that?"

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Currie: "No. This Bill just says there has to be strong signage telling people that there is a real risk if a camera catches them speeding that they're going to owe a significant fine. The point here is to tell them to slow down."

Ramey: "And I agree with that purpose is to make sure that people are slowing down 'cause we have those signs and people tend to ignore them and they don't understand what they mean because of the way that the language is used on those signs. Who pays for these signs or... and these cameras?"

Currie: "The city will."

Ramey: "They will pay for the signs to post for this..."

Currie: "Yes."

Ramey: "...and the cameras to go up?"

Currie: "Yes."

Ramey: "There will be... there is no company that uses... will be watching the videos for... on those cameras that goes directly to the police stations in the local areas?"

Currie: "I... no, I don't know whether it goes to the police station or the City Department of Transportation. There will have to be a report or the... that video will have to be examined by a police officer or a retired police officer before the ticket can be given."

Ramey: "Correct. And is that video also available online for the person to see?"

Currie: "Yes."

Ramey: "Before they go in for the actual... a hearing?"

Currie: "Yes. Oh, yes."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Ramey: "Yes."

Currie: "So, it will have to be on... online so you can have a look and see if it really did look like your Buick or whether it looked like somebody else's Prius."

Ramey: "Correct. Thank you for answering those questions."

Speaker Lyons: "We have two final speakers. Representative Art

Turner and Representative D'Amico will be last.

Representative Turner."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Turner: "Just a couple quick questions. What... what would be a defense? I know with the red light cameras, you... you're sent a video of yourself running the red light or doing some violation, but with the speed and... and with the speed cameras it would just say... you would get a ticket that says you were speeding in this zone?"

Currie: "It'll tell you by how many miles. There will be some kind of calibration in the pavement that when you go over that... that whatever it is strip that will identify how fast you're going. I mean you... for example, one of the former speakers talked about those signs. You know, you're driving along and there's an electronic sign and it says you're going... this is a 40 mile an hour..."

Turner: "Right."

Currie: "...zone and they clock you at 55. That... this will operate the same way. So, the camera will identify how fast you were going."

Turner: "So, I can't... I can't necessarily look at a video of myself speeding online and argue with the camera speed.

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

It's just... I guess my only argument would be that the camera wasn't calibrated correctly or something like that?"

Currie: "Well, it's just like radar, Representative. You know, radar works the same way. The cop comes along and they say by the time the cop catches you you've slow down, but the cop has radar to show that you were going 65 in that 55 mile an hour zone. So, this is really quite analogous to that, quite comparable."

Turner: "So, I would be... I would be arguing against the radar and that seems like a real uphill battle but..."

Currie: "Yeah."

Turner: "And... and if I... if I appeal and say that the radar, I...

I believe that it's not calibrated correctly... we'll get some... the city officials will take that request seriously and go back out and check that recording upon my request?"

Currie: "They... they could, but we are requiring very regular, very frequent calibrations using the standards that are set by the Illinois State Police."

Turner: "Okay."

Currie: "So, the calibration, that's always an issue. So, we're requiring that to happen very frequently with each of the cameras using very strong standards so that the chances of them making that kind of error, just like radar, not so great."

Turner: "And as I understand how they'll be implemented, some of... many of the red light cameras in the city will be retrofitted with speed cameras to..."

Currie: "I don't know if that's their plan or not."

Turner: "Okay. Well, I think that's what I got from the city."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Currie: "But... but I can tell you that red light cameras have very effectively reduced speeding, reduced crashes, and reduced fatalities more than 70 percent across the city.

Reductions in..."

Turner: "So, if I sped through... I'm sorry... if I sped through a red light camera that was al... that also had the speed zone camera on it, as well, would I be eligible for two tickets?

A red light ticket and a speeding ticket."

Currie: "Running a red light is already two different violations. I... my... I thought they were going to use different cameras 'cause they're going to have to do different things on the pavement, I believe, for calibrating by how much you were going too fast."

Turner: "So, I would be eligible for two tickets."

Currie: "Right now, right."

Turner: "Okay."

Currie: "So, don't do it."

Turner: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "To the Bill."

Turner: "I understand the public safety aspect of this Bill and why the mayor wants it. And you know, one kid getting hurt, one death in a school or by a park is too many, but I... I really think we rushed this thing. I... I'm not sure if this is the best approach, but this is what's needed. And I guess I'm going to support the Bill, but I... I still have some reservations about it. I'm not sure. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Our final speaker will be Representative D'Amico and then Representative Currie to close."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the legislation. And I want to commend the Sponsor on all of the hard work that she's done on this Bill. The bottom line is with... with these cameras... these cameras do work despite what some of the other sp... speakers have said. They force us to be better drivers on the road. They force us to pay attention. They force us to slow down when we come to intersections and now around schools. And the bottom line is it's going to make our roads a little bit safer. And if we can do something like that here and give the City Council that ability to make our roads and school zones safer, I think we need to do it. We... we voted on this legislation like this before in construction zones and it went over... it went out of this House with unan... almost unanimous support. So, I strongly urge an 'aye' vote and I urge an 'aye' vote for safety. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Reminder, this only applies to the City of Chicago. Without this legislation the city could not decide to find a way to keep our kids safer when they're in their schools and when they're in our parks at play. People have suggested this is a revenue raiser rather than a safety issue. Let me tell you, the... the automated speed cameras in the City of Baltimore account for less than one percent of the city budget and in Seattle it's less than one hundredth of one percent of the city budget. So, I don't think we're talking about a major revenue raiser here and remember any money that comes in has to be spent on after school programs and on making our

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

school areas safer from traffic problems. People are concerned, gee, this is going to hit somebody hard. It's only going to hit you hard if you're speeding. This is not about people who are driving safely, people who are driving sanely. It's only about people who are going too fast. Help me protect our children. Help the City of Chicago create streets that are safer, streets that are saner, and children who are not the victims of car crashes, are not cut down in their year... early years on their way to and from school. Please vote 'yes'."

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 965 pass?'
 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr.
 Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 64 Members voting 'yes', 50 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, on page 3 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, is Senate Bill 1992. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1992, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie on Senate Bill 1992."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. You'll remember that we adopted work rule changes and other provisions affecting the operation of conventions at McCormick Place in the City of Chicago. There was a lawsuit filed objecting to some of the changes we had made

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

in the statute and a federal judge said, in fact, there had some violations of the Federal National Relations Act. There have been since, discussions between those union groups and the McPier Authority, and the people who run the convention programs. They have entered into a settlement agreement and that settlement agreement, I believe, is filed with the Il... Illinois Secretary of State. This legislation makes some changes so as to be responsive to the settlement agreement. One of them has to do with the provisions that mandated employee pay for Saturdays, Instead, pay will be based on Sundays, and holidays. collective bargaining agreements and it repeals provision that all stewards are working stewards and there may not be more than one working steward per building. It... this would give the Authority the discretion to modify the straight time window, Monday through Friday for the that's performed by car... carpenters. work Other jurisdictions would stick with the original rule. And in addition, there are two other changes. We asked the Authority to put jurisdictional decisions in writing and require that the work rules apply not just at McCormick Place but also at Navy Pier, which also, of course, is governed and run by the McPier Authority. I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I hope you will join me in supporting the settlement reached between management, the general contractors that operate at McCormick Place, and union organizations."

82nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Senate Bill 1992. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor awaits your question, Sir."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much. Leader Currie, there's been a lot of conversation about this particular Bill, this particular issue. So, based on the changes that have been adopted by, I guess, the feuding sides, can we expect that more conventions will now come to McCormick Place as a result?"
- Currie: "I believe we can. Certainly, that is the expectation.

 Certainly, that is the goal."
- Davis, W.: "So, as I've heard, not necessarily read, but heard with regard to some of the changes that we're talking about, if I'm a... if I'm a participant in a convention that if I pull my car up to the curb and want to unload things that I may have the ability to do it, I don't have to wait on someone to do it, things of that nature. Are... are those the kind of changes that we're talking about?"
- Currie: "And those are the changes we made in last year's legislation. And those changes are not affected by this legislation."
- Davis, W.: "They're not affected by it."
- Currie: "So, you'll still be able to do that."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. With regard to the cost of... of things and sometimes when you participate in a convention the cost of obtaining goods or services are sometimes elevated. Is that reflected in anyway in this?"

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Currie: "We made changes along that line, again, in last year's legislation and that's not changed by virtue of passage of Senate Bill 1992."

Davis, W.: "Okay. My... my last question would be one of probably my own observations as it relates to union employees down at McCormick Place is that they're not very reflective of diversity or minority populations. Will this speak in anyway to encourage those groups to allow more minorities who are in those unions to be able to have the ability to work at McCormick Place?"

Currie: "I... I don't think that this legislation directly addresses that issue."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ken Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, our colleague here, Will Davis, asked some... some very good questions. Questions that I certainly want to answer... to... to ask. My question is about the diversity issue. I know this Bill addresses work rules, stipulations, et cetera, which a lot of us would support because we want to see vibrant economic opportunity here in this state and certainly in our city, but there is a real underlying issue as it relates to African Americans and Latinos, and women working at McCormick Place in the very unions that are mentioned. The trade unions such as carpenters, such as riggers, such as the decorators, such as the electrical workers, such as the Teamsters, that is a

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

real issue that a number of... of constituents in my district and probably many other districts, as well, have a real concern with. Is there a way that we can add an Amendment or some additional language that will help assure that there is real equitable participation for black and Latino and women to participate in the trades at McCormick Place?"

Currie: "I think it's late for an Amendment to this Bill, but my recollection is that there already are affirmative action requirements that apply to the management at McCormick Place and at Navy Pier. They are required to encourage diversity and they're required to report to us on an annual basis and I believe there are Members of this Assembly who traditionally have been part of the advisory groups that are giving some help and encouragement and also pointing to appropriate paths to the management at McCormick Place and McPier."

Dunkin: "Sure. The Bill requiring or mandating encouragement is one thing but I think, since we are on the same page of trying to encour... increase participation from companies and businesses and trade shows to come to our great state, I think we... we need to be that much more... much more aggressive than we have been now and going forward with real participation. I mean, if you have... every... there's not one town hall meeting or community meeting or some communication when I mention McCormick Place or Navy Pier, for that matter, that the... the inevitable question comes about of participation and the trade unions at McCormick Place and their lack of black and Latino and women participating in the jobs. As a matter of fact, there is...

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

I understand there is a substantial amount of Indiana residents who work at McCormick Place in these unions because of the insurance is relatively inexpensive, about 30, 40 percent low and so, Illinoisans are also separated from that. But I think now is the time, and I don't see an overwhelming amount of sense of urgency or rush, we need to address this issue other than simply pushing favor to the same trade unions who are not... who are not being fair to... to Illinois residents."

Currie: "Let me just make the point that we cannot mandate quotas. We do have goals for participation of members of minority groups and people who are winning in the activities of McCormick Place and Navy Pier. And I guess I would encourage you to sign up for the advisory committee to make sure that the administration is pressing those issues and not just sitting on the sidelines."

Dunkin: "I agree wholeheartedly. Do you have the numbers of Teamsters and the carpenters, in particular, and what their minority participation is?"

Currie: "I do not."

Dunkin: "Can we get that information before we vote on this Bill?"

Currie: "I'm sure we can... I'm sure... I'm sure we can get them.

We will ask the people from McCormick Place and the show
managers to supply that information to us."

Dunkin: "Can we get that before we vote on this Bill?"

Currie: "No. We're voting on this now."

Dunkin: "Representative, I think the issue that I'm raising is a significant issue and it needs to be addressed at all

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

levels of government at... at the local level, certainly at the federal level, and definitely right here. And none of us want to be a part of an impasse towards progress of business coming to Illinois but this issue is not going It's just like we ignore the bankers and their excessive behaviors of fees and sort of getting around what it is that they should have been doing. This is a live issue, especially during these ec... these difficult economic times where we should not be allowing the trade unions at Place to continue their McCormick practice discrimination of women, of taxpaying citizens, who happen to be black and Latino, in particular. That is a real and sev... a severe problem at McCormick Place that needs to be addressed. So, I would like for us to hold off voting on this Bill until they can give us a forensic of what actually is going on in the trade unions at McCormick Place and Navy Pier and their black, Latino, and women participation in the trades. Because the nepotism and the favoritism that too many of the unions are talking about and even... I've met with black journeymen with 12 to 25 years of experience and they are not working on average. Sometimes they're doing four hours a day. Sometimes they're not even called for weeks. This is a serious issue, Representative. Thank you."

Currie: "I shar... I share your concern. We will get the numbers."

Speaker Lyons: "Repres... Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "This is important legislation if we want to continue bringing trade shows to McCormick Place. This represents

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

an agreement, a settlement of a lawsuit that if we don't settle it would make it much more difficult for all those groups to decide to choose Chicago rather than our competitors in Las Vegas and Orlando. I urge your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's recommendation to pass Senate Bill 1992. This Bill will take 71 votes. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative D'Amico, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', 3 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Tom Cross, on page 4 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 512. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 512, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Cross, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "It's my understanding, Ladies and Gentlemen, there'll be no vote on this Bill. This is only to move the Amendment onto the Bill and then put the Bill on Third Reading. Representative Cross moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

82nd Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Frank Mautino, on Senate Bills-Second Reading, on page 6 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 2458. Mr. Clerk, what's the status on that Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2458, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Mautino."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mautino on Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2458."
- Mautino: "Thank you. This appropriates \$10,806,400 and 2... \$225.5 million for the offices... Excuse me. This is the money for the office of the Regional Superintendent of Schools. We passed that legislation and this gives the authority. It required both an approp. and a substantive Bill. Ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy, do you want to address the Amendment? Okay. All those in favor for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Mautino."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Frank Mautino on Floor Amendment #3."

82nd Legislative Day

- Mautino: "Okay. The information that I just explained to you is actually Amendment #3, which is a gut and replace. And so, it's all rolled in there and this is the funding for the Regional Office of Superintendents again. We liked it so much, we ran it twice. I'd ask for adoption of Amendment 3."
- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. And read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2458, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mautino on Senate Bill 2458."
- Mautino: "Thank you. This is the actual appropriation Bill, which will allow for the payment of the Regional Offices of Superintendent of Schools. It covers their salaries... salaries, benefits, and their operational costs for their offices. And it has a \$10.8 million appropriation line and... and a \$2.2 million appropriation line. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Senate Bill 2458. Are there any questions? Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 2458 vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This Bill requires 71 votes. And the rec... the record is open. Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'.

82nd Legislative Day

- Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill, there are 75 Members voting 'yes', 30 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jerry Mitchell, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Mitchell, just for an announcement."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mitchell for an announcement."
- Mitchell, J.: "Just for the downstate Republican Members. The Downstate Caucus meeting tonight has been postponed due to the lateness of the hour. We've already taken care of the bus. We will reschedule at a later date to be announced. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Arroyo, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to let you know that on Senate Bill 1992 I was voted as a 'no' and I meant to vote 'yes' on that Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes, Representative."
- Arroyo: "Bad switch."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang, on page 3 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, you have Senate Bill 1849. Read the Bill, Mr. Mr. Clerk, what's the status on that Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1849 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

82nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. And what's the status?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lou Lang on... on Amendment #3."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would recommend we simply adopt Amendment 3 and debate it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments, but several notes have been requested on the Bill as amended by Amendment #3 and have not been filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Mr. Speaker, could we review those fiscal notes. The last I saw the fiscal note request was related to Amendment #2. So, we... Amendment #3 is now on the Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "We have a state mandates note requested for Amendment 3, a Home Rule note requested for Amend...

 Amendment #3, a Home Rule note for the Bill as introduced, a state mandates note for the Bill as introduced, and a fiscal note for the Bill as introduced."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Mr. Speaker, I will move that the note requests be held inapplicable."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang moves that the notes be held inapplicable. I'll put that to a vote. All those in favor of... all those in favor of holding the notes inapplicable vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Currie, Dunkin, Franks, Golar, May, Morrison, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there are 62 Members voting 'yes', 49 Members voting 'no'. And the notes are held inapplicable. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Move the Bill to Third Reading, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, seeing no further Motions on that Bill, move the Bill to the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1849, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Deputy Leader Lou Lang on Senate Bill 1849."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, in May of this year after 20 years of work the Illinois House and Senate both passed a Gaming Bill that never made it to the Governor's desk for various reasons, but it did pass both the House and the Senate. It passed the House with 65 votes, passed the Senate with 30 votes. Subsequent to the passage of that Bill, the Governor of the State of Illinois and others made public comment as to some of the criticisms they might have with that piece of legislation. And as a result of those comments there was a decision made not to send that Bill to the Governor's desk to give us a chance to negotiate with the Governor's Office. During the months

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

of June, July, August, and September, there were many meetings held involving myself and the Governor, involving Senators Link and Cullerton with the Governor, some singly, some collectively and each of those meetings lasted in excess of two hours. So there were many hours of meetings, but at no time, Ladies and Gentlemen, at no time during any of those meetings was there a single moment of negotiation. Oh, there was a lot of talk; there were a lot of ideas thrown around, but no negotiation. And so those of us who thought that gaming expansion was in the best interest of the taxpayers of the State of Illinois to create jobs and economic development and new revenue for our state and to stop the stream of people to other states to spend their money, we were forced to negotiate amongst ourselves in the blind. And what we had going for us was... were comments the Governor may have made to us, comments the chairman of the Gaming Board made in public, comments that newspapers made public, comments that the Governor made the newspapers, and we didn't take those comments lightly. Bill before you today evidences our concern and takes a good Bill that passed here in May and makes it better. This Bill provides less gaming and more oversight. Bill provides more power to the Illinois Gaming Board and less to the imagination. This Bill provides more dollars for capital development for the Springfield fairgrounds in exchange for no racing at the Springfield fairgrounds. takes gambling out from our airports. It makes our gaming... the gaming expansion smaller and even with the smaller gaming will provide over a billion dollars for the payment

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

of old bills; and Ladies and Gentlemen, you know well we have many billions of dollars of old bills in the State of Illinois. This will provide a billion dollars-plus and a billion dollars a year, perhaps, of new dollars for capital, for education, for the things we want to do to improve the State of Illinois. This is a Bill that will create 100 thousand new jobs in our state and save 40 thousand jobs in the horse racing industry. Ladies and Gentlemen, you know that at its core horse racing is agribusiness. It involves breeders and trainers and feed growers and agribusiness people all over our state, but particularly in central and southern Illinois where our unemployment rate is massive, into the teens. What are we going to do about that? One thing we should not do is continue to allow jobs to leak out of our state and go to places like Louisiana and Delaware, places that should not have a horse racing industry as good as ours, but that's where our jobs are going. And what was the Governor's response to that two weeks ago when he laid out what he called the framework for gaming? His response was, no, I'm interested in agribusiness jobs in the State Illinois; no, I'm not interested in helping central and southern Illinois; no, even though they're already gambling at racetracks we're going to count these as new casinos in the State of Illinois. How ridiculous. How absurd. anyone among us, even those who will vote 'no' today, can anyone among us really think that adding some slot machines at a place that they're already gambling creates some sort of huge expansion of gambling that should frighten us?

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Those of you who are from central and southern Illinois, those of you who are from the ag communities, aren't you angry at this slap in the face? Doesn't it concern you that the Chief Executive of our state, one who has talked about job creation, one who has talked about economic development, and who campaigned on these issues, would stand at a microphone and the part of the Bill that most affects you he said that's the first thing that needs to The first thing that the Governor said was no help for our agribusiness people, no help for central and southern Illinois, no help for you. You're on your own. You're on your own. Oh, we'll continue to cut jobs in your communities; we'll close facilities in your communities, and so instead of helping you keep jobs, we're going to cut jobs in your communities. Would make me angry if I lived in central Illinois and here I am a Legislator from Cook County, no farms in my community, but I take my title seriously as a State Representative not just representing a little over a hundred thousand people in the 16th District but 13 million people in the State of Illinois as all of you do. The Governor said in his comments a couple of weeks ago, well, I represent the people. Those folks down there in the General Assembly with three loaves of bread under each arm from the lobbyists, they only represent their friends, but I represent the people. Let me give you a message, Governor, and it's a message that most people on this floor can send, I was elected the same day you were and in my district I got more votes than you did. Ladies and Gentlemen... Ladies and Gentlemen, gaming at its core is

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

about jobs; it's about economic development. Aren't you tired of watching cars and busloads of people leave our state to spend their money in Indiana and Missouri and Iowa and Wisconsin, costing us jobs and creating jobs in all the surrounding states? Even with this Bill, Ladies Gentlemen, for all of this discussion, for all of discussion of this huge expansion of gambling, this Bill only provides for five new venues for gambling in the State of Illinois. Five new venues: Danville, Rockford, Chicago, Park City and somewhere in the south suburbs, five new Every other place that this pla... this Bill provides for gaming already has gaming, but we took the Governor and his comments seriously. We gave authority to the Illinois Gaming Board. We gave supreme authority over the Chicago enterprise. We gave them complete review of contracts. We gave them the opportunity make the State Police be involved in the enforcement. We did all the things the Gaming Board asked We're giving them massive amounts of money to increase their head counts to regulate gaming in Illinois. And for all of my problems with the Gaming Board, and they are public, for all of my problems with the Gaming Board, they need to be applauded for keeping corruption out of gaming in Illinois. But even yet today the chairman of the Gaming Board is telling us this is not a good piece of legislation and the very same day he did that, representative of the Gaming Board in the Senate was sitting in a Senate Committee and filed a slip saying the Gaming Board has no position on this Bill. Now which is

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

it? Which is it? The pontifications of the chairman of the Gaming Board that hasn't even read the Bill or are we going to decide public policy? In this state, regulators don't decide public policy, Legislators decide public policy. This Bill is a Bill for our taxpayers; it's a Bill to create jobs; it's a Bill to improve Illinois. Sixty-five of you voted for it last time. Let's send a strong message that we do public policy in this chamber. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "To the Bill. I stand in opposition to this Bill. We have debated this issue for years if not decades and the economic consequences of having this type of gambling expansion is significant for the State of Illinois. It's a regressive tax. It disproportionately affects poor people. It cannibalizes off of existing revenue in the casinos that are already there, and it essentially relies on the gambling losses of Illinois citizens. The only way that the state collects money off of a Gambling Bill is if Illinois citizens go to casinos and lose money. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, a few years ago we passed legislation in this chamber to completely ban casino gambling in the State of Illinois. And so at that time we had a discussion and we had an argument and a recognition of the consequences and the losses associated with this. This is not without significant, detrimental consequences economically and socially, and we should not forget that as we rush to try to find additional revenue in whatever source we may. So, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Body, I appreciate the frustration of the speaker. I respect his position in this matter. I respect his frustration with the administration over the way that he feels that he's been handled, but at the end of the day we have to decide what kind of state we're going to have and whether or not it's going to be a big-time gambling state or whether or not we're going to continue to limit gambling within the State of Illinois. On that, I would ask for a 'no' vote and I would also call for a verification."

Speaker Lyons: "Your verification is so noted, Representative.

Representative Hays."

Havs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Bill. When the original gaming legislation came before this Body two decades ago, the criteria was supposed to be to reach out and assist communities in economic distress, yet some communities were passed over. community of Danville, Illinois, who unfortunately more than once in that time frame has had unemployment of 18 to 20 percent, was passed over. This is not about gaming in any way. In Vermilion County, this is about jobs. This is about the 750 jobs that it will bring to east central Illinois. This is about the median income plus benefits for those jobs that is much higher than the median income the citizens at large. This is about the 350 construction jobs in Illinois. The people from our locals are leaving and driving across the state line to Indiana every day, to Terre Haute, to Evansville, as Kentucky to get work. This will bring the work back home where it belongs. Ten thousand people have left the

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

community of Danville over the last three decades. Companies like GM, 3500 employees; GE, and the list goes on and on. Twenty-nine percent of the citizenry of the community is gone. Twenty-five percent of the citizenry in We are located downstate. the county is gone. cannibalize no one. We have studies that indicate that 65 percent of the revenue will come back across the state line from Indiana into Illinois. What a wonderful dynamic that would be in this era. The revenue for the state is needed. The revenue for our local community is going to be shared in a very creative way. The City of Danville, the local community college, the county of Vermilion, every public school in our county will share in the revenue, the ag community benefits. I am asking for your support. not okay to pass over communities like Danville. It's not okay to pass over communities like Rockford. It is high time that everyone gets a share. I appreciate your support. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Linda Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. You know, it's interesting enough, earlier, one of our colleagues mentioned jobs, okay. Let's look at how this... this Bill for the casinos was created, and why it was created, and where we're at today, and how it's not doing what it needs to do as far as the jobs. We in Aurora, and I have a casino, and I stand in strong opposition to the Leader on this Bill, but we're down 25 percent. You know, there's only so many people in the State of Illinois that want to go to the casinos and creating more casinos doesn't

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

necessarily mean we're going to get more people in the State of Illinois to go to those casinos. What's it... it's going to mean that they drag away customers from the casinos and what the purpose of the original piece of legislation produced probably around 20 years ago has tried to create in certain cities throughout the State of Illinois. So, I stand in strong opposition. I also want to say for you... those that don't understand, the Governor is not going to sign this Bill. He already said he was in opposition of this Bill. So, no, he's not going to sign the So... so, be cautious on your vote on this because, you know, taking a vote now and knowing the Governor's not going to sign it, I think what we need to do is come back the table and make sure everybody's a part of discussion. And as I said, I have a casino. I know it's... it's difficult to be in a position where a few of us have casinos and to see them now start to go downhill and lose revenue and understand that we're going to be producing other casinos. Jobs for the meantime, but what's that mean to the other casinos that are already in place. That's very difficult to see because what's going to happen is the same thing to those new casinos that's happening to the casinos that are existing right now. And I also want to say that I'm in strong support for a Chicago casino. think if we could have a general consensus that we'd like to do something in Chicago, I'd be all for that, but right now, as the Bill stands, I'm in strong opposition."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis."

82nd Legislative Day

- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Sponsor a question, if..."
- Speaker Lyons: "We'll get him back for you, Representative Davis."
- Davis, W.: "...if he'll indulge me for..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang, I think there's an inquiry here on your legislation. So, the speaker yields and awaits your questions."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Lang, I was reading the analysis and there's a lot of information about minority participation, but one thing that I didn't see, and I'd just like to ask this question for the record is, it doesn't speak to ownership in any way at least not what I'm reading. So is there something that speaks to ownership, not just vendors or construction companies or anything like that, but about ownership in any way, shape or form?"
- Lang: "We believe that in the legislation, and we will get you the information, Representative, but we believe it calls for minority ownership goals of 25 and 5 percent female ownership, and it's on page 282 of the original Bill."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I think the question with regard to that is, how does it come together? Because I've had a conversation with a gentleman that represents a group of African Americans that were interested in participating in minority ownership on the Des Plaines or I think it's called the Rivers Casino. And I don't know if there is ownership on that one, but they were kind of turned away and said, well, think about the next gaming Bill if there's going to be

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

one. So, I... so, with any of this, it's about how do we enforce and make sure that these kinds of things happen. So if there are provisions for ownership, how do we ensure that it indeed does happen on one if not more of these facilities?"

Lang: "Well, firstly, constitutionally, it would be improper to mandate those numbers. And so, in the Gaming Board's mandate under the original statute, one of the... there's a lot of criteria, dozen, dozens of them, I think, that the Gaming Board has to review before they give anybody a license. One of those criteria is meeting these goals. And so the Gaming Board is the backstop between having the minority participation and not having the minority participation. There are also... there's also goals set in the statute not only for ownership but for vendors and contractors. And so, as you know, a gaming enterprise has dozens of different contracts, people that sell liquor, glassware, chips, napkins, forks, dozens and dozens and dozens of contracts, and also dozens of contracts for building. All of these things have to be reviewed by the Gaming Board before the Gaming Board will provide somebody a license."

Davis, W.: "I guess... I think the question then is whether or not we have any faith and confidence in the Gaming Board to kind of ensure that these things happen, and you don't have to answer that question, more rhetorical than anything."

Lang: "Well, let me just... I will just say this, this is not an answer; it's just a comment. The Governor, in his wisdom, has just appointed a brand new Gaming Board. The only

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

person who was reappointed was the chairman, and the Senate will soon decide if these people will be confirmed, but we're going to have a new Gaming Board and hopefully a new look at how these things should go."

"Well, let's certainly hope so. Davis, W.: Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I stand in support of legislation because, if for no other reason, it finally has inclusion relative to the south suburbs, and that they should have a facility somewhere in the south suburbs. of the previous speaker's talked about loads of buses. Well, in my area, we see those buses traveling east on the interstate going into Indiana. That's something that we The south suburbs is the last bastion have to deal with. against gamblers going to Indiana. And it's clear, we've seen the statistics and I've seen it personally, where if you go to a facility in Indiana and drive through the parking lot you see a plethora of Illinois license plates. So, why not give them the opportunity to gamble if that's what they choose to do in the State of Illinois. I think it's important that the south suburbs be included in this, and I'm certainly happy that the Sponsor has recognized that and that others have decided that the south suburbs must be included in this particular piece of legislation. Now, myself, I'm not a gambler in any way. I probably, like most of you, have probably gone to Las Vegas, taken 15, 20, maybe even a hundred dollars, and gone to the casinos just to have a little fun. But I think the distinction that needs to be made is, Las Vegas is a destination point. People go there to have fun. So, for those of you who are

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

concerned about the same Illinois people gambling and gambling their dollars away, we have to work harder to attract more individuals to the State of Illinois. So we must treat Illinois as a gambling or a gaming destination so that there's more to do at... in and around these facilities than just sitting at a slot machine or at a craps table, whatever the case may be. There should be shows, there should be excitement, there should be fun. So, if we want to be concerned about people gambling and spending their money, let's work to try to bring more people to the State of Illinois. One of the greatest, greatest tools that we have in the State of Illinois is People come to Illinois. They come to Chicago tourism. because it's a great place to visit. Well, while they're here visiting, why not give them the opportunity to go to a gaming facility and spend some of their money if that's what they choose to do. So we have to take the onus on suggesting that only people in Illinois and people that live in Illinois are the only ones that would go to a gaming facility. Let's work, let's put more money in tourism. Let's do whatever we have to do to be able to attract more people, and hopefully, hopefully, with a facility in the south suburbs, if you drive through a parking lot of the Illinois facility, hopefully what we'll see are many Indiana license plates in the parking lot which means they're bringing their dollars over to our state. And I think that's something that we have to think about and we have to do more of. So, again, I stand in

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

support of this Bill and would encourage others to do the same. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some questions for the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman awaits your questions, Representative."

Harris, D.: "Representative, my primary interest in the gaming Bill is with horse racing, and specifically the slot machines at racetracks. And I understand that once again, the slot machines are placed at the racetracks in Illinois as they were in Senate Bill 744. Is that correct?"

Lang: "That is correct, Sir."

Harris, D.: "Help me understand then. If the Governor primarily said in his... he didn't have the... he never saw 744, but he came out and said I do not believe that there should be slot machines at the racetracks, and he was very public and very vocal and very adamant about that. Slot machines at the racetracks are in this Bill, what's going to change the Governor's mind?"

Lang: "Well, Representative, I would make several comments. First, I don't... I hope the Governor will change his mind, but irrespective of whether he changes his mind, I want this chamber and the chamber across the hall just to simply do the right thing. The Governor chooses to do the wrong thing, that's the Governor's choice, and we will have a chance, if he does the wrong thing, to take care of that problem in this chamber. But more importantly, the Governor laid out in his framework, a couple of weeks ago,

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

several items that he was concerned about. Many of them are in this Bill. Almost all of them are in this Bill. And so, I am hoping that with a very strong support of this House, particularly if we can get the 71 or more votes, and we can do the same in the Senate with a very strong vote of 36 or more, we will say to the Governor, we accepted some of your framework, we made the Bill better. This is a better Bill. And I'm hoping he will then say, all right, I'm going to compromise on the issue of slot machines at racetracks. Now, the Governor's comments about this issue lead one to believe that he thinks that there's not already gambling going on at racetracks because he counts them as new casinos. Well, I guess, technically that's correct, but there isn't a person on this floor that really thinks that putting a slot machine in Arlington Park or Balmoral Park or Hawthorne Park is adding any casino. We already have gambling at those facilities, as you well know, Sir."

- Harris, D.: "Right. Thank you for your explanation. Did the Bill... was the Bill addressed in the Senate just recently?"
- Lang: "They did not vote on it, but they have a subject matter hearing on it, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "Oh, I thought they had voted on it. Okay. Thank you. Let me turn my attention for just a second to Chicago and the Chicago casino. It's my understanding that in this Bill you creat... or there is created something known as the Chicago Casino Development Authority. Is that correct?"

Lang: "That's correct, Sir."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

- Harris, D.: "And that Authority is in-between the Gaming Board, above the Gaming Board, below the Gaming Board, how does that fit in?"
- Lang: "When we passed the original Bill... when I say original Bill, I mean 744, the Bill we passed in May... that Bill was crystal clear that the Illinois Gaming Board is supreme over all, and that the Illinois Casino Authority only existed to take in recommendations, to go through potential gaming operators, to look at potential vendors, and to make recommendations to the Gaming Board for their approval. That's what the Bill said."

Harris, D.: "Right."

- Lang: "This Bill... this Bill, because there's been so much public comment about this and so much misunderstanding, takes what was already crystal clear and makes it more crystal and more clear."
- Harris, D.: "Why don't we then have a Rockford Casino Development Authority or a... or any of the other... a Park City Casino Development Authority or any of the others? Why... why do we have to have one specifically for the City of Chicago?"
- Lang: "Two reasons. First, the others did not ask for it, and secondly, the proposal for Chicago is so big and so massive in terms of the number of vendors and the number of contractors and the amount of infrastructure that has to be done and the amount of vetting that has to be done. And the Chicago City Council, as you know, has 50 members. You could not turn this over to the entire City Council as an ad-hoc committee. So they had to set up a smaller

82nd Legislative Day

- committee to take all of this information and to make recommendations to the Gaming Board."
- Harris, D.: "And this advisory... or rather this Development Authority is consisting of five members all appointed by the mayor, correct?"
- Lang: "That's correct, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. What is the general nature of the Development Authority? Is it not a unit of local government?"
- Lang: "One second. This group acts as an advisory group to the mayor. It has no taxing authority, no bonding authority, no authority to sign a contract."
- Harris, D.: "Ah, Sir, I'm not convinced of that. I believe the Bill says that it is a unit of local government. I understand it doesn't have taxing authority, but I believe it is a unit of local government which it allows it to borrow in the capital markets at the same rate as the City of Chicago. To me, that is an unfair competitive advantage that no other casino in the State of Illinois has. If they can go to the capital markets and borrow money at two and a half or three percent and... and the Rivers Casino or Harrah's or any of the others has to go to the capital markets and pay four or four and a half percent, that's a significant difference when you're borrowing millions of dollars."
- Lang: "Two issues, two responses. First, again, no one else asked for it. Secondly, this is a public body representing a public body that will own the casino. The taxpayers of the City of Chicago will own the casino. They are entitled

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

to have an entity out there getting the best deal for the taxpayers to save those taxpayers dollars on the open market. All of the other gaming, whether it's a... slot machines at racetracks or whether it's other casinos or riverboats, are all privately owned."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Lang: "So, this a measure designed to protect the taxpayers of the City of Chicago."

Harris, D.: "I appreciate your answers. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we have six speakers left and I don't want to discourage conversation on a very serious issue like this, but I did not turn the timer on. If you could hone your remarks in, I think it would be appreciated. Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, the gaming Bill that we worked together on in the spring contained some significant revenue for soil and water conservation districts, for 4-H, for what I would term interest for... that we've had trouble funding downstate especially. Now this legislation does contain revenue for a number of those programs?"

Lang: "In fact, it's enhanced revenue. Those projects you referred to, which we would call downstate ag projects for lack of a better term, in the original Bill, 744, we had \$25 million for those projects. This Bill takes it to 30 million. This Bill also has a \$10 million a year revenue stream to go to the Illinois State Fairgrounds for capital improvements so we can improve the State Fair. And an

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

additional \$5 million a year for Springfield tourism to bring more people to our State Capitol, more people to Springfield, and to the State Fair. That will improve the economic climate in this community."

"Representative Lang, I've been involved in the last Eddy: couple days in some budget meetings, and I got to tell you, from the tone I hear, while it's difficult this year, next year and the year after could be very, very difficult years for those programs. My concern is that without some additional revenue from some source both those types of programs that are important to rural parts of this state and education may not receive funding that might available in this type of a package. So, my concern is that based on what I've seen as a trend from this Governor, and this Governor's trend as if you're going to look at places to cut, you're going to cut facilities that are downstate. You're going to cut transportation for schools that's a downstate funding problem. We're certainly continue to see that trend from a Governor who doesn't seem to care about funding for those programs. And in this particular Bill, we make sure that those programs are funded with real dollars from a specific, targeted revenue source. I cannot understand why the Governor has this kind a chip on his shoulder related to programs downstate, but this gives us an opportunity to decide our funding regarding programs fate about that are important to us. So, I would urge individuals who are concerned about those programs to guarantee that funding by supporting this, making sure it gets 71 votes and sending a

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

very strong message to this Governor that we do exist, and our programs are important and we're going to make sure by putting our vote on this that those programs are funded. The other part of this that has to do with downstate is the agriculture part. We have to support an industry that without the support of slots at tracks is dying in this state. We simply have not kept the promises that we made to the horse racing industry in this state. We've not kept the promise on several occasions. This Bill contains those promises. Representative, I think this is fair for lots of reasons. Representative Davis stood up and talked about the migration of money out of this state for gaming interest in Indiana. We see it happen in downstate. We have casinos that would pull money away from... or have pulled money away from what a site might bring us in Danville. This makes common sense at a time we do not have money. We have no revenue. I understand if you have a casino in your backyard you don't have a problem, and so, you're not concerned maybe about the economic development problems in other areas and you have to protect your self-interest. But for the rest of us in this state and for downstate, fund those programs that are important to us. I urge Members of this Body to support this. At this point, we really do need the support to let the Governor know that his objection to this, although it's been heard and it has been addressed especially the portion of ethics, we are tired of not getting support in the general revenue in the budget and we're going to take matters into our own hands. Request an 'aye' vote."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, you and I have been here a long time, and it kind of is déjà vu all over again. We've discussed this a number of times. What do you have in this Bill for problem and compulsive gambling?"

Lang: "As in the Bill we passed in May, Representative, this Bill provides \$10 million annually for compulsive gaming programs. The first time in history, we've provided these kinds of dollars directly from the gaming industry to enable those who can't help themselves to get the help they need."

Mulligan: "Do you have to pass this Bill and the other Bill to have a complete package? Isn't that a little ambitious to have to pass two such Bills when it's hard enough to pass one?"

Lang: "This is not a trailer Bill, Representative. This is a whole Bill unto itself. This is the Bill we hope to send to the Governor."

Mulligan: "So you incorporated the provisions of the previous Bill that you passed and... or you were trying to get done with this one."

Lang: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "It is my understanding... I happen to be from Des Plaines, so we have the newest, 10th casino. So, I'm not really in favor of your Bill. It doesn't help us a lot. My understanding particularly from what they've published in the newspapers about the amount of money that the new

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

casino has taken in even though the new casino has taken in a lot of money, the total sum of the amount of money for gaming in Illinois still remains the same. So, the new money only takes away from other casinos because the total amount that's spent on that type of entertainment is x, and it may be x with a little bit more to the new guy. But if you put more in, isn't it still going to be x just spread out in a thinner amount over more casinos."

"First of all, Representative, your premise is 175 percent incorrect. So, if you compare the amount of gaming revenue taken in by the State of Illinois in August of 2010 to August in 2011 and the only difference in those two years being Rivers Casino in Des Plaines has been in place, if you compare those two years, yes, a few of our casinos have lower numbers, but the bottom line because of the great success of Rivers is higher. We got more gaming revenue for the taxpayers of the State of Illinois in 2011 than we did in 2010 and the reason is because people have stopped going to Indiana. If you read the press releases coming out of Indiana and you listen to the Governor of Indiana and listen to the tourism bureaus in Indiana, you will hear them panicked because Illinois is going to take our people back and put them to work and let them do their play and their entertainment right here in the State of Illinois."

Mulligan: "Well, Representative, first of all, I think that the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Tribune disagree with you. It wasn't me, personally, that was disagreeing with you. And second, I want to point out something that's been

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

pointed out by several Chamber of Commerces to me, that we will always lose money to out of state because when we do gaming here a lot of us are concerned about it so we keep the stations less. If you have less stations, the amount it costs to play blackjack is higher. Well, the reason we have so much competition from Indiana and other places they have more stations, and the amount to sit down at a blackjack table is cheaper. So, if you have a senior that's going out, where we always pass the buses, particularly driving down here to Springfield, we see them all the time, they can play blackjack at a table for a lot less than they can in Illinois and that's attractive particularly to people on a fixed income. So, I think that's a point that we've overlooked here that's been pointed out to me on several occasions. Also, one of the other speakers talked about minority participation. Every time we've brought this up, we've brought up minority participation. In fact, the one time when we put the first casinos out there, the women of the House decided they were going to go together and buy a share because we determined that women were minorities, and we could buy a share of the casino. It was kind of a joke, but we actually talked about it. So, I don't think that that's a good carrot because it never actually happens the way it's held out. We have held out to the south suburbs that they were going to get a casino a number of times. They still do not have a casino. So, if you put out false hope to people in order to get them to vote for a Bill, but then it never happens, don't you think that maybe people

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

who have been here a long time realize that's not necessarily true?"

Lang: "Representative, there's been no hope held out to anybody. The… I've been working on gaming Bills 20 years, but the very first gaming Bill I ever brought to this floor passed in May. And this one's going to pass today. So this…"

Mulligan: "Right, I know. I've been in the committees listening to them for 20 years."

Lang: "...this is where the rubber hits the road. This is where my friends in the south suburbs get to say this is our chance for economic development. This is our opportunity to keep people getting in busses and trains and cars and bicycles and going to another state to spend their money that they ought to spend in the State of Illinois."

Mulligan: "All right, Representative, I've introduced several Bills that says there has to be 20 miles between major casinos, which would put one okay in the downtown City of Chicago, but not one at O'Hare or someplace next to the new Rivers Casino, which gave away a lot of concessions. My community gave away money to minority communities. They gave away a lot of concessions in order to get that 10th casino license. My feeling is that we shouldn't impact them, you know, downtown on the lakefront, fine. You want to put another one there, that's the only one I've ever agreed would bring in real tourist dollars because I don't think the ones in our area bring in the tourist dollars. I think it's the one downtown in the Loop, which would be 20 miles is what I figured. So, I figured 20 miles away from

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

ours would be fair to the 10th casino. And I'd like a reduction. I don't see another 10 casinos. That's like... you know, it used to be fun to go to Lake Tahoe or Las Vegas. What fun is there to drive five miles down the street to your own casino. You know, basically, it's to get away and have a good time. It's not to have them all over everywhere because we can't figure out how to balance revenue in the State of Illinois. So, how do you feel about keeping them 20 miles apart?"

Lang: "Well, Representative, if you propose the Bill, we'll talk about it, but it's not going to..."

Mulligan: "I did. I've got three of them in."

Lang: "...it's not going to be part of this Bill, but let me tell you something you didn't mention. You talked about cannibalization and you talked about competition. Are you aware that the owner of the Des Plaines casino is for this Bill?"

Mulligan: "Yes, I had dinner with some people that and talked to them to find out about what they were for."

Lang: "So, if he's for the Bill..."

Mulligan: "But that he's not for the..."

Lang: "...and if he's not worried about competition...

Mulligan: "No."

Lang: "...why are you so worried about his bottom line."

Mulligan: "They're not worried about competition in downtown Chicago. They're worried about competition, you know, in a couple of miles away. Why wouldn't anybody be worried about it?"

Lang: "Apparently, he's not, he's for the Bill."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Mulligan: "I doubt that seriously because I have aldermen from Des Plaines and other people that have contacted me, and that's not what I've been told."

Lang: "I didn't say the mayor of Des Plaines is for the Bill. I said the owner of the casino is for the Bill."

Mulligan: "Well..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representatives, if we could bring this to a conclusion, it'd be very much appreciated."

Mulligan: "Representative, I don't see how you can all of the sudden go from the 10th casino to adding 10 more in Illinois. I think the Bill is flawed. I think how we run gaming is flawed. And I think there's only x amount of dollars that will ever be spent on it, and you're just diluting it for other casinos."

Speaker Lyons: "We have seven people left to speak, and I'm going to cut off debate. Arroyo, Jefferson, Poe, Moffitt, DeLuca, Kay, and Riley. That's it. You speak for five minutes apiece, we'll be here for 45 minutes, two minutes apiece, we'll be here for 15. Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in full support of this Bill. I think this is a great Bill. Lou, I applaud you for the hard work you're doing. I won't stand here and criticize and yell and all that kind of stuff because I think that this Bill's got a lot of legislation, a lot of points in here and foreclosure. It talks about we're having a problem with our homes. People are getting foreclosed out of their homes, and you put some language in here to be able to get some millions of dollars to be able to help people, and... and foreclosed homes. Also, you have

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

a portion here with training programs to make sure that people come into the trade, journeymen, and apprenticeships in the... the casinos. There's a lot of things that are good in this Bill, a lot of good things for minorities. We're going to finally... some minorities are going to be able to own some of these casinos. I'm also a gambler. Indiana. I go to different a... areas to play. I would like to stay in my own... in my hometown of Chicago and finally gamble in Chicago, so I won't have to go to Indiana or anywhere else. I have a lot of people that come from Indiana in busses to pick up my constituents and take them to Indiana. I want my constituents to stay in the City of Chicago, and not have to go to Indiana to spend their money over there. Our tax dollars should stay here in the State Illinois and in Chicago, not in Indiana, or not Wisconsin. Lou, keep up the good work. Keep fighting. We're going to pass this Bill today."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jefferson. Chuck Jefferson."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this Bill. It's a great piece of legislation. I don't know what's so hard to understand about this. This is a great Bill. It's a jobs Bill. It's a revenue Bill. We talk every day about the fact that we don't have revenue to support the programs that we already have in existence. We talk about closing up facilities because we don't have the money to fund them. I'm from Rockford, Illinois, and we've got one of the worst unemployment percentages in the State of Illinois. Rockford, along with the State of Illinois, has a terrible unemployment percentage rate. We

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

can fix that. This is a jobs Bill. This is a revenue Bill, and I don't agree with the people that spoke before. is going to attract dollars into the State Illinois. This is not going to repeal dollars. The people are going to reverse their transit and instead of going out of the state, they're coming into the state. cannot tell me that by putting a casino in Chicago, it's not going to attract new revenue. We are missing millions of dollars because we don't have a casino in Chicago. People travel... millions of people travel through Chicago in That's tourism dollars that we won't ever realize if we don't pass this Bill. That's not hard to figure out. This is a good Bill. It's going to be a revenue generator. We're going to be able to... to actually afford some of the programs we got in place. We're going to be able to fund some of the programs we got in place. And instead of closing facilities and closing programs, we're going to be able to keep those programs open, expand on those programs. This... this is a no-brainer. For those of you who think it's... it's not going generate the revenue we need to because it is. It's money that's going to come into the state that we've never realized before through tourism dollars. We're going to reverse that trend where they'll no longer will be going into Wisconsin. They'll be staying in Wisconsin and we'll... staying in Illinois, and we'll also be attracting some of the people from Wisconsin to come into Illinois. I watch every day in Rockford, when drive through Rockford, Illinois, to Wisconsin, to take those dollars to Wisconsin. We can

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

reverse that trend and have Wisconsinites coming into Illinois. This is a great Bill. This is a revenue Bill. Lou, I commend you on it. We need to pass this Bill. We need the money. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Raymond Poe."

Poe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Some of the things that concern me tonight is when we've got Legislators talking about their concern is it's not doing anything for their districts. This is... this is more about jobs; it's about a whole industry. And like it was talked about earlier, the horse industry in Illinois is on the verge of moving out of Illinois. This is a jobs Bill that will save thousands and thousands of jobs if we keep them here in Illinois. Would the Representative yield for a couple questions?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Poe: "Okay. You know, Lou, just for some legislative intent and you've mentioned it a couple of times, but as we all know, the Illinois State Fair is a showplace for agriculture which agriculture represents twenty-four and a half percent of the income and economic development in Illinois. Is there money so we can go ahead and take care of that fairgrounds and rehabilitate it?"

Lang: "Thank you for the question, Representative. I know that, particularly, this fairgrounds is important to you, to everyone in Sangamon County, but to all of us in the State of Illinois. And so, as we watch over the years the inability of our state to take care of the fairgrounds, its maintenance, its capital improvement needs, it was

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

important that this Bill be used to help that. And so, we put \$10 million... \$10 million a year into a fund for capital improvements at the fairgrounds, an additional 5 million a year for tourism for this area to bring people down to the fairgrounds to visit our State Capitol, to visit the historic sites here in Springfield."

Poe: "I think that's another example of \$10 million a year spent at the fairgrounds. That's another jobs Bill. That creates jobs and it takes care of a liability that the State of Illinois's had in the past. So, what we're looking at, we're looking at a total of 10... or 15 million dollars to be spent in this... on the fairgrounds so we can showcase agriculture. Is that right?"

Lang: "Annually, Sir."

Poe: "What about 4-H, FFA, county fairs and some of those things?"

Lang: "Well, Representative, as you know, in Senate Bill 744 that we passed in May we set aside \$25 million for those programs and we've now bumped it up to \$30 million which will give those programs a huge shot in the arm and do a lot of good for this region and agriculture all over our state."

Poe: "To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support and whenever you look at this Bill, this is going to bring right at \$45 million into agriculture, agriculture community, and supporting the number one industry in Illinois. Many of you, I don't care what county, if you... if this Bill affects you or not, you've had your soil and water conservation guys come into your offices the last

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

five years and the employees are losing their insurance, they're losing employees and these are the guys that make sure that we have clean water in the State of Illinois. This group will receive a twelve and a half million dollars more in funding if this Bill passes. Cooperative extension. is not... this is not a Bill that's iust agriculture, this is something that everybody in every town uses for advice from trees, plants and gardening. Historic sites, as Representative Jefferson said, they're going to get receipts of the money and we know that brings money in. State and county fairs, there's going to be an extra 16 million for them, for all over the state and that also affects everybody's area. State parks, we continually hear that they're very possibly might be going to close some of those down. There's going to be \$3 million more in this Bill that would help those out. So, even if this isn't something that's happening in your district, this something that's going to save jobs in Illinois. It's going to save the horse industry in Illinois. And when we spend this money out of these local communities, it's going to make sure that we still have soil and water conservation which I said earlier is the way we keep clean water in the State of Illinois. So, I'd urge everybody to vote 'aye'. This is a Bill that protects our kids, our FFA, our 4-H, those things... those projects they take to our county fairs. This is back down to we're taking care of the kids and education. So, again, please vote for the vote... the Bill. Thank you."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Speaker Lyons: "We have four speaker left: Moffitt, DeLuca,
Kay, and Riley. And once again, I'll ask you to please
hone your remarks to a minimum and respect for the debate
we've already had. Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative... Leader Lang, I'll try to be very brief, the hour grows... grows late. I'm from a rural district. I support all the things that have been mentioned, like 4-H extension, soil and water, the horse racing industry, but I certainly have some concerns. The estimates that have been told that will be given to those, and to these different things, I mean, soil and water and so on, is that an estimate or is that a guarantee?"

Lang: "It's a quarantee from the Bill, Sir."

Moffitt: "And that will be an annual?"

Lang: "Yes, Sir."

Moffitt: "And was that done by an independent third party estimate for that revenue or who's estimate is it?"

Lang: "Well, it's not an estimate of anything. We've decided that it was important to take care of some agriculture and downstate interests in this Bill. And so, we simply said that of all the gaming revenue that comes in, these are the first dollars out. So, these are exact amounts that we chose..."

Moffitt: "The agriculture component?"

Lang: "...and we put in the Bill. Yes, Sir."

Moffitt: "Okay. Appreciate..."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Lang: "And... and I must say that this... this effort was led by Chapin Rose on your side of the aisle."

Moffitt: "And we appreciate him doing that. I was off the floor for a while, so if... if this was mentioned, I apologize, but I would like to know the answer. Obviously, something of this magnitude, all parties should be at the table including the Governor. Has the Governor been at the table, and... and like, I heard the chairman of the Gaming Board made some statements about this Bill today. Were they in on these negotiations?"

Lang: "The Governor was not at the table by his own choice."

Moffitt: "He was invite..."

Lang: "Invited to the table many times, refusing to go to the table. In fact, last week he announced there would be no negotiation. So, you can't negotiate with someone who's unwilling to negotiate. As for the chairman of the Gaming Board, he knew that we've been working on a gaming Bill for 20 years. And many of those 20 years, he wasn't chairman of the Gaming Board but during the last several years that he was, every Session his minions would come to my office. Will I help them with this Bill; will I help them with that Bill. Every time I helped them without fail. And every time I said, working on a gaming Bill. Here's the gaming Bill. Do you want to help? Are you interested? Never one peep. Never one peep from the chairman of the Gaming Board until he could get his face and his name on the front of the Chicago Tribune."

Moffitt: "Okay. Leader, just... I want to help the agriculture interests of the state, but just... my one concern was that

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

they would definitely get the amount estimated. If... if I vote 'yes', it's going to be a reluctant 'yes' just because I think it could be an even better Bill than what it is if we could address some of the concerns, especially some of those that have been expressed by the Governor. Is the Chicago casino under separate jurisdictions, separate super... it's not under the Gaming Board, or... correct... tell me which is correct there. Is it under state gaming..."

Lang: "Well, first, I want to... first, I want to back up to your last statement, Sir. We took many of the suggestions by the Governor about governance, about the Chicago casino authority, about the flow of information, transparency, about openness, about all sorts of things, about more money for the Gaming Board, fingerprinting. Hundreds... well, maybe not hundreds, dozens of suggestions made by the Governor, and most of them are in the Bill. The one glaring issue that is not in the Bill is he wants to cut out agribusiness from horse... horse racing from this gaming Bill. The one glaring thing I would not do is tell you folks from downstate that I don't have any interest in what you do. Well, the Governor may not have any interest in what you do, but this Legislator does."

Moffitt: "Leader, I... I appreciate your responding and I said I have some concerns, I just hope that it's really the estimate. And on the Governor's commitment to agriculture, I tell you, I've known him a long time, I know he stands up for agriculture, and I know he wants to help agriculture. Would it..."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Lang: "Well, he didn't prove that last week, Sir, when he said he wasn't going to help you; when he said it would be okay to send 40 thousand jobs from downstate to Delaware."

Moffitt: "Well, this... this is the Bill. I appreciate your response. I think the Governor has consistently stood up for agriculture. I appreciate that. I... I wish this could have been more of an agreed Bill, but thank you for your response."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Anthony 'Smoking Joe' DeLuca."

DeLuca: "I had it coming."

Speaker Lyons: "We need a little humor here."

DeLuca: "I had it coming."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill.

Speaker Lyons: "...the Bill."

DeLuca: "In the... in the south suburbs, in the Chicago Heights area where I live, where Representative Riley lives, where Representative Davis lives, where Representative Jones lives, it's extremely difficult for us to attract new development. It's very difficult for us to attract business to create jobs because of the competition with northwest Indiana. We've been talking for years about a third airport. We've been talking for years about a purposed Metra southeast service line. We've been talking for years, we've been talking about a southland casino. We finally have an opportunity here to create an economic engine in the southland, which is what we need. I'm asking you for

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

your help. I'm asking you to please vote 'yes'. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, I appreciate your effort that you've put into this. Twenty years is a long time and so I'm going to keep my questions very simple. I don't recall and I don't have in front of me the analysis on this Bill, but as I recall, with respect to my district and the revenue split, Alton received 45 percent of the revenues, East St. Louis 45 percent, and Collinsville 10 percent. Is that correct?"

Lang: "You're referring to the racino revenues from Fairmount Park. Is that correct, Sir?"

Kay: "That... that is correct."

Lang: "And that answer is yes."

Kay: "And let me just follow that then. Why would that be when
those two towns, East St. Louis and Alton, are not even in
the district that Fairmount He... Fairmount Park or Fairmount
Heights is in?"

Lang: "So, in the process of negotiating this Bill and that part of it was negotiated many months ago in the early parts of the spring, in fact, Representative Holbrook who has moved on to greener pastures, was deeply involved in that. And that was an effort to deal with the issues of both Alton and East St. Louis having competition that close from the racinos and it was felt by most at the time that this was a good way to deal with those competitive issues. Certainly Representative Holbrook felt that."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Kay: "Okay, well. Thank you for the answer. I'm not sure that the people in the 112th District agree with that, but I appreciate your... your response. Let me... let me just talk about some practical matters for a second, Leader. Assuming that the Bill is passed, I'm told that there will be infrastructure that will need to be completed. How... how is that going to be paid for?"

Lang: "Are you referring to infrastructure in the local communities?"

Kay: "Well, I'm talking about changes to... and I know you're not
familiar with the Metro East area, but..."

Lang: "I've been there, Sir."

Kay: "Okay. In fact, I heard you were at the World Series."

Lang: "I was... No, but I was... the World Series when the White Sox were in it."

Kay: "Okay, Lou. Two fifty-five is an example, would have to have some work done to it. And my question is 255 is a big highway it carries a lot of traffic, if it has to have more work done to it, who's going to pay that bill?"

Lang: "The state highway... is it a state highway, Sir?"

Kay: "It is. Well, federal highway."

Lang: "It's a federal highway."

Kay: "Yeah."

Lang: "So, I'm going to work with you, if necessary, to help you get the state and federal dollars you need to upgrade that road."

Kay: "Well, I can't even get the necessary funds to complete I-159 which is the last leg of a project that's been 30 years

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

in the making. So, that's an interesting... an interesting take, Leader, and I would... I'd like your help."

Lang: "Well, I would als... I would also add this. I would also add this. This is not going to be a mass exodus across that road. The casino's going to hold the... the racetrack is going to have some people there gambling. You already have people crossing back and forth to go to Alton into East St. Louis and all kinds of other places. This is not going to create 10 thousand cars a day or 50 thousand cars a day. So, in the normal course I assume, like every other road, that road will be handled."

Kay: "Okay."

Lang: "If there are problems..."

Kay: "Okay. I..."

Lang: "...I think it will be dealt with."

Kay: "Okay."

Lang: "Now, you could argue that the infrastructure won't be dealt with quickly enough, but let me ask you a question.

Would you be asking me this if Disney came to plant an Epcot Center at the same location?"

Kay: "Well, as a businessman I probably would."

Lang: "Okay."

Kay: "And I, you know, that's just... it's a part of planning, but this isn't Disneyland and it's a different matter, and I'm told that infrastructure will have to be built. This is a serious question, Representative. I'm looking for an answer that's serious."

Lang: "I can't answer your question..."

Kay: "Okay. All right."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Lang: "...about what's going to happen with a federal highway, Sir."

Kay: "Let me... let me move on then, Leader. I'm also told that it's going to require additional police and additional firemen, equipment, manpower, to take care of any expansion wherever we put additional casinos or racinos. Do you agree?"

Lang: "I agree and that's what the local sheriff's for."

Kay: "Well, that's interesting you mention that because our local sheriff has asked the question of who's going to pay the bill for the additional staffing and the police cars."

Lang: "And again, I repeat, that's what the local sheriff's for. And I find it interesting, Sir, that this Bill has been floating around since March, and I haven't heard from your chief of police. I haven't heard from your sheriff, and in fact, I haven't heard from you."

Kay: "Well, Leader, I didn't get up here to argue with you as I
said..."

Lang: "Well, I'm not arguing the point."

Kay: "Well..."

Lang: "But this is a Bill we already passed once and now you want to tell me the flaws in it as it relates to your roads and as it relates to your chief of police. Where have you been?"

Kay: "I've been here."

Lang: "Okay. So have I."

Kay: "And I'm trying... Leader, I have always given you due
respect and I expect the same from you."

Lang: "You're... you're... I'm giving you respect, Sir."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Kay: "Well, no you're not."

Lang: "I'm just trying to answer your question."

Kay: "You know, I can... I can play this two ways. I asked some simple questions. All I want is a yes or no. Can we do that?"

Lang: "Certainly."

Kay: "Okay. So, I've got two noes so far. We have a no for the infrastructure. We have a no about roads. We have a no about police and fire. So, let me just ask you this. What about the promise money that you've talked about? You told Representative Moffitt that you assured him that money would go to this party and that party and so on and so forth, and you guaranteed that. Isn't it true that that money has to be appropriated every year?"

Lang: "This Bill is not an appropriation Bill, so we have to appropriate it; however, under the Bill this money goes into certain specified funds, can't be spent for any other use. And so we would be either required to appropriate it or it would just sit there. It couldn't be used for another purpose. So there would be no advantage to the General Assembly to not appropriate the money."

Kay: "Except a fund sweep."

Lang: "No, it can't... this is not subject to fund sweep, Sir."

Kay: "Okay. Well where I was headed Leader is just this. We have talked a good deal about the Governor and what he has done and what he won't do and my question is, it seems to me like we're going to have revisit this issue every year to make sure that your assertion that we can guarantee this money in fact is a guarantee."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Lang: "You know 118 of us were sent here to do budgets every year..."

Kay: "Okay."

Lang: "...and to appropriate."

Kay: "Okay."

Lang: "And so if you'll read the legislation, Sir, you'll see that the money cannot be used for any other purpose."

Kay: "Yeah. Well..."

Lang: "And so, there would be no one here who would say let's not appropriate it and let it sit in a fund gathering dust for no good reason at all."

Kay: "Let me ask you one last question. You mentioned earlier or someone mentioned earlier that there is money set aside for those people who might have a problem from gambling and that number was what?"

Lang: "Ten million dollars, Sir."

Kay: "Okay. Is that enough?"

Lang: "Right now we appropriate less than \$1 million a year for compulsive gaming programs so this would be 10 times more.

Is it enough? I don't know that anybody's done the study."

Kay: "Okay."

Lang: "But I'll tell you this, if it turns out not to be enough I will be the Legislator, and I'm sure Representative Mulligan will join me, who will propose legislation to give this program more money."

Kay: "Well, it seems like if you did the math and I'm sure you probably have done a lot of it, Leader, that you're increasing it. But my question really is, are you

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

increasing it proportional to the amount of increase in gaming? And I don't know..."

Lang: "But we're not... we're not increasing gaming 10 times, but we're increasing this fund 10 times."

Kay: "Well, it seems to me like what we're saying today is that there are winners and losers in this match. And we know there's going to be losers and we know we have pay for their problems, and we're willing to accept that in the State of Illinois, and I'm not."

Lang: "Sir, we're paying for those problems if they exist today except these are problems from people that are spending their money in Indiana and Wisconsin and Iowa and Missouri right across the border from where you live."

Kay: "Well..."

Lang: "So, Illinois residents go to Missouri and they... if they have a gambling addiction they have a gambling addiction in Missouri and then they come back to Illinois with their problems."

Kay: "Well, I would just say that that's kind of an interesting concept from the standpoint that I guess we're saying we don't mind being responsible. Now, Leader, you've got to stop that. That's... I'm not trying to be funny about this. I'm asking some serious questions."

Lang: "I take your questions seriously, Sir."

Kay: "Well, then don't point to your head like I don't know
what I'm talking about."

Lang: "Sir, I was having a joke with Mr. Burke..."

Kay: "I understand that."

Lang: "...about another issue."

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

Kay: "I understand that. The simple truth is we know that this is going to create a lot of problems for the people who least can afford it, the most impoverished people who think they're going to have a lucky day and we know that. We're acknowledging it because we're going to set aside \$10 million and I think if this is our jobs Bill in Illinois, it falls way short. I have spent... the short time I have had here in Springfield trying to create jobs, in fact, I have created jobs in this state and many others, and I can tell you they're long-standing jobs and they don't bank on losing. They're all winners. someone winning and respectfully, again, I thank you for your answers. I'm sorry this got to be a heated debate. I didn't mean it to be that way. But the simple truth is this is not right for Illinois. It's not right for people. We're putting them at risk for the sake of a greenback and I think we should be ashamed of ourself for that. I won't..."

Speaker Lyons: "Final speaker will be Representative Al Riley."
Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. And it's good that we've had a full debate about it, let's... let's go ahead and vote. But here's some 'yeses', here are some things that I know. I know that my district is about 12 minutes from Dyer, Indiana. That's a 'yes'; that's what I know. I know I have some colleagues out in the south suburbs who can walk across the street and be in Indiana, that I know. I also know that I've got some great mayors who have experience in these kinds of issues because many of them have proposals, good proposals. Many of their proposals that were congruent with their own city's comprehensive plan for the tenth

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

casino license. They still have all that experience. I do know that we have a lot of other developmental... development projects that we've been working on a long time out in the south suburbs. This casino could be a great adjunct to them. Now, I'm a statistician as many of you know, and one of the issues has to be... has to do with the distribution of casinos. Now, what would be the best blocking factor? We about cannibalization, and there talked willcannibalization. If we have a south suburban casino, it's going to cannibalize Indiana and bring those revenues right back here. Now, we have to be pragmatic; we have to be serious about this. You know, we talk... you know, we've talked а lot about people not paying attention unintended consequences. You know, many of these mayors and other groups have had meetings, public meetings, public hearings, they've vetted the issue out. They know that everybody is behind these projects and so we're ready to go out in the south suburbs. We've been very careful and prudent about it. Many of our councils of government, many of our tourism bureaus have met. They're coming up with proposals. They're ready to go. They're ready to be serious about this. So, let's be serious. Let's help these communities and join me in voting 'aye' for Representative Lang's Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lou Lang to close."

Lang: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I appreciate the full debate both from those who support the Bill and those who do not. There's been a lot of talk on the floor about this being about dollars or greenbacks, as

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

I heard. You know, dollars are an important byproduct of this Bill, but for me this issue, expanding gaming, has never ever been about money. It's been about putting people to work. It's been about economic development. It's about a recognition that this is already a legal activity in our state. In fact today, there's more ways to gamble legally in the State of Illinois than in the State of Nevada. Now, you can say, oh, my God, what a terrible thing. Well, then, prepare whatever Bill you want to prepare, but for today gambling is legal in the State of Illinois and we don't tell any other business how many they can have. We don't tell Starbucks they have to have a limit. We don't tell General Motors they have to have a limit. We don't tell how many shopping malls can be built around the State of Illinois, how many insurance agents we can have in the State of Illinois, but somehow if you take out the word 'insurance agents' and you put in the word 'gaming' the whole world goes black, and oh, my God, we have such serious problems. We do have serious problems. We have problems putting people to work. In Representative Jefferson's district, he talked about unemployment, but he didn't tell you the rate. The unemployment rate in Rockford 20 percent, 20 percent. The unemployment rate Danville is pretty darn close to 20 percent. unemployment rate in the south suburbs is way into the teens. And the unemployment rate among people who used to work at farms in central and southern Illinois, that used to breed horses, train horses, and grow feed for horses is higher than even that. And those that still have jobs have

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

left our state and they've gone elsewhere. They're now living in the bayou in Louisiana; they're now living in Dover, Delaware. Imagine, the State of Delaware has a better horse racing industry than the State of Illinois. And worse, 40 thousand jobs are hemorrhaging out of this state every day. There was a time in our state, when I first started here, I said on the floor of the House, I don't know how many times, that the most important single thing we have to do in Illinois is to educate children. Well, it's one, but one (a) is putting people to work. The Governor of the State of Illinois talks about putting people to work, but he ain't doing that. Only we have the opportunity to do that. We have the opportunity through self-help today to put people to work. Now, the last time I mentioned this, we passed a \$31 billion capital program. I was the proud Chief Sponsor of that and people on both sides of the aisle supported me in that because even though there was some money involved and some debt service involved and some borrowing involved, you all said we have to put people to work in the State of Illinois. And that Bill, at its core, will put 400 thousand people to work in the State of Illinois and so what, a hundred thousand new jobs isn't enough? I did all I could do to work with every party who had an interest in this Bill: the ag community, the horsemen, the racetrack owners, the casino owners and the Governor and the Gaming Board. And to the extent that people wanted to work with me, my door was open, where changes to this Bill that came in the Amendment we filed earlier that we agreed on yesterday. I haven't stopped

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

negotiating this Bill. This Bill is a better Bill than the one we passed with 65 votes. This Bill will pay a billion dollars on old bills. It will put a billion dollars a year in state coffers. It will put people to work. We took the changes the Governor proposed, even though he wouldn't sit at the table with us, and we put most of those in the Bill. And one of the things that he was particularly concerned about was how we treated video gaming in the Bill. And the last Bill that 65 of you voted for gave provisional licenses to bars and restaurants that wanted video gaming. And a lot of people said, why did you do that? That was a bad thing. So, we took it out of the Bill and instead we just put in the Bill a simple sentence that says that video gaming has to be operational before anyone else gets their license because they have been waiting two years to move their deal forward and we think that's appropriate. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm asking you for your help. As I go around the floor, I hope I... people were telling me what they're going to do and it seems to me like I might pass this Bill. I hope I will. I hope those that voted for it last time won't abandon this concept and I hope we've convinced some new people to come to the table. But please recognize that my efforts in this and the efforts of so many in the House and in the Senate to bring this matter to a conclusion are only about improving the economic climate of the State of Illinois and putting our citizens to work and keeping those people who every day drive to Indiana and Missouri and Iowa and Wisconsin right here in the State of Illinois. If they're going to gamble, they might as well

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

gamble in a state where it's already legal where we get something from it. That's what this is about. Let's improve the econ... the economics of our state. Let's do everything we can do to enhance a legal industry under controlled circumstances and put people to work in the State of Illinois. I urge you in the strongest possible terms to get this to 71 votes and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Bradley has requested verification. So, Members, please push your own switch. And Representative Lang moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1849. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 58 Members voting 'yes' and 53 Members voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Please place this matter on the Order of Postponed Consideration, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "On the request of the Sponsor, this matter will be put on Postponed Consideration. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have an announcement here. I just want to remind you... I just read them, I don't write them... but you are being... Members should be prepared to return to Springfield on Monday, November 21 at 11 a.m. So, make a note of that. Secretaries, who are listening to this, make a note. Be prepared to return to Springfield on Monday, November 21 at 11:00. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet tomorrow morning. At 8:30 a.m. the Revenue & Finance Committee will

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

meet in Room 114. And at 9:30 a.m. the Executive Committee will meet in Room 114."

Speaker Lyons: "And now, seeing no further business to come before the Illinois House of Representatives, Representative Barbara Flynn Currie moves that the House stand adjourned to the hour of 10 a.m. on Thursday, November 10. All those in favor of adjournment signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. And allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House stands adjourned to the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, November 10. Have a pleasant evening, everyone."

Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3881, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. First Reading of this House Bill. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 7... correction... Senate Bill 274, offered by Representative Watson, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. First Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 773, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. First Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1047, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. First Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1462, offered by Representative Bost, a Bill for an Act concerning education. First Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2502, offered by Representative Harris, Greg, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. First Reading of this Senate Bill. There being no further

82nd Legislative Day

11/9/2011

business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."