142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the
Committee on Rules reports the following action taken on
May 24, 2012: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor
is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2822. Perfunctory
Session at ease."

Speaker Lyons: "Good afternoon, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at your desks. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Michael Tozer, who is with the Springfield Four Square Church in Springfield, Illinois. Reverend Tozer is the guest of Representative Raymond Poe. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all electronic equipment, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Michael Tozer."

Reverend Tozer: "Representatives, let's bow our heads in prayer to give honor unto God. Mighty God, I realize as we bow our heads what an awesome privilege it is and that You touch us in such a deep way within our heart, a deep way within our spirit, and within our mind as we honor You. That is because within the holiness we find You everywhere in Heaven and on earth and within that You touch our lives in such a personal way. So, we can pray Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Oh, Lord, it is important that Your holy presence might be with these Representatives of Illinois, that they might make good decisions, wise decisions for this great state. Within the principles and the activities of the House, we see how

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

important it is to enact laws and to appropriate Bills for the setting up of the budget. Lord, they need Your divine power, Your divine sovereign intervention within their life as they make these decisions. Look upon this General Assembly and fill them with Your spirit of wisdom, with your spirit of knowledge, and Your goodness. Watch over those in authority so that these people might realize the presence of God who is within this state, so everyone within this state might experience freedom, sincerity, and peace. We also pray for both the Speaker of the House and the Minority Leader, their Chiefs of Staffs that they might make strong decisions, to make rules with purpose, strength and integrity. We ask this within Your holy name, Amen."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sara Feigenholtz, would you please lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Feigenholtz 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."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that there are no House Democrats who are excused today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Bost, GOP."
- Bost: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Gaffney is excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 117 Members responding to the quorum call, we do

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

have a quorum present. We're prepared to do the work of the people of the State of Illinois. Committee Reports, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee reports. Representative Dugan, the Committee Agriculture Chairperson from on Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4193. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Elections & Campaign Reform reports the following committee action taken on May 23, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3722. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 24, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 551; do pass Standard Debate is Senate Bill 3616; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 5192, Senate Bill 3241, Senate Bill 3320, Senate Bill 3497; do pass as amended Standard Debate is Senate Bill 410, Senate Bill 2971, Senate Bill 3389, Senate Bill 3479. Representative Golar, Chairperson from the Committee on Disability Services reports the following committee action taken on May 24, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #4 4866. Representative House Bill Daniel Chairperson from the Executive reports the following

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

committee action taken on May 24, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2840."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, Representative Poe has House Resolution 1091. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman, Representative Raymond Poe."

Poe: "Could we read the Resolution first?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1091 offered by Representative Poe.

- WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are pleased to congratulate the Southeast High School Spartans Girls Track and Field team on winning the Girls Class 2A State championship at Eastern Illinois University on May 19, 2012; and
- WHEREAS, The Spartans Girls Track team Coach and Hall of Famer Tom McBride is retiring after 31 years of coaching; he moves into retirement after seeing his team win the State championship 3 years in a row; and
- WHEREAS, The Spartans Girls Track team had many highlights at the State meet, including bringing the gold medal home in the 4×100 relay, the 4×200 relay, the triple jump, the 100 yard dash, and the 200 yard dash; and
- WHEREAS, The Southeast Spartans Girls Track team also won the City Championship in 2012, the Central State Eight Conference Championship, and the Class 2A Lincoln Sectional Championship; and
- WHEREAS, Charday Crawford swept the 100-meter and 200-meter dashes and also anchored the Spartans' first-place 4 \times 100 and 4 \times 200 relays; and

142nd Legislative Day

- WHEREAS, Southeast junior Brion Portis ran on the 4 x 200 relay, and she also won the triple jump with a career-best 39-feet-2½ leap on her final attempt; she also finished sixth in the long jump while teammate Shawnise Stelivan finished third; and
- WHEREAS, Southeast edged Chicago Morgan Park 50-49 for last year's championship, and 2 years ago the Spartans won the State championship against Bloomington 57-48; and
- WHEREAS, Coach McBride is a 1974 Southeast graduate who is retiring after 31 years as head coach; and
- WHEREAS, The Spartans lost 2 assistant coaches this year:

 Dana Roundtree and Don Ewing; the winning year and the

 State Championship was dedicated in their memory; and
- WHEREAS, The members of the Spartans Girls Track team that went to State are: Elizabeth Canady, Justice Collins, Charday Crawford, Halle Devoe, Dami Emuze, Jashay Fisher-Fowler, Kamaria Gage, K'Leesa Gilliam, Tashlyn Hall, Shirley Jones, Brion Portis, Jada Price, Shawnise Stelivan, Zaneta White, Shauniera Wilson, and Yakira Washington; the Assistant Coaches are Barb Montgomery, Shirley Bernstein, Leah Kincaid, Danyel Watters, and Reggie Brooks; and
- WHEREAS, The Spartans Girls Track team are to be commended for their hard work and dedication and Coach Tom McBride is to be commended for leading a successful team to many victories over the years; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate the Southeast High School Spartans Girls Track team on a great season and an impressive

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

championship victory and wish Coach Tom McBride all the best in his retirement; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the Southeast High School Spartans Girls Track and Field team and Coach Tom McBride as a symbol of our respect and esteem."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Poe."

"Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I Poe: want to tell you, you know, Chicago has the Chicago Bulls and they three peated, we have the Spartans from Southeast High School in my district, and this is the third straight row... yeah, years in a row that they've won the State Track Meet, and so we got our own three peaters here Springfield. Tom McBride, who's going to retire this year after 31 years of coaching, he's a Hall of Famer here in Springfield, we're quite proud of the job he's done. know and have a... and we can't name everybody, but we do have another special guest in the group, and Charday Crawford, everybody knows Lee Crawford here on the House Floor. Why don't you raise your hand and wave it, Charday, at the crowd. She got four first-place medals at the State Track Meet, and she's a junior so we're looking forward to coming back next year with a title. But let's... let's just say that we're really proud to have them in Springfield and wish Coach McBride a lot of success in his retirement, and what a great job you've done. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Congratulations, Spartans, we're proud of you.

Enjoy your day here at Springfield... at the Capitol. All
those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 1091

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is unanimously adopted. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, on a Motion."

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 1355 can be heard in Judiciary I, Senate Bill 1566 in Agriculture, Senate Bill 3438 in Personnel & Pensions, 3592 in J 1, House Joint Resolutions 88 and 89 in Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges. I know of no opposition. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no opposition, all those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the posting requirement is waived. Thank you, Leader. Representative Bill Mitchell, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like for the Journal to reflect on Senate Bill 3367 I wish to be recorded as a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request,

 Representative. Representative Brown, Adam, for what

 purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 3367, I wish to be recorded as a 'yes' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, the Journal will reflect your wishes. Representative Rosenthal, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

142nd Legislative Day

- Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be recorded as a 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 3367."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request.

 Representative Colavato... Representative Cavaletto."
- Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to be recorded as an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 3367."
- Speaker Lyons: "For a minute there, John, I got you confused with the former Rocky Calavito. So, the Journal will reflect your request, Representative Cavaletto. Representative Don Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Don."
- Moffitt: "And I'd really appreciate the attention of the Body."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Moffitt has an announcement, has something he'd like us all to hear. Shh. Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "I want to honor and recognize a solider who's visiting with us today. He's up in the balcony over here on the west side. Let me just tell you briefly about him. After graduating from the United States Naval Academy, Lieutenant Colonel Schimpf began his Marine Corp career as an infantry officer. And after tours with the 5th Marine Regiment and Marine Barracks, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, Lieutenant Colonel Schimpf went to law school at Southern Illinois University and became a judge advocate. As an attorney, Lieutenant Colonel Schimpf has served as the head prosecutor for the western recruiting region, the principal American attorney advisor to the Iraqi prosecutors in the

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

trial of Saddam Hussein, right up here in our balcony. And he's now... Lieutenant Colonel Schimpf is now the staff judge advocate for the Marine Corp Installation Command. Would you please make him welcome to our Capitol."

Speaker Lyons: "Colonel Schimpf, congratulations, an honor to have you in the Capitol. Enjoy your day. Representative Mike McAuliffe."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

McAuliffe: "...and a moment of silence. Last night we found one of your constituents and a good friend of mine, John Barry passed away. Jack was 92 years old, Pearl Harbor survivor, wife of Vicky for 35 years. Jack did a lot to help veterans throughout the whole state even if they weren't in his district. Jack would be downtown at Navy Pier with his good friend Mayor Daley, every year, Chicago and in Hawaii, they would actively remember all the Pearl Harbor survivors throughout the whole country and here in Illinois. Jack was former president of the Pearl Harbor survivors in Illinois. He helped the numerous cemeteries to help monument and the Abraham Lincoln Cemetery, and park district to help raise money for bricks to rebuild a World War I Memorial. A lot of these things Jack did, he did after he was retired, which he never did. He still worked for me up until this coming Thursday. Ninety-two years old, worked in his 80s and 90s and would say, what else do you need from me when I come back from Springfield? Jack had a lot of children and grandchildren that he was very

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

proud of, and of course his wife Vicky. He did die peacefully at home, and he was a good friend, a good constituent and became your constituent and I was proud to tell Jack, I said, don't worry you'll like working with Joe just like he did with me and my dad for over 30 years. So, a moment of silent for Pearl Harbor survivor John 'Jack' Barry, retired from the Navy and Chicago Police sergeant, too, for over 30 years. Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "May the repose of the soul of Jack Barry rest in peace. Representative Norine Hammond, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Norine?"
- Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like the record to reflect that I would like to be recorded as a 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 3367."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes, Representative. Representative Jerry Costello."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of privilege, please."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Jerry."
- Costello: "I would... I'd like to introduce the chamber to my youngest daughter, Danielle Costello, she's here with me today. I'd also like to acknowledge the fact the lowest grade she received on her report card this year was a 97."
- Speaker Lyons: "Danielle, we're proud to have you in Springfield. Keep an eye on dad today, though, will you please. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's several Bills... House Bills on the Order of Third Reading on page 4 of the Calendar. On the bottom of the page, Representative

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Lou Lang, Leader Lang, you have House Bill 4320. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4320, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lou Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this the Amendment we added yesterday that we called the Chuck E Cheese Amendment. All it does is say that games at places like Chuck E Cheese that used to be mechanical that are now electronic are not electronic games under the meaning of the Video Gaming Act. It's all really the Bill does."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of House Bill 4320 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? Monique Davis, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have a few Bills on Senate Bills-Second Readings which I believe Amendments are now prepared, so if you have... there's a couple of Bills on Second Reading, Senate Bills-Second Reading, I'll be seeing if Members are on the floor to move those Bills to Third. The first one I have, Greq Harris, is your Bill on page 11 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1351. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

142nd Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1351, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Har... Representative Harris. Greg, I've been told that the Amendment is not ready yet, so we'll hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Esther Golar. Esther, on the Order of Second Readings on page 11 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 1531. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1531, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Golar, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Esther Golar, on Floor Amendment #4."
- Golar: "Mr. Speaker, would you please hold that on Second for me, please? Hold the Bill on Second."
- Speaker Lyons: "Do you wish to adopt the Amendment or just leave it as it is, Representative?"
- Golar: "Leave it as is."
- Speaker Lyons: "All right. Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record on request of the Sponsor. Representative Chad Hays, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Hays: "Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to reflect that I
 intended to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 3367."

142nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes, Sir. Representative Mike Zalewski, on the Order of House Bills-Second Readings, you have House Bill 4239. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4239, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I want to table Floor Amendment #4, and I wish you'd go to the next Amendment."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, withdraw Floor Amendment #4.

 Anything further?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #5 has been referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lyons: "Floor Amendment #5, Representative, is in Rules, so we'll hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Esther Golar, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Golar: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to recorded... the records to reflect that I would like to be recorded as a 'no' on Senate Bill 3367."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, the Journal will reflect your wishes. Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll be going to some Senate Bill-Third Readings on page 5 of the Calendar. I'll be skipping around a little bit, but if you have something on page 5 or page 6 under Senate Bill-Third Readings, heads

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

- up. Representative Sara Feigenholtz, Sara, you have Senate Bill 278, 278. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 278, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Recognize the Lady from Cook, Representative Robyn Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill codifies the Human Services Commission into law. The commission works toward ensuring consistent, effective, and efficient delivery of human services in the State of Illinois. The commission is made up of a diverse group of representatives in both the public and private sector. It includes Members from the House and Senate as well as representatives from the eight Illinois Human Service Departments. Its purpose is to include timely and adequate reimbursement, look at outcome measures and best practices, and accountability mechanisms. At a time when we have less resources, it's very important that all of our human services departments, and programs work together to be as efficient as possible. So, thank you. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Senate Bill 278. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative... Leader Mike Bost."

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

Bost: "Now, with the Floor Amendment, what... does it add new members or does it actually just create the program?"

142nd Legislative Day

- Gabel: "The Amendment just adds two more char... categories.

 One, maternal and child health, and the other is a representative from the university and maternal and child health program."
- Bost: "And they are to oversee... the commission itself was created when?"
- Gabel: "Pardon? Right now there's a task force. And this Bill will turn that task force into a commission."
- Bost: "All right. So what's the difference between the task force and the commission? The commission..."
- Gabel: "The task force was supposed to end the end of this year."
- Bost: "So... so the task force was originally supposed to do this same thing as a task force, but now we're going to create the commission, correct?"
- Gabel: "Well, what the task force did is it helped with reorganizing the Department of Human Services, only, just that department. And we feel that there are... that the Public Health, the DCFS, HFS, that they all need to be looked at and we need to really consider if there are some programs in each of those departments that need to be moved... moved to other departments to create better efficiencies. So this commission will continue to look at that issue."
- Bost: "Once this is created as a commission, are the members...

 are they reimbursed or are they..."
- Gabel: "The members are not reimbursed. They're not paid and they're not reimbursed for any travel."
- Bost: "Okay. So, there is no cost..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Gabel: "There's no cost."

Bost: "...per... per se? Okay. And their job is to oversee and look for and advise us? Is that the intent or just to oversee and advise the department?"

Gabel: "The Governor's Office and the departments."

Bost: "To look for waste, to look for better operation, to look for what?"

Gabel: "Well, both of those, yes. To look at ways that the programs are more coordinated, to look at efficiencies."

Bost: "Do you know of things that they've already found as a...
as a commission or before being formed into the commission
as a task force, what things have they already found that
we have implemented to try to straighten things out?"

Gabel: "One of the things that they did was they got rid of the depart... the section for community and family health and merged that with the local offices. So, they have created some efficiencies with that already. One of my concerns is that the Title V Programs which are federal programs, they... in most other states they're all in one department, and I would like to work with them to make sure that all the Maternal and Child Health Programs are in one department so they can all be coordinated better."

Bost: "When... when this was passed in the Senate, we noticed that there were... it must have been a little bit of a controversy. Do you know what the issues were that was brought up or...?"

Gabel: "I don't, I'm sorry."

Bost: "'Cause it... is there... and the sunset date. Is there a sunset date on the creation of this commission?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Gabel: "I don't have any sense that there's some difficulties with this."

Bost: "Well, unless I'm wrong..."

Gabel: "Let me look."

Bost: "...our analysis is showing that there was a... there were negative votes and I was just wondering what that... the problem might have been over there if you... if you knew?"

Gabel: "I am... I am not sure."

Bost: "Okay, okay. I'm just a little concerned that we don't know what their concerns might have been. Does this have a sunset date or is the commission created and then permanent, forever?"

Gabel: "There may be people who just don't like commissions."

Bost: "Okay. But now my question is, is there a sunset date in this or is this commission permanent forever and ever?"

Gabel: "I do not see a sunset date on this commission."

Bost: "Okay. Thank... thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, are you just trying to add two sections or two members to this commission?"

Gabel: "Two members."

Mulligan: "Representative..."

Gabel: "Two issues."

Mulligan: "...Leitch and I serve on this commission, and I will tell you it harangues a lot and has a hard time figuring out how to get the Legislators that are on the commission with them to pass legislation because they talk and talk

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

and talk and talk, and quite frankly, I'm not sure if they move from discussion to understand how you legislation. And since I've served on this commission for a while and I'm usually the only Legislator aside from maybe Right... or Representative Senator Righter, Representative Leitch goes on and off, we are called in lots of times I'm doing it on the phone, I've gone to their meetings. Representative Feigenholtz, haven't you been on and off the phone over this? Representative... or Senator Kotowski's on it. They do not know how to channel the ideas that they have into legislation. When I've discussed that with them, they seem to have a problem with it. it seems to be something that this Governor has encouraged in order to put people on a group that was suppose to look at the services that were provided and I do not think they have done what I would consider an excellent job. They may not be happy with me for saying that, but I think the cochairs have not figured out how to direct properly, and this has been a tough commission to serve on as far as how they move issues forward. So, adding two more is hopeful and they're issues that I support to be added on, but I wouldn't get your hopes up."

Gabel: "Well, I know..."

Speaker Lyons: "Go ahead... proceed, Representative."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that the commission's first task was to prepare a report and I know that they accomplished that task and the reorganization of the… of Department of Human Services."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Mulligan: "I've looked at that report and the way the report was presented also was not particularly what I would call a quality way of doing a report. And I've served on this for a number of years and I'm one of the people that is usually part of it, but I... I will be quite honest and I suppose it's not the most wonderful thing to say, but I do not think they've done a really good job. I think they ought to take note of that and I think they ought to try improve how they're operating going forward."

Gabel: "That's my goal. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "Again, I believe that during these difficult times it's important for all of our social service groups to work together and to come up with a more efficient and effective way of providing services to the people of Illinois. So, I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 278 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?
McAuliffe, Poe, Saviano, Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 78 Members voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 24, 2012:

142nd Legislative Day

- recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 2840."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Unes, you have, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, on page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 548. Mike Unes, Senate Bill 548. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 548, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Unes."
- Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 548 is simply an extension of a TIF area in the City of East Peoria and also the City of Carlyle and as is precedence here on this Body, all taxing bodies have signed off in support of this and I know of no opposition. Happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Senate Bill 548. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its passage 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? David Harris. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 113 Members voting 'yes', 3 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Carol Sente, you have, on the Order of Third Reading-Senate Bill, Senate Bill 555. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 555, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Carol Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 555 makes it permissive for the Emergency Telephone System Board to use 9-1-1 funds to implement enhanced 9-1-1 technology. It is currently not clear whether the 9-1-1 funds can be used for this purpose, so this Bill is codifying that issue and the language is permissible. It makes change... no change to the existing 9-1-1 funding. Citizens can elect to provide as much data as they wish. The system is free and secure, and it can only be accessed by 9-1-1 responders. I'm happy to take questions."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, you were saying that the... that the funds that are collected may or may not be used to upgrade the systems? What are the funds for?"

Sente: "I'm saying that this Bill codifies and clarifies that the funds can be used for this enhanced 9-1-1 system."

Reboletti: "It... that's what I'm trying to find out. Just for the... for all the Members in the Body, if there is ambiguities in there in the system, so they don't know what they can or cannot use. I mean, so, I would assume that when you collect these fees that... you'd want to be able to use them for exactly what you're saying, which is to enhance the system so that it works better and that it does what it's suppose to be doing, and it's technologically

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

advanced. So, there are some type of issues then around the state this will clarify?"

Sente: "Well, in DuPage, that was the first county that used this. They went ahead and had that interpretation of that they could use the funds for this. This Bill makes it absolutely a hundred percent clear that that is permissible. So, it is permissible and it clarifies that issue."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sente to close."

Sente: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 555 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? DeLuca, Thapedi, Golar, like to be recorded? Esther? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dunkin, I think we have a special person on the floor you'd like to introduce. Shh."

Dunkin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you could bear with me. Today, we have with us on the House Floor, one of our long serving, highly distinguished, my Congressman, and by the way, all those Congressmen... all those people that Congressman Davis represents please stand. Let's welcome and give our... one of our state's profound voices in Congress, a great round of applause. Congressman Danny K. Davis."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "Congressman, it's a privilege and an honor to have you here. Enjoy your day in Springfield on the House Floor. We're proud to have you here, Congressman. Representative Daniel Burke, you have, on the Order of Third Readings, Dan, Senate Bill 968. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 968, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Dan Burke."

- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 968 would amend the Vehicle Code definition of commercial motor vehicle with respect to one segment of vehicles that currently qualify as commercial motor vehicles. Basically what it does, it just puts us into compliance with federal regulation so we can collect approximately \$7 million from federal funds. Be happy to answer any question."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 968 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady, Representative Cassidy, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cynthia Soto, on Third Reading you have Senate... out of the record. Representative Ed Sullivan, on page 6 of the Calendar, Ed,

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

under Senate Bills-Third Readings, you have Senate Bill 1900. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1900, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sullivan, you're ready to go."

Sullivan: "Sorry. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Bill 1900 is an initiative of the Lake County's Chief County Assessment officer. Presently, in the State of Illinois, outside of Cook, there are two counties where the assessor must turn in their books by October 15. The rest of the state, outside of Cook County, turns in their books June 15. So, this Bill fundamentally takes Lake County and requires assessors to turn their work over to the Chief County Assessment officer by July 15. The reason for this is very simple. The earlier that the assessment notices... or books get turned in, the better chance we have of getting the tax bills sent out on time. With the downturn in the economy and the depression of the real estate values, we've seen an increase in the amount of appeals of people trying to lower their assessment. What that has done is delayed the tax process overall and we're now to the point where the ability for the Lake County Treasurer to get the tax bills out on time has been diminished. If we do not get the tax bills out on time, obviously you look at school districts that have to go to tax anticipation warrants which cost money and take away education dollars. So, this is a good initiative to try and improve our tax process in Lake County. I'll entertain any questions."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. The Chair recognizes Representative Jack Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Franks: "Be an inquiry of the Clerk rather instead of the parliamentarian. There were notes filed. Have we had any answers to those notes?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the notes."

Clerk Bolin: "No notes have been filed on Senate Bill 1900."

Franks: "Well, then wouldn't the Bill have to remain on Second Reading?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, we're going to check on that, get right back to you. Mr. Franks, I've been advised by the parliamentarian that the notes were filed while the Bill was on Third Reading and that... therefore, they're inapplicable. Mr. Clerk... Representative Franks, you did file the notes yesterday, but it was after the Bill was moved to Third Reading. Representative Franks."

Franks: "Mr. Speaker, I think they might have been filed on Second, but I'll withdraw the notes. I'll withdraw the notes and leave it as it is."

Speaker Lyons: "Whether we withdraw them or not, Jack, I still think it's..."

Franks: "All right."

Speaker Lyons: "...good, it's ready to go, but I appreciate your good intentions on that. I'm sure the Sponsor does also, so... Representative Cavaletto, on Senate Bill 1900? Were you... We'll get back to you, John, after this Bill, okay? Representative Sullivan to close."

142nd Legislative Day

- Sullivan: "Thank you. And I appreciate Representative Franks...
 we had a little sidebar and worked out our differences.
 This is a good government Bill. It's good for Lake County,
 it's good for the Lake County taxpayers. I appreciate an
 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1900 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? Flowers, Ramey, you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative John Cavaletto."
- Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the previous Senate Bill 278, I would like to be recorded as a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "John, the Journal will reflect your request."
 Cavaletto: "Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dave Winters, on the Order of Third Readings, on page 6 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2867. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2867, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Dave Winters."
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2867 is the annual Environmental Protection Agency cleanup Bill. These are all noncontroversial, clarification of the use of guidance documents in air permitting, some cleanup language

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

regarding EPA inspections for Leucadia power holdings. We changed the date for services charging private sewage disposal system permitting to fit with the U.S. EPA general permit. There'll be JCAR review of registration smaller source programs, codification of environmental laboratory certification testing fees, and it streamlined process for special waste hauler permitting. This one would move from a 1-year permit that is \$100 per year to a 3-year permit for \$300. It will save administrative costs and the net cost to the permit holder will be the same. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 2867 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? Brady, Carli, Mayfield, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 88 Members voting 'yes', 29 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapin Rose, on the Order of Third Readings, on page 6 of the Calendar, Chapin, you have Senate Bill 2999. Out of the record. Representative Elaine Nekritz, on page 6 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 3216. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3216, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Elaine Nekritz."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation is a trailer Bill for the public-private partnership legislation that passed last year. The changes that are in this trailer Bill are all recommendations from IDOT that they felt would bring the P3 legislation more into line with their current practices. I don't be... I think that all the issues have been worked out and I'm not aware of any opponents. I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. 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: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "Representative, does this Bill eliminate the RTA?"

Nekritz: "Representative, I... I... it unfortunately does not, but we may have an opportunity on another Bill that might be coming back from the Senate to pursue that."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much. I look forward..."

Nekritz: "Thank you."

Davis, W.: "...to seeing that Bill."

Nekritz: "I appreciate it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3216. 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? Lang, Jerry Mitchell, Skip. Representative Sullivan, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 74 Members voting 'yes', 43 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sid Mathias, Sid, on the Order of Third Readings... The Gentleman does not wish to call his Bill. Representative Scott Penny, on page 6 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Readings, you have Senate Bill 3258. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3258, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Scott Penny."

Penny: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an attempt to get language in the Sexual Offender Registry Act synchronized to the Illinois Criminal Code so that people who have been convicted of child sexual offenses also are better defined in the statute. It specifically lists what sex acts with young children qualify. It allows the registering law enforcement agency to, at the point of registration, inform the registrant that he is not allowed in certain parks, schools. And it also adds to that definition, bike trails and walking paths so that they cannot loiter without any apparent purpose if they're on there. Another component of the Bill also allows a young person under the age of 25, who receives a reckless driving conviction, when achieves the age of 25 looking backwards if he has only had one offense he could seal and close and expunge that offense depending on the type of conviction he had. It's supported by law enforcement agencies. I would urge passage of the Bill, Sir."

142nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Reboletti: "Representative, there was a portion of this Bill if I'm not mistaken, under Floor Amendment #3 that addressed reckless driving and the ability to either to seal a supervision or I believe a conviction if the individual is under the age of 25. Can you explain that a little bit?"
- Penny: "What that would allow is if a person was convicted he could get the conviction sealed. If he had been arrested but was found not guilty, he could get the record of the arrest expunged. He could not do that in an effort to keep people from repeatedly sealing these types of convictions. He could not do that until he achieved the age of 25, so it would be one opportunity at age 25 to look backwards in time, and if he had only received one reckless driving conviction, this would apply. If he had multiple reckless driving or there was a DUI and a reckless driving conviction, he could not do this."
- Reboletti: "We did discuss that in committee where if it was a DUI reduced to a reckless driving, that would be ineligible for sealing, correct?"
- Penny: "Yes, Sir, that's correct. There were some concerns raised when this was at committee, and so we went back and modified this to address those."
- Reboletti: "And so the real issue would then for the reckless driving, would be that if a young person, obviously, they

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

have this conviction if they wanted to get a CDL down the road to become a professional driver, this would allow them to do so. If they didn't have this opportunity, they could not get a CDL and enter a trucking profession."

Penny: "Yes, Sir. That's exactly what this Bill is directed towards a young person who had one conviction and had made one mistake in a reckless driving violation would not be excluded from being a professional driver and would be able to move himself professionally and to get a good job."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative, I'll be supporting your legislation."

Penny: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Penny to close."

Penny: "This is a Bill that addresses a concern that we have with registered sex offenders. It tightens up some vague areas. Also, it provides in a slightly different area, for a young person to rehabilitate themselves and to get a professional driving type of position. I would urge your passage on it."

Speaker Lyons: "Question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3258 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?
Representative Cassidy, Currie, Karen May, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's a 107 Members voting 'yes', 9 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Speaker Lang: "On the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 3201, Mr. Lyons. You want me to come back to you, Mr. Lyons? No, I just talk fast. Read the Bill, Sir."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3201, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Lyons."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for getting right to me. appreciate your good intentions here. Senate Bill 3201 is an initiative of the Illinois Beverage Association and Management. Basically, it's a Plastic Merchandise Container Act that requires that purchasing five or more of the plastic bulk material... merchandise containers that are sold, if they are brought in, they need to be registered after five are brought in, just name and address so the purpose of record on that. But if it was... a purchase was found to be in violation, there would be a \$500 petty offense, and if it's over \$10 thousand or more, there could be a Class II Felony. Just to give you a little background on this, there's a whole underground business that revolves around cashing in on these plastic containers. The beverage industry, there's been over a half a million dollars for the beverage industry including the dairies, and 12 other states already have this in legislation, there's about a dozen other states that are doing the same thing we are here today. It may sound sometimes like we're kidding around with those small baskets which all of us probably have in our garage, but it's a million dollar problem for many, many companies and

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

we're looking for the right Bill, Legislator to take the action, pass this Bill on. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Representative Tracy. Please read the… please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3217, Leader Lyons. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3217, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Lyons."

Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an initiative of the Illinois Credit Union League. Basically what this does is three things. One, it clarifies that a surviving credit union in a merger where a consolidation or conversion is the successor in interest for any mortgages that are out there. So, if two credit unions are joined and the surviving credit union becomes the holder of the mortgages of the merged credit union, they would be included in their... in their right to successor and interest. Second of all, it allows the boards of directors of the credit unions to clarify what the age eligibility is for voting and well as for holding office within the credit union. And the last provision

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

here is a 30-day membership status to allow somebody's credit union to go beneath the minimum, whatever the minimum is, to become a member, gives them a 30-day grace period so when they have a problem they can come back within 30 days without having to be reinstated as a credit union member. I ask you for your support. Would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman's moved for the passage of the Bill.

There being no debate, those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lyons, can we run four or five more of your Bills while you're up? Should we wait for you, Sir? No, stay right there, stay right... no, I'm kidding, go ahead. Wherever you're going, Sir, enjoy yourself. So, Senate Bill 3259, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "This has nothing to do with getting rid of the RTA, just want to say that or Baba Booey. Anyway, so House... Senate Bill 3259 was created from the Governor mentioning that he wanted to bring up the graduation rate to 18 years of age and the Lieutenant Governor in her wisdom got involved in creating a Bill that would now

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

create the Commission for High School Graduation Achievement and Success. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Flowers, Gabel, McAuliffe, Mitchell, Reis. Representative Gabel. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3277, Representative Jones. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3277, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3277 is a TIF extension Bill for the Village of Glenwood. I do have letters and... on the record from all the villages and taxing bodies approving this. I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gabel, Representative Kosel. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'.

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3279, Mr. Rita. Please read the Bill."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3279, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that we debated about the roofer's license application using a government-issued I.D. We amended it, we moved it back the other day, took out photo I.D. and just used government-issued I.D."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

There being some debate... Mr. Bost is recognized. Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Bost: "Now... does this... we amended this, did it take photo I.D. out?"

Rita: "Yes."

Bost: "Okay. The reason..."

Rita: "Took the word photo... it took the word..."

Bost: "...was it because..."

Rita: "It took..."

Bost: "...you felt like it was very important we don't have photo I.D.s for voters, therefore, we shouldn't have photo I.D.s for roofers?"

Rita: "We just took the word photo and used government-issued I.D."

Bost: "But... but is that why we did it?"

Rita: "What was that?"

Bost: "What... what was the problem with having the photo..."

Rita: "It had to do with the Amish and a request from Representative... Representative Rose."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Bost: "Was there... was there not a way that we could have went ahead and had another for others? Is it important to have a photo I.D, don't you think?"

Rita: "Well, we took that out, so not... not necessarily in this case."

Bost: "Well, I know, I understand that with this Bill."

Rita: "I know where you're going."

Bost: "Well, good. Then fine, I won't ask the question, you just answered the question. Is it important to have photo I.D.s for voting?"

Rita: "In some cases. In some cases."

Bost: "In some cases. For voting?"

Rita: "This deals with roofing, building permits."

Bost: "Oh, okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Osmond. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3349, Representative du Buclet. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3349, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative du Buclet."

du Buclet: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3349 is an offender initiative program Bill. The program diverts selected nonviolent felony defendants without prior felony convictions into an intensive program to offer services to

142nd Legislative Day

- defendants with the goal of these defendants avoiding future criminal behavior. When the defendant successfully completes this intensive program, the state's attorney dismisses the felony charge."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Speaker, I think I might... in a raceway right now, the way you're running through these Bills. So, I know... you're doing a good job, but if we could just slow down a little bit."
- Speaker Lang: "I would be happy to slow down for you, Sir."
- Reboletti: "Thank you. Representative, is the county of Cook already doing this diversionary program?"
- du Buclet: "I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?"
- Reboletti: "Is the county of Cook already doing this as a diversionary program right now?"
- Du Buclet: "Yes. The county of Cook has successfully implemented this program."
- Reboletti: "Could you tell the Body what crimes are considered for this diversionary program?"
- du Buclet: "The crimes considered for this diversionary program include: theft, retail theft, forgery, possession of a stolen motor vehicle, burglary, possession of burglary tools, possession of cannabis, possession of a controlled substance or possession of methan... methamphetamines."
- Reboletti: "And in Cook County it is similar to what is known as 410 probation which is like..."
- du Buclet: "That's correct."
- Reboletti: "...supervision for a felony?"

142nd Legislative Day

- du Buclet: "That's correct."
- Reboletti: "And this would take the program statewide?"
- du Buclet: "This would take the program in Cook County statewide."
- Reboletti: "Does the... does the state's attorney of DuPage County have to participate and have to form this program?"
- du Buclet: "The state's attorney does not have to participate.

 It's up to judicial discretion. The judge has the right to offer the program and the judge also has the right to increase the number of months the program is available."
- Reboletti: "But the state's attorney does not have to implement this program if they don't want to?"
- du Buclet: "They do not. Has to be with the consent of the state's attorney."
- Reboletti: "I guess the other issue is, this is a diversionary program so that the state's attorney has to agree, the defense attorney and the defendant have to agree that they will participate and then the court has to agree. This is not a sentence that can be achieved..."
- du Buclet: "That's..."
- Reboletti: "...if you choose not to be in a diversionary program?"
- du Buclet: "That's correct. All three have to participate and restitution is a mandatory part of the program. The victims if possible will be made whole."
- Reboletti: "And restitution, was that required prior to the completion of the program before the sentence or can it be completed during the term of the sentence?"

142nd Legislative Day

- du Buclet: "I'm sorry, Representative, can you repeat the question? Restitution is required to the victim."
- Reboletti: "But do they have... do they have to make restitution prior to entering the program or will they... can they make it while they're on the special probation?"
- du Buclet: "They can make it while they're on the special
 probation."
- Reboletti: "Does the victim also have to agree to this or is this done through the State's Attorneys Office?"
- du Buclet: "The victim also has to agree to the program."
- Reboletti: "How many cases, if you know, that the Cook County State's Attorneys Office is diverting through this program and if you know what the success rate is, if you could advise us of that at well?"
- du Buclet: "I do now... I do know. We currently have 302 people currently in the program and the number that have completed the... the number that have withdrawn from the program is only 24. The rest have completed it."
- Reboletti: "And if the people that were in this program successfully completed and they have no prior convictions, they could move to expunge this similar to the 410 probation, I believe it's 5 years after the completion of their sentence. Is that correct?"
- du Buclet: "It does not change the current expungement law so whatever is on the books now it would apply to this program as well."
- Reboletti: "And could you advise us who the proponents of the legislation are that you have on your analysis?"

142nd Legislative Day

- du Buclet: "I'm sorry, Representative. Can you repeat the
 question?"
- Reboletti: "Yeah. Who are the proponents of the legislation?"
- du Buclet: "Proponents: Cook County State's Attorneys Office,
 Illinois State Bar Association, Cook County Public
 Defender, Illinois Probation and Court Services Association
 are all proponents. We have no opponents."
- Reboletti: "And with respect to the term of the probation, can it be longer than 12 months if the court so deems?"
- du Buclet: "Again, we have it currently written as 12 months but we… it's judicial discretion. So, he can make it as long as he'd like."
- Reboletti: "And I appreciate that because I know that was some of the concerns that..."
- du Buclet: "That's right. That was the Amendment that we..."
- Reboletti: "...some of these theft cases, the burglary cases, you may want to keep that person supervised longer than maybe a drug case or retail... a small retail theft case."
- du Buclet: "Absolutely, and that's the Amendment that we filed
 and passed."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."
- du Buclet: "Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, are we going slow enough for you, Sir? Representative du Buclet to close."
- du Buclet: "Senate Bill 3349 would end up saving the… it has saved the county \$1.1 million to date. It would be another tool for prosecutors to allow people to get their lives back on track and I think that it will benefit the state as well as nonviolent offenders. Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Beiser, Poe, Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Franks, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Franks: "A point of personal privilege, if I may, Mr. Speaker." Speaker Lang: "Oh, please state your point, Sir."

Franks: "You know, we spend a lot of time on the House Floor, and today is an auspices day for Shaw Decremer who's now reached the grand old age of 38 years old. So, happy birthday, Shaw."

Speaker Lang: "Man's packed a lot of life in the 38 years, I can tell you that. Senate Bill 3373, Mr. Jackson. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3373, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jackson."

Jackson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 3373 is an agreed upon language between the Illinois Finance Authority and the State Fire Marshal. The Bill is to resolve minor audit findings to provide more flexibility and to increase the amount of available funds and the number of loans the Office of State Fire Marshal can afford... offer each year. The amended Bill sought to resolve minor audit findings by eliminating the Fire Service and Small Equipment Fund and transferring the fund

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

moneys into the Fire Prevention Fund. And the initial Bill also sought to transfer the funds from the fire truck, ambulance, and fire house revolving loan funds into the… into a new fund that would be administered by both the Office of the State Fire Marshal and the Illinois Finance Advisory Authority. I would answer any questions and I like… I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman's moved for the passage of the Bill.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Moffitt: "...legislative intent?"

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Moffitt: "Representative, you and I have talked a lot about this Bill and I think we've worked out the details to make sure that it continues. It's what I believe to be an excellent program, it's not a giveaway program, these interest free loans and revolving loan funds. We always have a lot more applicants than what we have money for, and you and I have some similarities in terms of district needs, and I know we both want to see it continue. So, I do have some questions for legislative intent. The first one is, will the zero interest loans already approved by the Office of the State Fire Marshal and the Illinois Finance Authority continue?"

Jackson: "Yes, they will."

Moffitt: "Will the moneys set aside in the current funds maintain their current funding sources once they have been transferred to the IFA?"

142nd Legislative Day

- Jackson: "Yes. The moneys transferred to the IFA will continue to receive funding from the programs dedicated revenue streams. Additionally, repayments from existing loans will return to the fund for relending."
- Moffitt: "Next, will the initial selection of loan candidates continue to be made by the Office of State Fire Marshal?"
- Jackson: "Yes. The Office of the State Fire Marshal, in conjunction with the loan application review committee, would have the discretion to select suitable loan candidates based on the Office of the State Fire Marshal assessment of need. The IFA will continue its role of both evaluating each applicant's ability to pay and to document, close, and service all fund loans."
- Moffitt: "My fourth question, will the decision to abort zero percent loans under the proposed program rest with the Office of the State Fire Marshal?"
- Jackson: "Yes. The Office of the State Fire Marshal, in conjunction with its loan application review committee, would have discretion to select suitable recipients for zero interest loans based on the assessment of need. The IFA will continue its role to determining that each applicant's credit worthiness, i.e., ability to pay and documenting, closing, and servicing all loans that are ultimately funded."
- Moffitt: "Will the proposed program increase, decrease, or maintain the current level of responsibility for the Office of State Fire Marshal?"
- Jackson: "The Office of the State Fire Marshal responsibility will remain the same."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Moffitt: "Will the Office of State Fire Marshal maintain its current role in selecting appropriate candidates for financing under the ambulance, fire house, and fire truck revolving loan fund programs?"

Jackson: "Yes."

Moffitt: "How will the IFAs administrative fees for the loan applications be determined?"

Jackson: "The IFA will determine the fees based upon analysis of the internal costs associated with financial, due diligence, and originating and closing the current round that's, i.e., summer of 2012 of the fire truck loans. The dollars that will allocate and prorate the IFA cost on a per application basis which then... which will then be used to establish the fees."

Moffitt: "And is the legislative intent of this proposal to keep the administrative fees charged by IFA or Illinois Finance Authority on these loans as low as possible?"

Jackson: "Yes. The fees will be established and enable IFA to recover reasonable overhead expense associated with managing the program."

Moffitt: "Representative, you and I both feel very strongly about these programs continuing, if anything, get more money in them, and I would remind the Body these are not giveaway programs. You loan out the money, the next year payments come back, you have money to loan out again, so in effect, it keeps recycling, it's ongoing. So, I know you and I want to continue that and working with the State Fire Marshal's Office and Finance Authority, I think we can do that with the legislative intent we've indicated."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Jackson: "Yes. The idea is to make sure of continuing that those individuals receive zero interest or low interest loans. The idea is to make sure that the money is maximized on but also affording houses or fire... city's ability to borrow... get the money at zero interest."

Moffitt: "Representative, thank you. I appreciate your answers to the legislative intent, and I think this will make sure that a very good program continues and hopefully it's even stronger. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rose."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Rose: "Representative Jackson, for purposes of legislative intent, I have page 3 here of the questions. Are you ready, Sir?"

Jackson: "Yes, I do. Come on with page 3."

Rose: "For purposes of legislative intent, are you reading from a prepared script?"

Jackson: "Not yours."

Rose: "No, got it. Very good. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "That's it, Sir? That's it? You're sure? Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? You weren't sure, Sir? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

passed. Senate Bill 3397, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3397, a Bill for an Act concerning finance."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out of the record, please. Senate Bill 3420, Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bradley. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3433, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3441, Representative Dugan. Representative Dugan. Read the Bill, please. Don't run, Representative. No, no, no, the Lady says. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3442, Mr. Tryon. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3442, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3432 sets up the Plastic Bag and Film Recycling Act which we've had some discussion about in committee and chamber. This is the result of recommendations made from a task force that was created by the House of Representatives in 2007, and that task force was to include the boundaries of Lake County and a pilot program would be started with 41 municipalities and a task force from that would make recommendations to the rest of state on how to handle the increasing demands that are placed on our landfills by plastic and film bags. They did that and this legislation is the result of that recommendation. This is a Bill that is the initiative of those 41 communities that have gone through this for the last two-and-a-half years. It's also

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

the initiative of a cooperative effort between the Illinois Manufacturers Association, the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, and the Progressive Manufacturing Alliance. From that, we see a Bill here that sets forth a recycling program, not just in 41 communities, but will give access to the entire state of Illinois, so that we can recycle not only plastic bags but all kinds of polyethylene film. And polyethylene film is a dry cleaning bag. It's shrink wrap on bottles. It's shrink wrap that you see on boats, it shrink wrap that you see on tissue paper. shrink wrap that you see on almost all packaging. Keeping this out of our landfill, putting it into a recycling stream, and reusing it as other products is a good thing for us to do in the future as we try in our pursuits to protect the environment. When we look at this program and we look at what it really is, plastic bags is only 15 percent of the plastic recyclable or waste material that enters the waste stream. So, we're going to be able to look at being able to capture a significant amount more of that waste stream by doing this and bringing it to all areas of Illinois. And that is significant when the cornerstone is giving people the option to be able to recycle things they've never been able to do in the past. So when we look at what we have, and this Bill is not without opposition because it requires an exception to the Home Rule provision of our Constitution, in order for this program to work and for any recycling program to work, you have to have a consistent and integral source of the recyclable material entering the waste stream. So, we can't have communities

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

banning it or taxing it or keeping the material out of the waste stream because the recycling market will become depressed and would not be able to be able to be maintained as a viable market. So that is why we have a preemption of Home Rule. In addition to those 41 communities that are in support of this Bill, there are 6 communities that are considering other programs. One of them particularly has been vocal which is Champaign, who is wanting to establish a tax on bags. That interferes with the success of us being able to take this program statewide. And I will assure you that we will receive and obtain a greater result by having a statewide program than just by having municipalities that do this. This program will sunset away in the year... in four years, after four complete years which would be five years from the time that this Bill comes into law. And if the goals of this program aren't met, then the decision to renew it is a decision that the General Assembly at that time would make. So what we have here today, is a program that sets up registry of a manufacturers who manufacture and extrude plastic bag film stock. There's only about 20 of those manufacturers in Illinois and the entire country that sell into this market that would have to pay in to that registry. Those bags would have a unique identifier number on it so we know that the bags sold in Illinois are coming from bag... registered bag manufacturers that are participating in the recycling program. We will see a significant increase in the amount of bags that are being recycled and... and that is a good thing. And while our Constitution provides great and

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

special powers to municipalities when it comes to Home Rule, that great and special powers is not and was not ever meant to be at the expense of the greater good of the rest of Illinois. And this is a program that that would be an example on. Something that we could do for the next four years that would be a model program throughout the state with no cost to the taxpayers. And this is an industry-driven, private approach to a public policy problem that could be solved without taxpayer financing. I think this is a model program, a program that other states of success will be able to build upon, a program that we will be able to see and improve upon in four years. So with that, I would urge everybody to vote 'aye'. And I would answer any questions that you may have."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon has moved for the passage of the Bill.

The Chair recognizes Representative May."

May: "Thank you. Thank you, Speaker. To the Sponsor. I reluctantly have to oppose your Bill, and when I first heard of it, I, of course, wanted to support it. I think that it's an environmental problem, but I don't think it's an environmental solution. The real problem that I have with this Bill, it prohibits local communities from doing what they want to do. With Illinois, only recycling 1.5 percent of its plastic grocery bags and .7 percent of its plastic film, we are at the bottom. I am fro… afraid that we are codifying failure. So, what I need to make sure from the Chair though, because this is prohibiting local governments and our Home Rule communities from doing what they want to do, what are the votes required for this?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Speaker Lang: "I anticipated that question, and we've asked the parliamentarian to provide the answer and we'll get that to you before the end of debate."

May: "You are such a fabulous Speaker. Thank... not... I would like it before the end of the day or the debate did you say?"

Speaker Lang: "The end of the debate."

"Thank you. Thank you. So, I had to look at this very May: carefully because my community of Highland Park, being very environmental, put its own program into place. Now, I am glad that you're Amendment did incl... at least not take away powers that they have right now, but when you just look at the math, it doesn't it just doesn't make sense. our math professor's going to talk to that, but you know, zero plus zero equals zero. We're at a very low level. We are not getting to the heart of the problem. I think that it will be tying our hands from doing more for four years. The representative of IRMA, and I did talk to them because I felt like I needed to understand what we were doing with this environmental problem, said, well, we're trying to get something to happen in Jacksonville. Well, I called the Wal-Mart in Jacksonville and they already collect plastic bags as do many retails. Wal-Mart, Jewel, Dominicks, Kroger and Schumcks (sic-Schnucks) are already doing it, but we are not getting to the heart of the problem. I would remind... and those who are concerned about fees that this does include fees in it. The Chicago Tribune did editorialize against it. The opponents include Illinois Municipal League plus several cities. The City of

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Springfield passed a resolution recently. The Alliance for the Great Lakes, Environment Illinois, Sierra Club, the Illinois Recycling Association, the Illinois Policy Institute, the National Resources Defense Council, and just recently, the Environmental Law and Policy Center. So, reluctantly, I speak against this because it's not solving the real problem. The idea of preempting Home Rule was nonnegotiable, it was not allowed. We need to at least allow that we get beyond being on the low rung of what are we... what we are doing to recycling for the communities that want to do the more they have to be allowed to do more. Thank you. I reluctantly urge a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Because there are still 10 people that wish to speak, I will take it off of Short Debate, but we will have a strict two-minute time limit for each speaker. The next speaker is Representative Jakobsson for two minutes."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 3442. Really, tell me, would you rather have these flying around in the air..."
- Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Representative Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson: "...littering your streets, being caught in the trees..."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Jakobsson, let's get it quiet in here so we can hear you. I'll give you some extra seconds. Could we please hold down the noise in the chamber. Please hold down the noise in the chamber. Representative Jakobsson."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Jakobsson: "Thank you, I'll continue... or would you rather carry a reusable bag with you, one that doesn't have to be thrown away every time you use it or put in supposedly a recycling unit every time you use it? These last for a long time. I've had this one for several years, I mean, you can see it's been used. This one was provided to me by the Farm Bureau even. So, you know, they want to see us use recyclable materials. And for those of you who think that maybe you don't want to carry something around that size, I have this in my purse with me every day, and look, it opens up really big, it can hold a lot. So, there are certainly ways to get away from plastic bags. But one of my big problems with this Bill is that it doesn't get at the source. And it would disallow the City of Champaign from enforcing its resolution that it wants to put in place because it would like to get at the source and not allow stores just to give away plastic bags or paper bags. The board of directors of the Illinois Recycling Association voted its regularly scheduled meeting not to support Senate Bill 3442 because it doesn't get at the true source of these bags and get a source reduction. So, I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia, for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "I'm afraid to ask a question because his answer might

be longer than his opening statement."

Speaker Lang: "You can count on that, Sir."

Sacia: "Representative Tryon..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Tryon: "Coming from you that's a compliment."

Sacia: "Thank you. My first question, has there ever been back to back trophies from the same county."

Tryon: "I would not have the answer to that."

Sacia: "And why don't we recycle on the House Floor? Wouldn't that be..."

Tryon: "I think that... I think that's a good point, I don't know why we don't."

Sacia: "Seriously, Representative, I think the biggest reason that I wanted to ask a couple of questions is when I... there seems to be such a contradiction of those in opposition and then those in favor. Would you just enlighten me a little bit as to why?"

Tryon: "Well, the opposition mostly centers around the exemption or exception to Home Rule, and that's a decision you have to make today. For this program to work, you have to have the resource of the bag in the recycling market. It doesn't work. The Bag Alliance tried this in California and three counties banned it; and therefore, they could never hit the goals of the program. And as you might well know, in order to make a recycling program work you have to have a market for it. So... so... this... this Bill is a result of learning from that experience."

Sacia: "Is... is there... listening to one of the previous speakers, in fact, it was the first Lady that spoke, some of her questions were along the lines of... an organization like Sierra Club. I still struggle with their opposition to it."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Tryon: "Well, their opposition... I mean, most of the opposition even from the environmental groups isn't on environmental issues, it's on governance issues. It's... there is one environmental group that thinks if we don't have anything, we... we will likely get bans across the state. Now, that's not going to happen and that's not going to happen in four years. We'll get more bags out in the next four years if we do this program than if we do nothing."

Speaker Lang: "Are you finished, Sir? Excellent. The next speaker is Representative Williams for two minutes."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I support recycling programs and would be supporting this Bill but for the fact that it preempts Home Rule. The reality is, that this Bill sets low recycling goals but prevents any municipality from doing more even when the residents of that municipality want to do more. Why should we tie their hands like that? When you're talking about a statewide recycling ban, I think we need to look at setting a floor, not a ceiling, as this Bill does. Unfortunately, while I support the goals underlying the Bill, because of the preemption of Home Rule and stripping local communities of the ability to control their recycling programs, I'm going to have to vote 'no'. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mell for two minutes."

Mell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to... to the Bill. I would just like to point out that the City of Los Angeles, the second largest city in the United States, became the largest U.S. city to ban plastic bags today. And as we see, this is

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

becoming more and more of the case with our smaller cities and bigger cities and I would urge a 'no' vote because we are tying the hands of our villages and cities when they want to really do a true... to make a true environmental impact on their... our community."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Senger: "I just want to make sure my understanding here. A person who buys a plastic bag has to buy only from the manufacturer with the label on it? Is that how's it's suppose to work?"

Tryon: "They have to buy a bag from a registered source, the State of Illinois."

Senger: "Okay."

Tryon: "So, they... we have a unique coding number that was part of the Amendment we adopted yesterday, so it doesn't disclose the actual manufacturer."

Senger: "So anybody who purchases plastic bags have to have that..."

Tryon: "Anybody that purchases plastic bags for resell. So if I'm a person... if I'm a business that takes plastic bags and print on it 'Citizens for Senger', then I have buy up that bag from a registered source."

Senger: "Okay."

Tryon: "Now, there are only about 20 known manufacturers in the country that extrude the film products that you can make those bags out of."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Senger: "Yes. Checking with my community in Naperville, they're... they think this is a good idea but again, they'd like to do it themselves and they would... you know, they don't like the fact that businesses have to go to a certain manufacturer only to do it. They would rather see a program where it's working for them to recycle, particularly in our downtown area, it's very difficult to recycle. So, they're... they don't like the fact this take away their Home Rule power to do what really works for them, which is a little unique."

Tryon: "Well, from my understanding, all of the bag manufacturers in the country but two support this, so..."

Speaker Lang: "David Harris for two minutes."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A quick question of the Sponsor. This Bill preempts Home Rule. Does it preempt Home Rule in Chicago?"

Tryon: "No, it exempts Chicago."

Harris, D.: "It does not preempt..."

Tryon: "Wait, we exempted Chicago 'cause they already have a program, so does Highland Park; we exempted them."

Harris, D.: "Okay. It exempts Chicago..."

Tryon: "We exempted the programs that are already operating."

Harris, D.: "Thank you very much, I've only got two minutes.

Ladies and Gentlemen, it's good enough for everybody else in the state, but we're... we're leaving Chicago out. Well, I don't think that's the way things should be done. Let me tell you what then, I know you all know how you're going to vote on this Bill, but let's put some things in the record. This is what the Chicago Tribune said about this Bill. The

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Bill to curb plastic bag usage heaps government regulation on a prodem... a problem best solved by us, the consumers. Reusable fabric bags are the environmentally friendly That's what we should be alternative to plastic. promoting, rather, this Bill cracks down on the manufacturers of plastic bags, adds new regulations to businesses that use the bags, creates a pile of mandatory reporting requirements and it lists the EPA as the enforcer of last resort. One of the previous speakers made the comment that it really doesn't increase recycling very much and they're very correct. It's only going to re... increase the recycling rate in the State of Illinois from about 1.5 percent to about 1.68 percent. That is not a whole increase in recycling we ought to be shooting for. Bill has lots of problems. The Gentleman's intent is right; we need to recycle. I just don't think this is the right path to take or the right Bill that we should be voting for. I request a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Committee Report. Mr. Reis for two minutes."

Reis: "Before you start your timer, Mr. Speaker, we don't want to use our... your two minutes up there for Committee Reports."

Speaker Lang: "You go right ahead, Sir."

Reis: "Thank you. To the Bill. I... I've been following this quite a bit and my good friend Representative Tryon has been in my office many times and I've struggled with this Bill, but when you hear the debate today, there's people standing up that you wouldn't think that would be in

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

opposition to this Bill. And you have to ask what's their Their reason is, is that they want to have individual bans on these bags. Either that or you're going to get charged a dime for them. Champaign wants to charge a dime for every plastic bag. So, you're going to go into the store, you're going to forget your bag, your carry... recyclable bag or reusable bag, you're going to be faced with buying the plastic bags for a dime or you're going to be carrying things out in your arms. So, in talking with IRMA and the retail merchants, they think that they're being proactive with this. They're going to put a statewide program in place so that you can come down here and go to the grocery store and you know what the rules are going to be. I can go to Highland Park or in the northern suburbs and I know what the rules are going to be. It's proactive in trying to get plastic bags out of our environment and you're not going to have a hodgepodge set of rules and regulations that are different in Champaign than they are in Cairo. So, I struggled with this Bill; I'm going to support your Bill. I've encouraged everyone to, to be proactive and not just have situations where we're going to be banning bags in individual towns. We see that going on in California; I don't think that's the direction we want to go. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

142nd Legislative Day

- Biss: "Representative, could you just explain once more, 'cause

 I haven't totally understood it, exactly what this Bill
 does vis-à-vis increase recycling targets?"
- Tryon: "This Bill actually will provide a statewide recycling program that will be done by the industry. The industry will reg... the manufacturers of the actual extruded products will register, become a registered source. Those manufacturers..."
- Biss: "No, no, I understand the… if we could just… with respect to my two minutes. What is the numerical impact of the Bill? What does the Bill do about increased numerical recycling targets?"
- Tryon: "Well, you know, I know where the fee... or the percentage of 1.5 percent came from; that's wrong. They don't understand how this Bill works. This Bill has a formula for setting a baseline of the number of bags divided by the tons recycled, and when we do that, the minimum that this will set is 4.2 percent of the bags. Already they're going to start way higher than where they're at today, and then in the first year, they're going to have to increase that by 12 percent. So, this is a... few hundred percent increase from where we're at today."
- Biss: "I would just argue for the Body, that 12 percent that's being fought back and forth about is a really tiny drop in the bucket. You're talking about incrementing a number whether it's one-and-a-half percent or 2 percent or even possibly as much as 4 percent by a tiny little bit. In a moment in our society when where we're seeing recycling

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

numbers increase anyway naturally at a rate that would exceed that. And so the truth is that..."

Tryon: "Actually that's not true."

Biss: "...that increment in your Bill, it's a blithe, it's going to be an invincible blithe. I stand in opposition to this Bill, not because I want towns all across Illinois to immediately start banning bags, but because I've talked to my own mayors who say, we just don't know where we're going to go and this completely ties our hands and it'll have a negligible impact on actual recycling. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Reboletti: "Does this Bill need 71 votes to pass?"

Speaker Lang: "Representative May asked that earlier and I indicated we would have an answer before we voted, Sir."

Reboletti: "Thank..."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Reboletti: "...thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?

Representative, how do we recycle bags right now?"

Tryon: "The only recycling of the bags that are done are done through return to the retail outlets that are participating by themselves into a program."

Reboletti: "And so we're not even at 1 percent based on putting some cardboard boxes at some of the grocery stores and other facilities like that?"

Tryon: "We're at a very low rate right now."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Reboletti: "And we've heard that this only moves it up from 1.1. percent to 1.2, is that true?"

Tryon: "No. What this Bill will do, it will have to set a baseline by 2014 and that baseline will be decided by the amount of bags sold in the state and the amount of... and the tons recycled, and what that's estimated to generate is a baseline of about 4.5 percent of the bags, and then in the first year they have to increase that by 12 percent. And the goal is to try to get to 20 percent. So it has some significant... it is a floor and it's not a ceiling."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. I'm surprised I hear this argument about preempting Home Rule, what about my town? Not that many years ago we put a smoking ban in the state which preempted Home Rule, but this is different I guess because if you don't like it because you want your own community to tax bags and tax plastic, we got tax bottles that you can't drink out of a plastic bottle, don't use a plastic cup. We're going to tax those. Use your hands to drink water, that's ridiculous. If I don't want to bring a bag to the store, I'm not going to bring a bag to the store. Again, we go back to the nanny state. Here's an idea to try to get plastic bags from flying down the street, to keep them out of the landfills. The Gentleman's got a good Bill. I urget... I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti and Representative May, in answer to your question about the vote requirement, the Chair rules that because of the preemption of Home Rule this Bill will require 71 votes. The Chair recognizes Mr. Rose."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This really creates quite a conundrum. The reality is... the reality is we are now asking government to save us from I've sat here for the last three weeks and been confused as heck by, what do you do? Do you vote for the bigger government or the bigger government? are you going to go with? Well, back where I lived, in the City of Champaign, decided they thought it'd be a good idea to do a nickel a bag tax on people. Well that sounds okay I guess until you realize that most of the people who shop at the retail don't live there nor do they vote on the city council people who are thinking about installing that rule. Now, since this has become such a big whoopty do here under Representative Tryon's Bill, the city council decided to pull back, but the reality is, all our constituents, my constituents that shop there on the weekends would end up paying that recycling tax for a nickel a bag. So now here I am being called upon to stop them with us, and I ask... I mean this is one of the most bizarre Bills in a long, long time because we're asking government to stop government, so, may the government win. I'll be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "That was definitely a conundrum, I didn't understand a word you said. The Chair recognizes Mr. Winters for two minutes, the last speaker on this Bill."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. One of the facts that was brought out is that only 15 percent of the plastic films in this state are the plastic bags that we all think of. We think of them as a huge problem, but in fact, six times as many pounds of

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

plastic will not have a recycling market, no facility available to them to recycle film that's used to wrap so many other things than groceries. I applaud Representative Tryon for the fact that he's brining this forward and making recycling available pretty much throughout state. The problem we have is a few communities that think they're so smart that they ought to tell their residents exactly what they can and cannot do, but they haven't had the guts to pass it as a Resolution in the city council. Now they're all stirred up because we might preempt them. Well, I think that we should. We should make recycling for plastic films available throughout the state, not let a few elitist communities decide that they know better than us. We should support this Bill, pass it, and make recycling of plastic film available throughout the state on a uniform basis. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon to close."

Tryon: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's been a lot of misinformation about this Bill, and one of that... the biggest part of that is around the amount that is going to be recycled. But one of the environmental groups is saying today it's a percent and a half. They don't understand how this Bill works. This Bill will require a baseline to be done. A baseline will be based upon the amount of bags sold in Illinois which is 81,400 tons a year divided by the amount of bags that are recycled. That will create a percentage of 4.2 percent, and that will have to be increased after that. That's a substantial increase and will generate an additional 852

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

thousand pounds of bags and film products that won't go our landfills. And if you're concerned protecting our landfill space, you're concerned about having a solution to this problem that goes statewide, I assure you that in the next four years we will take more... way more bags out of this waste stream than we will by it's nothing. And unfortunate that that misinformation is out there. The other thing, quite frankly, I've been dumbfounded by, was that environmental groups that supported the initial Bill that set up the Plastic Bag and Film Recycling Act that created a task force to look at that, isn't supporting the task recommendations. This is what the task recommended. We are taking the pilot project statewide. It worked, it was successful. It will be successful. It will be there... there will be annual reports. This is a huge commitment for the industry to make, and if those annual reports indicate that we're not actually going to hit those results, then in four years the program goes away. would we be opposed to an industry-driven solution to this problem that doesn't cost taxpayers any money, that doesn't treat cities around Illinois differently, because some cities will never ban it and they'll never have recycling options. This is a good Bill. It's good public policy. Let's support our industry that came together, worked hard for the last two-and-a-half years based on a Bill that we passed and asked them to do. Let's show them the support, let's show that Illinois can do it, let's have a model

142nd Legislative Day

- program, let's be the first in the country. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman's moved for the passage of the Bill.

 This Bill requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Lilly. Representative Lilly. Please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Bill... Mr. Tryon."
- Tryon: "Can I put that on Postponed Consideration?"
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman asked for a Postponed Consideration, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Lyons in the Chair."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're proceeding to Second Readings on page 13 of the Calendar. Representative Feigenholtz has Senate Bill 2840. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2840, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill's read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments #4 and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Feigenholtz."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz on Floor Amendment #4."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 does not allow Senate Bill 2840 the Smart Act to become law unless Senate Bill 3397 which is the Section 25 Finance Act Reform and House Bill 5007, the Cook County Waiver Bill to become law."

142nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Floor
 Amendment #4. The Chair... on the Amendment, Representative?

 On the Amendment, Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Reboletti: "Representative, could you explain what Committee

 Amendment #4 does? What Floor Amendment #4 does? I

 couldn't hear you, I'm sorry."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a major piece of legislation."
- Feigenholtz: "I'm... I'm sorry, Representative Reboletti."
- Speaker Lyons: "There'll be a lot of questions going back and forth. Sara, wait a second. We need to bring the noise level down, please. Shh... Thank you very much."
- Reboletti: "Representative… Representative Feigenholtz, I know many of us on this side of the aisle could not hear your explanation of the Floor Amendment. If you could explain it again, I know this is a very… a very major reform piece."
- Feigenholtz: "It is. And I apologize, Representative Reboletti. Amendment #4 is the Smart Act."
- Reboletti: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, 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. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz on Floor Amendment #5."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you. Again, I confused my numbers.

 Amendment #5 all... does not allow Senate Bill 2840, the

 Smart Act, to become law unless Senate Bill 3397, which is
 the Section 25 language for this Act, and House Bill 5007

 which is the Cook County waiver Bill to become law."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Floor Amendment #5. Seeing no discussion, all those in favor of its adoption 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2840, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz on Senate Bill 2840 as amended."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier this year we were... we had the Governor in this chamber. He told us that the Medicaid system was on the brink of collapse and that we had a \$2.7 billion hole, and that we had to do something about it before we left here this spring. This Bill addresses those issues. The Smart Act was developed by all four caucuses. Representative Patti Bellock who's been talking about Medicaid reform for many years along with Senator Steans and Senator Righter who worked tirelessly along with our staff to try and craft a Bill that protected

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

the neediest people here in the State of Illinois but also cut back on excesses in the program. We are, in this Bill, reducing eligibility to 133 percent of the federal poverty level rate for adults in the FamilyCare Program removing Illinois Cares Rx from... from law, improving integrity and putting a lot of measures in place on issues that we've been talking about, about eligibility and income verification. And I would be glad to answer any questions from Members of this House."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, can I have your attention for Leader Tom Cross."

Cross: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to spend a lot of I want to acknowledge some things about this Bill and some people that have been working on it. I became Leader for our caucus about nine years ago, and a number of people talked about Medicaid in our caucus on a pretty regular basis, but none more than Patti Bellock. And you know, it was year in and year out that she said we've got to do Medicaid reform; it's essential. Representative Mulligan talked about it and others came along and said this is something we have to do; it's putting huge, huge pressures on our budget. And for a long time, I thought all it was was going to be talk, and I thought, this is never going to happen. All we're going to do is talk about it year in and year out, and we, in fact, saw pressures rise in our cost and our expenses continue to rise through the Blagojevich years and beyond. And then all of a sudden, it occurred to me that this might really happen as we watched this year, and because of work of Representative

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Feigenholtz and we heard Steans and Senator Righter and the administration, a lot of people have pitched in, a lot of people in this chamber gave ideas, a lot of people throughout the state gave their ideas, and it's pretty amazing that we're here today talking about what I think is a pretty significant Bill. And I want to say thank you to all of those people. Clayton Klenke on our side worked along with Patti Bellock. These people put in literally hundreds of hours, not just idle chitchat but hard, hard, hard, difficult, difficult work that have impacts and affects a lot of people. As we're finding out, it's very easy to talk about cutting government, it's very easy to slice here and slice there, but when you do it, it impacts people, it affects people, but they did it in a pretty remarkable way. Is there more to do? I think there's some and many of us on our side would agree there's more to do. This doesn't mean reform is over, it's doesn't mean that we will stop, and there's some that firmly believe we need to go further, and none of us would argue with that, and I would be the first to say to those that are saying it's not enough, yes, we need to go further. But at the end of the day when you think about this, we're going to have a billion six in pressure relief for us, short- and longterm. You couple that with a billion and seven, I believe we're going to pay off in bills, 900 less spending from the year before. It is the beginning and slow trip out of this very difficult and deep hole that was created, and we can talk on and on about how we got there, and there'll be time for that, but this is a part of that exit. And we need to

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

not lose sight of the fact that a billion and six in cuts in the Medicaid program is very significant. Imagine, as well, the fact that we will have a private vendor implementing a lot of these reforms, looking over them and this whole issue of verification on whether or not people should be enrolled in this. It doesn't mean that we're trying to hurt people that need Medicaid, the fact that we say to those that belong on Medicaid rolls, we want you to be there, but there's a belief that there may be over 300 thousand people that whether they may not live here, they're making more money, they may not even be alive, are still on our Medicaid rolls. It almost sounds like a county that runs a voting... their voting rolls, and it was suppose to be an attempt at humor, excuse me, but the reality is, the fact that there's an agreement to utilize a private vendor to go through these rolls is incredibly significant. This Bill also contains a two-year moratorium on further expansion which we found is something we do need to do, we needed to discipline ourselves. So, to all of those that have been involved in this process and you've done a very good job of trying to minimize cuts to providers, recognize that there's certain hospitals that shouldn't take cuts, certain segments in the health care community whether it's dentists or physicians, or FQHCs that shouldn't take cuts and there have been a lot of people working to find that happy medium. I think you've gotten there, so thank you for that. There's more to do over the next couple of days to get this whole package completed, but this is a great first step, and again, on our side to Representative

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Bellock, Patti, an incredible job. Thanks for your perseverance, your stick-with-it attitude from 10 years ago even beyond. We very much appreciate and believe you were one that drove this issue for many, many years and we're finally there, and so thank you for that leadership. And thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader Cross. Representative Will Davis."

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

Davis, W.: "Representative, can you in any type, way, shape, form or fashion, explain to me what the impact of these cuts will be?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I can talk to you a little bit about how many people may be affected by the federal poverty level rate, how many people may be losing coverage when it comes to Illinois Cares Rx, but I could also tell you and assure you, that if we do nothing, all of Illinois and every vulnerable person who's Medicaid eligible will lose... the whole system will collapse."

Davis, W.: "And I can appreciate it. A previous speaker talked about this was a happy medium. I don't know what's happy about anything that we have to do here, particularly, for our populations or constituencies that are going to be overly impacted by these particular cuts or maybe it's happy because it's not his constituents, but it's certainly mine and I'm not happy about it, to be quite honest with you. But nevertheless, nevertheless... so, when we met with Director Hamos, when I say we, I'm talking about Members of

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

the House Black Caucus, we talked about certain things that we wanted to at least make sure were protected or saved in the midst of this conversation. So what can you tell me about detox services?"

- Feigenholtz: "Representative, in the original draft, almost all optional services were removed. And from that point on what we did as a group was we decided that optional services were originally designed to avert costs. When we revisited the issue of detox, we put it back in, and we believe that there... it will be able to be rectified with utilization control."
- Davis, W.: "So there will be services, detox services that will not be removed from certain hospitals?"
- Feigenholtz: "That is correct."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. What can you tell me about wrap payments for FQHCs?"
- Feigenholtz: "The FQHCs will be paid by the managed care companies and their..."
- Davis, W.: "You said 'will be'. Is that a... is that set in stone?"
- Feigenholtz: "When... when this Act becomes law, I believe the legislation reflects that."
- Davis, W.: "Are you certain? I just had a conversation with the president of an FQHC who indicated that she was told by Director Hamos that they would have to go and negotiate additional dollars from managed care companies. You make it sound like that it's automatically going to happen. So will it happen or will it not happen?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

- Feigenholtz: "My understanding is, is that the Director of HFS has been in contact with FQHCs about exactly what you're talking about. They have agreed to enter in negotiations and they have reflected that they are satisfied with that as an answer."
- Davis, W.: "Well, it sounds like they didn't necessarily agree to negotiations, but they're being told that's what they're going to have to do in order to try to get these additional dollars."
- Feigenholtz: "Representative, there is nothing in this Bill that anyone is completely happy about. I am not going to ever represent that."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. With regard to safety net hospitals, that is in this Bill, correct?"
- Feigenholtz: "That is correct."
- Davis, W.: "So, was it that there was an original threshold I believe of Medicaid at 50 percent, that that was the original threshold and that that threshold was subsequently lowered to 40 percent?"
- Feigenholtz: "Representative, if you're trying to ask about the calculation, it's 40 percent with 4 percent charity care."
- Davis, W.: "Well, that's what it is now, but was it always at that level?"
- Feigenholtz: "That was always the proposal."
- Davis, W.: "That was always the proposal? Okay. I'll just end with this. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. It's my understanding that before or as this conversation got started, the question was, \$2.7 billion, was that actually attainable in one year? It's my understanding that we have

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

had experts come to this state to tell us that \$2.7 billion was not attainable in one year. So, the question I think still remains, why so eager to get to that number in one While I understand what the Sponsor indicated that if something was not done, that the entire system would indeed collapse and I can appreciate that, but the question is, did we have to go this far in one year? And some would argue that while there was a need for reform, there was a need for change, there was a need to address the issues of waste, frod... fraud and abuse, that going this far, this quickly, is going to have a greater impact on communities than had we not taken our time, not to go against and not appreciate any of the work that the worked committee, the Medicaid Committee understand and appreciate the long hours that they put into it, but the fact that we're going this far. I mean, if we're cutting rates to providers and they stop taking individuals, those individuals are going to wind up in emergency rooms. And if they wind up in emergency rooms, isn't that going to cost us more than if we were able to simply pay enough providers to take care of the individuals at the appropriate rate? The fact that we're making these kind of cuts in such a drastic way and such a quick way, in my opinion, certainly I think is what's going to damage our system even further. So, unfortunately, and is with regret that I would encourage a 'no' vote on this Bill. Give us an opportunity to go back and do it sensibly and in a way that we will not drastically and overburden communities,

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

particularly like the ones that I represent, in this way. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mary Flowers."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. It's really amazing to me that there are 2.7 million people, women, children, seniors, and people that's disabled, 2.7 million that's going to be affected by this Bill that we are about to... or that's before us today and the budget deficit is 2.7 billion. There's just something about that 2.7, I don't know where these numbers came from, but there's something going on with that 2.7. And when you take consideration that what we are about to do is going to be very harmful and it's going to be very dangerous to the State of Illinois and the people whom we're suppose to be here to help. And I think there's other ways that we can address this \$2.7 billion deficit. I don't know where it's written in the law that this has to be balanced off the backs of poor people, off the backs of seniors, off the backs of the aged, blind, and the disabled. I haven't seen that in the years that I've been down here, but may I make a few suggestions, please. I would like to bring to your attention, what happened to the cigarette tax? I hear some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, under no circumstances will they vote for a cigarette tax. Now that would bring \$700 million in so we don't have to balance the budget off the backs of poor people. happened to making foreign dividends subject to Illinois income tax? That would bring in a mere \$386 million. What about reinstituting the fund sweep of the surplus funds

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

and... that's outside the General Revenue Fund. That would bring in 300 million. What about reducing the statutory transfer by nine percent? That's two million. What about eliminating the retail sales tax discount? That's 100 million. What about closing the corporate tax loophole on purchasing industry insurance? That's 10 million. about broadening the sales tax to select consumer services? That's 550 million. What about closing the corporate loophole tax for offshore drilling? Offshore drilling, \$75 million the State of Illinois is paying out. There's lots of things, Ladies and Gentlemen, we can do rather than putting senior citizens and disabled people out on the street without having access to their health care. Representative, I would like to ask you a few questions, please, in regards to this Bill. There's a Section in the Bill that deals with who can have home health care services and who can go to nursing homes. But one of the requirements... one of the requirements is that you would first have to do something very expensive before you could have these services, and that is go to the hospital. why, if we are so broke and need to save so much money, would we force these people to go into the hospital before they can get the services that they rightfully deserve? Can you answer that, please?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Flowers, in this Bill we are limiting home health to posthospitalization."

Flowers: "That's not answering my... what do you mean by posthospitalization? The Bill says that if you want this service, that you have to be referred to the hospital. Now

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

I know you're... there might be some changes made, but right now, the Bill that we are about to vote on has that language in it."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, we still have programs in the State of Illinois for people who need home health care such as the CCP Program and the Home Services Program at the Depart..."

Flowers: "That's not answering my question. Is this language in the Bill that a certain group of people would have to go to the hospital first before they can get that service?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Flowers: "Okay. So, again, that's another waste. In regards to the administration, what's being changed in the administration? Are the hours going to change so people who can apply for Medicaid or... are there going to be different hours or are they still going to close at 5:00? That's number one."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, that's DHS..."

Flowers: "But DH... wait, excuse me. We will not play semantics or deal with the initials, okay? Because DHS, part of DHS deal with Medicaid. Am I correct about that?"

Feigenholtz: "We are in the process..."

Flowers: "And we're talking..."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I know what you're talking about and if you let me answer, I'm going to tell you that the Human Services Appropriations Committee just this week discussed increasing staffing at the very offices that you're referring to."

Flowers: "Is it in this Bill?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Feigenholtz: "No. Hopefully it's going to be in the budget."

"Hopefully. See Representative, that's part of the Flowers: problem, that's how we got here in the first place because the administration. Now one other thing, by the way, right now, with the Department of Unemployment Insurance, you can go any place in the state. And as far as getting a driver's license, you can also go any place in the state. In regards to applying to Medicaid, can you go... I know you can apply at any office, but when it comes down to actually getting your services, you have to go to the one in your district and some of those office are very overcrowded and the quality... and there's been... there has been people standing in long lines. So, what about the ... again, what's ... what's being changed in regards to the administration? And by the way, by the way, Representative, it was testified to that the department does have a telephone line that they were referring people to, knowing that that telephone line would not be answered and was not operable. So, is this the type of services that we're going to continue to impede for the people who are in need of Medicaid? Will they be sent to a dead line where no one is answering the phone?"

Feigenholtz: "That's certainly not my intent..."

Flowers: "Is anything..."

Feigenholtz: "...and we are trying to..."

Flowers: "...to fix that in this Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I think the reforms and the cost savings that we are going to be able to realize, hopefully, in this Bill, are going to be able to right the system.

That would be my goal."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Flowers: "No, it will... no, what you're doing, because those people will be dead, you want to at the expense of people's lives, okay, because it's not the senior citizens, they're not writing the Bill nor are they try... they will... they'd be in a position to make this Bill right because they will be dead because they will not have access to health care. want to know what's being done in the office, what's being done on the administrative side? What type of quality assurance are we bringing to the table in this legislation? What type of preventive fraud control are we bringing in regards to the contracts? In regards to the providers? What checks and balances are we bringing to the table in this legislation, Representative, that will save dollars for the people of the State of Illinois that will help close the gap? I know we will be eliminating people, I know we're going to lose matching federal funds, but you tell me, on the administrative side, what are we doing?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, we are doing our best as I said earlier to shore up this system and to bring integrity back into it so that we can solve the problem..."

Flowers: "Integrity... integrity, Representative, it sounds like it's business as usual to me inside the office, because let me explain. By not providing adults with the necessary dental services they need, is not assuring integrity. By not providing prescription Medicare (sic-Medicaid), that's... we're going to pay for the hospital services, Representative, we're going to pay for these same patients to go into the hospital. We're going to even pay for them to go into the nursing home, but oh, my goodness, if they

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

ever need the prescription drug that will keep them out of the nursing home, that will keep them out of the hospital, we're going to deny that, and don't you think that a \$10 bottle of pills is more effective than to have... than to have the patient to go into the hospital or to go to a nursing home?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, Illinois is the only state that has an additional program like Illinois Cares Rx. Seniors get their drugs through Medicare Part D now."

"Oh, Representative, you're absolutely right. Flowers: Seniors do, some seniors. If their income is less than \$10,000, Representative, but what about those seniors that's income is 10,001 up to \$30,000? They will not be covered by Medicare Part D. That was the reason why, Representative, we had this Rx Program in the law. It was to save the state money; it was to save lives. It is the medically necessary prescription that the doctors have prescribed that we... have ... we paid for it, Representative. We paid for these patients to go to see the doctors. We paid for the doctors to write the prescription. It's the prescription company, the doctors and the... the pharmaceutical companies, they're going to be paid, but the patients will not be able to get their medicine. So, would you please explain to me how that is saving money? And by the way, Representative, another thing. You know, we pass all kinds of laws about driving safely, but because you are... because you are having the seniors or the adults to get one pair of prescription glasses a year. Now, if a doctor says that the senior, I'm not talking about the

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

children, but if the doctor says that the senior need prescriptions or need to have their eyes checked more than once, then what do they do?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, group health insurance provides for the same provision for state employees. This was an overly generous plan and..."

Flowers: "Overly generous? At least with the group health...
with that group, they're working, Representative. They are
working. So..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, Representative Flowers..."

Flowers: "So, if they want to put theirs on a payment plan, thank you..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Flowers. Mar... Mary. Mary, we have several other speakers and I know how passionate you are. We'll let you continue, but I do have several other speakers, Mary, so..."

Flowers: "I will..."

Speaker Lyons: "...proceed but try to bring your remarks to the end."

Flowers: "To... to the Bill. To the Bill, and thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really appreciate your time and your patience, but I just want to say to the Members of the Body, cutting prescription drugs for the people who need it the most should not be an option. This should not be the way that we should balance the budget. Having people to... the problem with Illinois is for the last 20 years we've underfund Medicaid. This is not what we should be doing. Let's close up the loopholes, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let's deal with some administrative cuts. Let's deal with some

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

changes in the law in regards to what's going on, on the inside before we start causing people to die because we're trying to balance the budget off their backs. I'm not trying to take away anything from anyone about your long hours and your hard work. I commend you. If that's what you believe in, I respect that, that's your... you're entitled to that. But I know that this is wrong and this is not the right thing to do for the people of the State of Illinois. And I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we have numerous speakers and I'm not using the timer. I know how passionate on both sides of the issue we are, but I'd appreciate if you'd be considerate of the other speakers and try to bring your remarks within a five-minute range. Next speaker, Ken Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I know you've worked hard on this, we certainly recognize the fiscal challenges that our state is... has... sort of... that we're in right now, quite some time. Can you explain to me how does the Affordable Care Act possibly play... come into play with this big modification? We're heading into the Affordable Care Act in about another year-and-a-half. How does that fiscally impact our state's Medicaid spin?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, Representative, we're certainly prepared and if the ACA survives the Supreme Court challenge, I mean, the one thing that we have to look forward to if the

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Affordable Care Act becomes law, is that adults without children will be finally covered by Medicaid and that will afford us a lot of opportunities for additional dollars. The Affordable Care Act also brings more... a higher rate, brings the Medicare rate to our practitioners. So, I'm not exactly sure what you're asking. I think it's something we're going to have to wait and see."

Dunkin: "So, but is... are there any projections of savings or savings cost reductions that have run across the committees 'cause..."

Feigenholtz: "I... I think if we take a look at perhaps the Cook County waiver. There has been a discussion and an effort to try and calculate perhaps what kind of an offset that opportunity would give us when we pass that and I'm looking forward to doing that."

Dunkin: "Is the Cook County waiver on this legislation? I didn't see it."

Feigenholtz: "It is not."

Dunkin: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "It's not on here, but it is linked to this Bill."

Dunkin: "Sure. So at this point, you don't know the fiscal impact of the Affordable Care Act as it relates to our Medicaid cost reduction or savings?"

Feigenholtz: "Not as a state… not as a statewide program."

Dunkin: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "Only as it pertains to Cook County, it might be calculable."

Dunkin: "Fair enough. Will... in this legislation, again, you have the authority, is the southwester... southwestern and

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

the Sheridan drug treatment facilities, are they impacted with this particular legislation?"

Feigenholtz: "I don't think so."

Dunkin: "Are you sure, Representative?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry. The southwestern drug..."

Dunkin: "The SWICC. There's a southwestern facility, a prison that runs... that's run by DOC, that has a drug treatment program in it, and I believe some... there are federal dollars and state dollars that impact that program even though it's housed in a DOC property... and shared in a correctional facility as well. Their medical program... there are health programs that are in those respective systems."

Feigenholtz: "You know what, I don't think this is in the Medicaid budget, Representative, although I will tell you that if these are people that are at 133 percent of the federal poverty level rate and they had been receiving care or there is federal match, I don't believe that that changes, but we can check on that."

Dunkin: "Okay. I appreciate that. You know, do… what I'd like to ask is, you know, Members… is there… why we running this Bill first compared to looking at revenue Bills that come through here? Because, it's so easy for us, Representative, to do cuts and eliminations and reductions, but we've only put on the table cuts, eliminations, and reductions. Did you argue the fact that we should start looking at revenues as well or at least come up with an omnibus Bill that would directly deal with our reductions or cuts along side our income generations, such as a cigarette tax?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Feigenholtz: "This was certainly part of the package that we're trying to cobble together to reach the \$2.7 billion, but we do have a single subject issue when it comes to revenue in a Bill like this."

"Sure. Well, again, this is the second Bill that's Dunkin: going through a number of cuts and reductions. As a matter of fact, this is the most significant cut and reduction that we're probably going to be asked to vote on, but we have not had the discussion on significant revenue generation. And I'm looking for votes on both sides of the aisle to talk about ways in which we're going to pay for State Government. Ways in which we're going to pay for our pensions, we have not had that discussion. And so, this is the second major Bill and our most significant Bill and yet it's about cuts, it's about elimination, it's about reduction that some of my colleagues here, that's all they can talk about. Because, well, I don't want to put my personal perspective on this, but I would like... is there a possibility that you can table this Bill until we at least the cigarette tax vote and other get out revenue enhancement votes, Representative Feigenholtz?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Dunkin, there is nothing more than I want than to ebb these cuts and come up with other revenues, but we're going to pass this Bill I hope today and hopefully we will pass revenues shortly thereafter."

Dunkin: "Well, see, I'm hopeful as well, but we walked the walk when we eliminated the health care... the health care benefits for seniors... for those who put in 25 and 30-plus years here as state employees, but we have not talked about

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

generating revenue or ways in which we're going to pay for State Government. Clearly, we all understand where we need to head with getting our Medicaid costs under control. But we have not put any real skin in the game when it comes to paying for how we operate as a state. How we're dealing with pensions. We're talking about the cutting eliminations far too much or far ... significantly compared to us doing some heavy lifting. There are lots of Members who have no problems with making cuts and reductions. But what are we going to do to generate dollars? So, that's the real problem that I have, the inherent problem of how this process is going because we're putting the... with the horse ... the cart before the horse as far as I'm concerned. to see what my coll... to the Bill. I want to see what my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are willing to do and are willing to sacrifice irrespective of their political stripe or their political dot or Party, on what it is that we have to do responsibly since some of us did not want to raise the income tax. Some of us don't want to vote for the cigarette tax. Some of us don't want to look at some of the lists that Representative Mary Flowers listed, some of the corporate income tax. She listed a myriad of income or revenue generators that's not even a part of this General Assembly's discussion. But we want to do the slice, slice, cut, cut on the backs of some of our most vulnerable citizens here in this state. Now I don't want to... I'm not going to talk too long on this, Representative, but what I do want to do is to make sure that we don't have deaf ears on what we have to do in order to pay for State

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Government in order to become fiscally responsible. Thank you, Representative, for your indulgence."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mayfield. Rita Mayfield, wish to speak to the Bill?"

Mayfield: "I wish to yield my time to Rep Flowers."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Flowers, are you utilizing that time, Mary? Please, I've asked you to, you know, keep your remarks within a time frame, considerate to everybody else. Thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you. Representative Feigenholtz, can you please answer a few of the questions? How are we going to pay for it? What happened to the revenue? Where's the revenue?"

Feigenholtz: "We're... there... we're still talking about it,

Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "So, Representative, I, too, think that this system that we have had since the '50s is broken, and it is time for a change. But this is one thing you really have to remember. We're going to get a dollar for a dollar with a Medicaid match. So, we can do this right and maximize many people to get what they are entitled to and get our money back. But in the meantime, there's some other dollars out there that can be used... that can be used, whereas, that we don't have to hurt senior citizens. You know, I had the experience one time of going to Walgreens to pick up my own prescription, and Representative, until such time you see a elderly person... when the Medicare Part D Program first was implemented, the worst thing you could do is see a elderly person standing at the counter and say that she can't afford her prescription drugs. And she had to leave her

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

prescription drugs at the counter. That's heart wrenching, Representative. And so you have to ask yourself, whatever happened to that senior? Did she go home to die? That's not what we want. Can you please take this Bill out of the record? It's not going... we're not trying to take anything away from you. We're not trying to stall for time. understand what it is that you're trying to do, but just the way you're going about doing it is not Representative. You know, just because you all worked long and hard on this issue, doesn't mean that you were working on the right thing and working... and going toward the right direction. So, I ask you, again, the changes that's necessary for this program to be successful and Illinois to get out of the hole, can you tell me the game plan because it's not in the Bill? It's not in the legislation."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Flowers, I said it earlier. If we don't do something, our providers will be at a over 300-day payment cycle. There will be no health care. For the last few years, doors in Illinois have been silently closing. Our providers who have not gotten paid are shutting their doors on our poor and the most vulnerable. The very senior citizen that you're talking about is already being denied health care because we have to stop and evaluate and look at what we're doing. We... I stood on this House Floor with you, Mary Flowers and with a lot of our Republican colleagues and passed the FamilyCare Bill which we are undoing today because, unfortunately, we cannot be all things to all people in this state. We have to save this

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

program for the future of the children in the State of Illinois, for the families of the State of Illinois and for the poorest in the State of Illinois. And I know it seems ironic, but this is the only way we can accomplish that."

"And Representative, with all due respect, I've Flowers: worked... you and I have cried together, we fought together, we played together and we worked hard together. And I have the upmost respect for what it is that you do. And this is not the only way. See, that's what I'm trying to get you to see, Representative. This is not the only way. If I may tell you one more time, let's close up some of the tax loopholes. Can we try that way first? Because when you say... when you say that there will be no health care, there will be no health care for these people. The... there will... there's 160 to 180,000 people that will not prescription drug coverage. There will be no health care for them, Representative. There's no access to care for them. They're not poor enough... they're not poor enough, so you have to have an income of less than \$10,000 in order to apply for the Medicare Part D. But once again, if we do away with the Domestic Product Credit which is \$200 million, if we deal with the oil offshore drilling which is \$75 million, let's deal with the online hotel purchase. They don't pay taxes when they order... do their hotel rooms That's \$25 million. The industry insurance, that's 10 million. I'm trying to show you, Representative, there is a way. We don't have to do it this way. only thing I'm asking you, please, I'm begging you, Representative, for the life of the people who's going to

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

die as a result of this legislation. I'm begging you, please, let us do something different. Let's just try it this way because there's nothing in the legislation that would address any of the cures..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, I gave you a full five minutes additional time. There's numerous other speakers that wish to talk. Chair recognizes Representative Randy Ramey. And Representative, please within five minutes. I'm being very generous with the time, but I'd appreciate your consideration also."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Ramey: "Thank you. Representative, I think there's some confusion here, for the last speaker was saying some of the people are going to lose their coverage. But what are the guidelines that we're looking at that we're going to try to get some of the fraud out of our program that's dragging it down?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, there has been a lot of conversation and Representative Bellock, who's been working on this, is really the expert when it comes to eligibility verification, and we have incorporated a..."

Ramey: "Well, let me help you out a little bit, Representative, 'cause I have it right here in front of me."

Feigenholtz: "Oh, good."

Ramey: "So, the idea, first of all, is that we're going to have enhanced eligibility verification with a private vendor as the chief procurement officer to conduct an investigation

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

of all the people that are part of the program now, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "That is right."

Ramey: "And so, what we're going to be looking at is income levels, state residency, you know looking at I.D. cards, driver's licenses, what their income is. So, the reality here is that we're not really putting the poor people out of this program, would that be a correct statement?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Ramey: "We're... we're getting people out of the program that can afford and should be a part of this program."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Ramey: "Okay. We were... we were trying to clarify a few of these things, and I know that with the All Kids Program, we know there's a report like 75 percent of it was fraud. It came out last year. We're going to be checking... it says about some citizenship stuff, immigration status, I.D.s, income tax information. So, all of these will be used in verification of who the people are that are part of the program?"

Feigenholtz: "There's a very strong commitment, Representative Ramey, to do exactly what you said earlier, which is to root out the bad actors, the people who don't belong in the program, the providers who may be abusing the system as well as enrollees, to finally get an outside vendor who can use all kinds of databases to scrub the rolls."

Ramey: "Right, and I think that's a fantastic idea. Isn't there also... we're going to put it at the federal poverty level, a hundred and..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Feigenholtz: "Hundred and thirty-three percent."

Ramey: "Do you know what that number is?"

Feigenholtz: "It's 15 thousand approximately for one person."

Ramey: "Fifteen or fifty?"

Feigenholtz: "Fifteen, one five."

Ramey: "That's the federal level, so we're going to be 118 percent above that?"

Feigenholtz: "No. That is 133 percent of the federal poverty level rate."

Ramey: "Oh, 15 thousand is?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Ramey: "Okay. And... my... my last question we're going to deal with here is, is the RUGs Program in this legislation?"

Feigenholtz: "It is."

Ramey: "When is the implementation date of that program?"

Feigenholtz: "Eighteen months after this Bill becomes law."

Ramey: "Why are we waiting so long to implement that program?"

Feigenholtz: "You know, there was a lot of discussion that went on here, and this seemed to be where it landed, 18 months."

Ramey: "But I have been informed that there are facilities that are ready to implement this program now."

Feigenholtz: "I understand that, and from what I understand, there are just as many who aren't."

Ramey: "But can we allow some facilities to get into this program now so they can start saving money?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I... I think that there will be continuing discussion about this, but at this point, the 18-month provision is going to remain in the Bill. We are all committed to making sure that all of our providers, all

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

across the State of Illinois, are able to keep their doors open. I..."

Ramey: "Well, my understanding is that some of them are closed because they need to be a part of that program. So, how are we going to make sure that they stay open?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry?"

Ramey: "This... I have been informed that there are a few facilities that will have to close because they need to be in that program now and they can implement it now. But if we're going to wait 18 months for it, they're going to be closed. So, how are we going to make sure they stay open? You just said we were going to make sure they stayed open. That was your statement."

Feigenholtz: "You know what, Representative, this is a very complicated... it's a very diverse group of providers. This was the best we could do at this juncture, but I know that there are those of us who will continue to work on this. If we have to step in and remediate for Veto Session, we will do it."

Ramey: "Is there a possibility for a follow-up or a trailer

Bill to allow some of these facilities so they can get into
the program quickly?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative we're..."

Ramey: "Maybe 12 months."

Feigenholtz: "One of the things that we can do is when we start paying down our Medicaid bills, our payment cycle, simply by virtue of the..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Sara, I'll let you finish your answer. Randy, we've gone a little more than five minutes. So, Sara, continue and then we'll go to our next speaker."

Feigenholtz: "Simply by virtue of Medicaid liability shrinking and the payment cycle improving, we're hoping that the very providers that you're talking about get paid on time. We will certainly work toward that end."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tryon. Five minutes, Mike." Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

"In the Executive Committee today, we talked about the nursing home reimbursement rate, and after we did the bed tax and changed the process at which we calculate how we reimburse nursing homes, several nursing homes got hurt pretty bad. In fact, worse than what was even anticipated, and we built into this, a process to use the federal recommended RUGs billing reimbursement rate which is the Resource Utilization Group. And Sara, the problem is, while in committee, it was said that we are honoring a compromise agreement. My understanding is about 40 percent of the nursing homes aren't at the table because they don't belong to any of the associations that that compromise might have been worked out of, and one of those happens to be one of my nursing homes. And it's a very, very real chance, under the way that we're doing the reimbursement rate today, that nursing homes that are good nursing homes who are being... who have been hurt by the current billing structure are going to go out of business, and we're waiting 18 months to implement a change in the billing

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

process. And my question to you is, is there anyway we could speed that up so that it's not 18 months, if everybody else is in agreement that we're going to use these... this federally recommend billing process?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Tryon, one of the things that I'd like to remind the Body about is this is a Bill about reduction, and the simple fact that RUGs even made it into this Bill is amazing as well as the rate reform piece on the hospital portion of this Bill. I am committed... I promise I will continue to work with you on this matter. I, too, have concerns, but again, one of the things that... that gives me comfort as a resolution about this, is shrinking that payment cycle."

Tryon: "Yeah. Well..."

Feigenholtz: "That is the key provision of this. The Republicans..."

Tryon: "I appreciate your work..."

Feigenholtz: "Section 25 is going to fix all of this, Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "I appreciate your work, especially to get the RUGs in, all right. The 40 percent of the nursing homes have to count on their State Representative to make this vote today. And I would like to know if there's a shot that 18 months could be moved up because it may be too late for a substantial amount of nursing homes."

Feigenholtz: "We're the Legislature; we can do anything."

Tryon: "Well, I'm ready to make the cuts. I'm... this doesn't affect the amount of money we're going to cut. This just affects the way we're going to redistribute it. And if it

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

can be redistributed and help keep services to the people in a fair way, in a way that everybody's agreed on, why do we have to wait 18 months? That's what I don't understand."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I promise to work with you on this. You know, I've given every possible answer for a resolution at this moment in time."

Tryon: "Well, I... I would hope that you would be forthright in that statement and that we could make something work faster than 18 months 'cause as I said, I have a nursing home who isn't in this association, who was a part of this compromise who has to count on me, and I bet you most of this General Assembly has a nursing home just like that, and I would hope that their voice is being heard here today. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dwight Kay. Five minutes, Representative."

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

Kay: "Representative Feigenholtz, you've been on the floor here a long time today and I'm not going to take much of your time, but I want to just take a moment and say thank you for the work you have done here. This is not easy. It's tough, you've done a lot of math, you've done a lot of pondering, and I appreciate your work as well as Representative Bellock's. But I do have a few questions. I'm curious about the percentage of savings that we will recognize in this Bill of the Medicaid expense that we have today. What percent of savings will we recognize?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Feigenholtz: "Although it's a very difficult number to calculate, our wonderful staff who's been working around the clock for at least a month, every day, came up with the magic number of 12 percent."

Kay: "Twelve percent."

Feigenholtz: "Approximately. Ish."

Kay: "And considering that we have added in the last 4 years to our rolls about an increase of about 16 percent, what do you anticipate the addition to the rolls being in the next 4 years?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe that we've been growing on average about five to seven percent a year. If the economy improves, perhaps we will level off. I have seen that in other utilization charts in other parts of the Health and Human Services arena. It's really hard to say."

Kay: "I understand."

Feigenholtz: "But I'm sure we'll be watching it very carefully."

Kay: "Right. In fact, you're able to stand here today and with some certainty predict the savings because you're going to have an oversight person in place to make sure that there are savings that we all recognize. Is that true?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, it is."

Kay: "Right."

Feigenholtz: "The OIG will be watching carefully."

Kay: "And you feel confident that that process, that person, or those persons that have the ability to assure that year in and year out we will be able to benchmark savings in the state?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Feigenholtz: "I am hopeful and optimistic."

Kay: "Let me ask a separate question. What happens if we do nothing today?"

Feigenholtz: "If we do nothing today, as I mentioned earlier, I mean, already... there's not a Legislator in this room who has not gotten a phone call from a long-term care facility, a hospital, a mental health provider, somebody providing DD or substance abuse services communities about how we are borrowing on the backs of providers. We have to stop this or the whole system of human services and health care in this state is going to collapse. So, we are literally on the Representative, if we do nothing, our payment cycle will extend out, as I said earlier in debate, to maybe a year and there will be no health care system and no Medicaid in Illinois."

Kay: "And in fact, I think you would agree with me that we will be penniless if we don't take some action today and provide a cure for the problem and it will jeopardize the security of this state. Is that not right?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Kay: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. The simple truth is that if we don't do anything, we will be out of business, we won't be doing business. I've heard a lot of passionate comments today that certainly makes some sense from a passionate standpoint, but the real truth is, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we are standing in a breadline I think asking for toast and we can't afford the toast. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lou Lang."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Lang: "Representative, you and I have had a few conversations about one portion of this Bill dealing with elderly people and their assets and we discussed that Director Hamos and her agency worked with JCAR over a period of about 18 months and proposed rules and reproposed rules and reproposed rules, and in the end, JCAR had rejected those rules and then we found some of those rejected rules in this legislation. You recall having that conversation with me?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, I do. Going forward but not backward."

Lang: "Right. And so, I do want to say that they took the retroactivity out and in the area of spousal impoverishment there were some changes that satisfied those that deal with this in the industry. And there's an area called Pool Trust which I understand is not going to be touched at all, but there's one area I just want to discuss with you. The area of homesteads and trust. On this issue, the Director had said that her understanding of their intent is that they don't want to be able to go after the assets of the homesteads and trusts after the community spouse has passed on. She said that they don't intend to kick living community spouses out of their homes and trust. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, Sir."

Lang: "Now having said that, that's not exactly what the Bill says. And if you read the strict language of the Bill, the

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Bill doesn't say that at all, and so, it's important for legislative intent that you state for the record that it's not the intent of this Bill, the department or yourself to remove these people from their homes."

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Lang: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis. Five minutes, Monique."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative, what is the drug rebate fund?"

Feigenholtz: "It is a fund where our drug rebates get deposited, Representative."

Davis, M.: "So, you get it from the Federal Government?"

Feigenholtz: "No. That... that comes from drug manufacturers."

Davis, M.: "So, the drug manufacturer rebates to you some of the cost for prescription drugs?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "And you want to use that money for administrative purposes?"

Feigenholtz: "Just a very small piece of it is... we're intending to use for the Medicaid program."

Davis, M.: "So, when people have to call in for permission for a procedure, someone will have to answer that telephone and be on the other line and it will be a number where people do answer the phone so that they can get the waivers they need. Will that happen hopefully with this administrative fund?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Davis, M.: "And about veterans, why are we going to encourage veterans to use federal facilities?"

Feigenholtz: "For better services, Representative."

Davis, M.: "Well, are you sure that happens? Now, we know sometimes veterans will say they would rather not go to a veterans hospital because of a long wait or because they don't have the best medical procedures for them at that location. Are we really going to encourage them to not to get the care, the very best of care?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I think that the veterans' program has improved dramatically recently in the last few years. I mean, I understand what you're referring to. I have those same recollections."

Davis, M.: "Well, I'm not sure. What's the difference between the Army and that National Guards? The Nat... I'm sorry. Is it true the National Guard Members cannot go to the federally funded hospitals? I don't know. The veteran hospitals?"

Feigenholtz: "Are these trick questions, Representative Davis?"

Davis, M.: "No, they are not."

Feigenholtz: "I'm kidding."

Davis, M.: "I'm asking you..."

Feigenholtz: "I don't know."

Davis, M.: "No, listen carefully. No, no, listen very, very carefully. I am asking you because I don't know the answer."

Feigenholtz: "If they are Medicaid eligible..."

Davis, M.: "We listen... no, no, no..."

Feigenholtz: "...they'll be served."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

- Davis, M.: "...no, no, no. We claim in this Body that we love and we respect our veterans, and here in this Bill you are saying to me that National Guard's people, who have gone to Afghanistan and these other places, will be encouraged to use a federal veteran's facility. Now, I don't object to that, but I do object to us not thinking that they may have great need for the very best medical care."
- Feigenholtz: "If their needs cannot be met at the VA, we will pay for them."
- Davis, M.: "Well, it just doesn't say that."
- Feigenholtz: "If they're Medicaid eligible."
- Davis, M.: "Dental care, only for emergencies? Now surely, surely, someone in this working group, surely someone there knew that lack of dental care especially for seniors, can create a nutritional deficit that creates health problems. Surely someone in that group could tell you that dental care, not just emergency care, but good dental care allows seniors to be able to eat food properly, chew the food properly, therefore, they're digesting nutrition and it keeps them healthy. Surely we know that."
- Feigenholtz: "Representative, I... I never said that this Bill was pretty."
- Davis, M.: "But it's almost dangerous. Not just pretty, it really looks very dangerous. I mean, something as critical as a senior citizen being able to get dental care so they can eat properly so they don't get really, really sick and have to go to an emergency room."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time has expired. We'll give you another minute, Monique, to finish your thoughts."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Davis, M.: "Thanks. Is the AARP in support of this Bill?" Feigenholtz: "I really don't... I haven't looked on my analysis.

I'm not sure."

- Davis, M.: "I understand the purpose, but I agree with Representative Flowers. We had many, many places to look for revenue. I urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Our final speaker will be Representative Bellock and then Representative Feigenholtz to close. Representative Patti Bellock. Patricia, you're up."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the Bill. First of all, I'd like to thank Representative Feigenholtz for taking all the questions because there a lot of tough questions here, and I want to thank Senator Righter and Senator Steans for all their hard work on the Bill. also people like Representative Flowers, Representative Mulligan who over all the years have put so much of their time and dedication into these issues that are SO important. So, I just want to end this by saying today, when we talk about this Bill, this Bill is about saving peoples' lives. Three million people now in the Medicaid system. And I think there's only a few choices here the Governor has asked us to make. When he asked us to cut \$2.7 billion, we went into that room four months ago and said, we're going to try to make those cuts, but our number one goal is to serve the population that deserves this health care, that most fragile, vulnerable population. So, that was the number one goal. We did not want to take away the access or the health care to the people that deserve it in our state. But unless we make some of these reforms

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

now, we have what we call a crisis in health care in the Medicaid system in Illinois right now and we have to address that right now by restructuring this system, not just making cuts but reforming and restructuring the system so we can serve those populations. Right now, in this Bill, you're looking at the safety net hospitals and the critical care access hospitals going to have problems staying in business over the next year. Who hasn't received a phone call from these groups saying, where is our money, where is our voucher, can you call the Comptroller's Office... excuse Can you call the Comptroller's Office for me and get this paid? Sister Jean over in Naperville, not getting Another person in downstate in a critical access hospital, not getting paid. This is the issue we're facing right now. We have three million lives that are touched by this program and we have two choices here. We have to save this program and save the lives of the people in it and we have to do it in the best way possible and that's what we're addressing here in this Bill. It's a heart wrenching process to look at this and all the things that we've had to do over the last couple of months. But I really believe that unless we save this system, our nursing homes, some of those nursing homes that we were talking about on the RUGs issue, they may not be here in 18 months because right now, they're getting the tax and they're going to have to pay between 200 thousand and a million dollars on that tax. Can they afford that? Our critical access hospitals, our safety net hospitals, all of these places that we want to keep alive because we want the people to be able to serve

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

by them, and that's who we're addressing here in this issue. I ask you to go with us on this Bill to save this system now because in five more years the \$15 billion that we're addressing now in the bills will be \$21 billion. Twenty-one billion dollars will be two-thirds of the entire State of Illinois budget. We need to make sure we save these people's lives and we make sure to save the budget of the State of Illinois. And what the Governor asked was \$2.7 billion, if we don't move on this issue, we have to go back and cut another 900 million dollars out of those four appropriation committees. I thank you for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes legislative intent, this Amendment and its intent is the General Assembly that the department will implement one level of care eligibility criteria for institutional and home and community-based care. I'd like to thank Patricia Bellock, I never thought I'd be able to work with a Sox fan so closely, but one of the things that I know is that each and every person in this chamber feels very passionately about how we deliver health care in the State of Illinois. I certainly know that I do and that's why I am here. hope that we can continue to work together to fortify, as Representative Bellock said, a system that the poorest and the most vulnerable people in this state depend on because it's not happening right now. But this Bill will change all of that. This legislation would not exist were it not for the hours and hours and days and weeks and months of tireless work and I am going to mention some people, and

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

please forgive me, but Ashley Snavely, Jim Foys, Kim Schultz, Jeanette Badrov, Copal Casey Eagleson and Parker from HFS and of course the Director Julie Hamos, our former colleague, and we cannot forget the author who took time from his private life to come here, Dave Ellis, our former chief counsel to help us craft this legislation. Our staff and my budget director, John Lowder, the heavy hand of John Lowder pushed this boat from shore, and in the canoe he gave us a gift and her name is Samantha Olt. I'd like to give our staffs an incredible round of applause for all the work they did on this. It is enormous and monumental. Ladies and Gentlemen, stand tall on voting 'yes' on this It will right our ship of state. We will have to come back and fix things, it is not perfect, but it deserves your support for the future of the State of Illinois. I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2840 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Acevedo, Smith, Thapedi, like to be recorded? Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 94 Members voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bellock, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say thank you again to our staff Clayton Klenke. I think we neglected to mention his name and Ashley Snavely. Thank

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

- you, 'cause they did hundreds of hours of work. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mary Flowers, what purpose do you seek recognition, Mary?"
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to invite everyone to a reception at the Governor's Mansion for the new Director of Public Health, LaMar Hasbrouck, and it will start at 6:30 p.m. at the Governor's Mansion, to welcome the new Department of Public Health Director. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Flowers.

 Representative Will Davis... Representative Dan Beiser,
 you've been very patient, Dan. Personal privilege?"
- Beiser: "Yes. I'd let the record to reflect that on Senate Bill 3367 my vote should have been a 'yes'."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request, Representative. Mr. Clerk, on page 13 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, Representative Will Davis has Senate Bill 2934. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2934, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Davis, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis on Floor Amendment #2."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With regards to the Bill, Floor Amendment #2 essentially allows those entities that have an application in process before the

142nd Legislative Day

- passage of the substantive part of this Bill will allow them to be held to the old rules versus being subjected to the new rules. Be more than happy to answer any other questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of 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 the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Leader Frank Mautino, you have a Bill on Second Reading, Frank, Senate Bill 2706 on the Order of Second Readings. Read the… what's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2706, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Leader Dan Burke, on the Order of House Bills-Second Readings, on page 3 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 4277. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4277, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments #1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Burke."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Dan Burke on Floor Amendment #1."

142nd Legislative Day

- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. This is a proposal that is... I would... it's common sense that would help ensure that all public school students are treated equally when it comes to school funding. And Ladies and Gentlemen, this would be the equal funding for charter school students. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. 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 #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Daniel Burke, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Burke on Amendment 2."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2. And this is a matter that would simply extend the effective date of the legislation to 2013."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments, but a fiscal, state mandates, balance budget, Home Rule, judicial, pension, state debt..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "Well, we'll leave that Bill on the Order of Second Reading then, Mr. Clerk. I think that's a good idea. Continuing where we left off, Ladies and Gentlemen, on page 7 of the Calendar, Representative Ed Sullivan. Representative Sullivan on the floor? We'll come back. Representative Mayfield. Representative Rita Mayfield, on the bottom of page 7, you have Senate Bill 3453. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3453, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rita Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "Okay. Basically what this Bill does, it just establishes a special fund for the State Treasury to hold moneys that were received from DECO. This is no new moneys. We just need a mechanism in which to place these moneys so they can be better distributed. There is no opposition to the Bill. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady'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: "Representative, where is this money coming from?"

Mayfield: "This is money that already comes to DCEO from ComEd, from the utility company."

Franks: "So, why do we need a separate fund if they're already getting the money?"

Mayfield: "Okay. Because the money right now... I'm trying to... I need to tell you exactly what it is. This right here was

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

an initiative that we were working on. The money is not... give me one moment. Hold on one moment, please."

Franks: "Sure."

Mayfield: "The money was initially... the program was initially funded. There was not a designated fund for this money, and we need a statutory change in order to hold this money. That's my understanding."

Franks: "I thought there was, because we had some Bills that we had passed before, I think prior to you being here, where we gave tax breaks and incentives for those that used energy efficient appliances or whether it was wind or solar, but those were always spent down very quickly and there was never enough money in those funds for all the individuals who actually applied. And I'm wondering how this would help, if at all? I'm just not sure what this Bill really does 'cause I thought that we already had those type of accounts and then they were paid out."

Mayfield: "My understanding is the money is going into a general fund as opposed to a special fund which is being requested by the department."

Franks: "Okay. Maybe somebody from the department can come talk to me about it later. I just don't get it, but thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mayfield to close."

Mayfield: "I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3453 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?

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Representative McAuliffe, Saviano, Senger and Cassidy, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting... 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, I'm on page 8 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, so heads up if you've got a Bill. Representative Marcus Evans. Representative Evans, you have, on the top of page 8 on the Order of Third Readings, Senate Bill 3484. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3484, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marcus Evans."
- Evans, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill 3484 adding an optometrist to the Board of Health. Currently there are 19 members on the Board of Health. I would like to add a twentieth member, an optometrist, to the Board of Health."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Gentleman's..."
- Evans, M.: "I'd like to ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "...explanation. Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes Leader Mike Bost."
- Bost: "I know the hour gets late, I know it does. But Representative, is this your first Bill?"
- Evans, M.: "The Honorable Representative Bost, this is my first Bill."
- Bost: "And... and you... you say that this adds a member to a board, is that correct?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Evans, M.: "Yes, Sir. It adds a member to the board. The board currently has 19 members, this adds a twentieth member to the Board of Health."

Bost: "Have you ever served on an even memberd board?"

Evans, M.: "Well, I have never served on a board."

Bost: "Well, let me tell you why we keep odd-numbered members, because that way a tie can be divided. Do you want to do this to these people? Do you not understand what will happen when you put 20 members, you're putting the opportunity for this board to fail because they can't get decisions made. Is that what your intent is?"

Evans, M.: "No, Sir. I contacted the Department of Public Health and I was informed that generally most of the votes are a large majority. They rarely come down to a tight vote, so they don't expect this to be an issue."

Bost: "Well, then... so they don't have tight votes there? Then why don't you take the Bill out of the record, amend it where it abolishes the board because... and then we'll just put one person in there and they can decide what they really need to do because if... you know, no... if, there's no major votes or anything like that? Would that be all right?"

Evans, M.: "No, I would like to keep the Bill as is written."

Bost: "Do you know who the original creator of this board was?"

Evans, M.: "No, I do not."

Bost: "Well, did you go back... now, this is very important. Did you go back and possibly find out why the board was created, what the genesis originally of the board was, and then who carried it and see if you can find them and find

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

out if they're okay with the fact that you're adding a member?"

Evans, M.: "No, but I know the purpose of the board is to… to assist the director of the Department of Public Health in making decisions for the State of Illinois."

Bost: "He has to have help?"

Evans, M.: "No."

Bost: "Or he or she, I'm not sure. Do you know who that is, please? Do you know... do you know who the director of that is?"

Evans, M.: "No."

Bost: "Representative, look, it's pretty simple. What we do here is we study our Bills and we find out the details before we come to the floor to present them. It is so important. Each one of us have to be informed as we move forward with legislation that is... this is... this could be state changing. This is serious. This is... this isn't a game. It's important that you know your Bill when you get here."

Evans, M.: "Oh... okay."

Bost: "So, you'll... so you'll take it out of the record and come
back? So, you'll take it out of the record and come back,
correct?"

Evans, M.: "No, no, I'm definitely not taking it out of the record."

Bost: "But I thought you wanted to be, as a Member, you know, you and I we've met, I like you a lot..."

Evans, M.: "Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Bost: "...and I thought you wanted to work together? I'm just asking you to take it out, get some answers to these questions and we may have a few others, but I think it's pretty important that we take it out, we'll work on it and bring it back later. We got plenty of time."

Evans, M.: "No, I would like to keep it in the record, Sir."

Bost: "Well, let me tell you that there's two problems other than that problem I have with your Bill, is one, we're late in the day and for a new Member to be able to bring a Bill, their first Bill, late in the day is always frustrating to the other Members. So, I'll let... just find out who else wants to question on this Bill, but there is a problem in the fact that I think you're going to whack it... mess the board up by putting an even number on it."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lou Lang. Twenty minutes for questioning, Leader?"

Lang: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman yields."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, I think I heard Mr. Bost ask you about how you break the tie if you have 20 members? How you going to go about doing that?"

Evans, M.: "Again, I spoke to the department. It was relayed to me that this is rarely an issue with close votes, so they didn't expect 20... to have an even number of members to be an issue."

Lang: "All right. You're going to have to say that again, Sir. So... so, let's say it's a 10 to 10 tie, what happens then?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

- Evans, M.: "That's not really a precedent, and before they've never really had an issue that would cause to be that close of a vote, so..."
- Lang: "All right. Well, I don't get that answer, Sir, but let's move on to the next issue. So, you want to add an optometrist to this board, is that correct?"
- Evans, M.: "Yes, Sir."
- Lang: "So, do the other people that treat the eyes have a problem with that? Are you discriminating against ophthalmologists?"

Evans, M.: "No."

Lang: "Have you talked to them?"

- Evans, M.: "Yes. I visited the College of Optometry in the City of Chicago and yes."
- Lang: "So, you visited the College of Optometry, but did you visit a medical school where they teach ophthalmology?"
- Evans, M.: "No."
- Lang: "I... and don't make me say it again either cause I tripped over the word. So, you don't know if the doctors that do the eyes have an objection to you adding these folks that are not doctors?"
- Evans, M.: "No, they never reached out to me and I didn't speak to any ophthalmologists."
- Lang: "And so you might be discriminating against a whole class of people?"
- Evans, M.: "Yeah, well, if they're interested as my colleague mentioned, then I'll run a trailer Bill and ask them later."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Lang: "So, you don't think it's your responsibility to sort of reach out to them, they must reach out to you?"

Evans, M.: "In the future, I'll reach out to them, Sir."

Lang: "In the future?"

Evans, M.: "Yeah."

Lang: "If the Bill passes it might be too late, right?"

Evans, M.: "No, we can add a trailer Bill, Sir."

Lang: "Okay. Pretty good answer. So, these b... board members are all appointed by the Governor? Fits you great, really. Fits you great. I wish I had an optometrist here so I could see that better. So, can we get back to my question now that you look so amazing. And by the way, that's not red, but it's probably the best we can do. These board members are appointed by the Governor, Sir?"

Evans, M.: "Yes."

Lang: "Which Governor?"

Evans, M.: "The current Governor."

Lang: "Our Governor, the Governor of Illinois, right?"

Evans, M.: "Yes. Yes..."

Lang: "All right."

Evans, M.: "...Sir, the Governor of Illinois."

Lang: "And it's done with the advice and consent of the Senate.

So, you're including the Senate in this are you not?"

Evans, M.: "Yes."

Lang: "Have you talked to anyone in the Senate about whether they're interested in doing this hard and heavy work?"

Evans, M.: "This is a Senate Bill so it passed the Senate."

Lang: "Well, I see that Senator Delgado, who used to be a House Member in fact, and probably enjoyed it better here, I see

142nd Legislative Day

- he's... did you talk to him about this issue about burdening the Senate with this process?"
- Evans, M.: "No, Sir, I did not."
- Lang: "Yeah. You know, you should have done that. Because Senators don't like all that extra work you're going to pile on them. I've met some of those Senators and they're not all that interested in this work. Why don't you take this part out of the Bill; we'll wait while you do it?"
- Evans, M.: "No thanks, Sir. I like the Bill as it's currently written."
- Lang: "Well, we're going to decide whether we like the Bill as it currently is, but thank you, Sir, I appreciate your answers."
- Evans, M.: "Thank you, Leader."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Thaddeus Jones, you have your light on, but I don't see you at your desk, Representative. Representative Jones."
- Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just have a couple of questions of Representative. Representative who..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Evans awaits your questions."
- Jones: "Just commend you for bringing this legislation. How did you get this legislation? Who brought this legislation to you? That's all right, Representative, I'll move on."
- Evans, M.: "Thank you."
- Jones: "I just want to, Representative, just wanted to know if you want to take this Bill out of the record. I have a better Bill, it's a snow removal Bill that did real well in the House. It's my first Bill, and I'd like to sign over

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

sponsorship to you and it'd be a better Bill than this Bill."

Evans, M.: "No..."

Jones: "Just wondered if you want to take that Bill?"

Evans, M.: "No, I'd like to keep this Bill in the record."

Jones: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ken Dunkin. Representative, can you limit..."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "...you're limited to 20 minutes for questions..."

Dunkin: "Twenty minutes, you got it."

Speaker Lyons: "...so please stay within the timeline."

Dunkin: "Representative, the College of Optometry is located where? Your district? Whose district is it located in?"

Evans, M.: "It's located in your district."

Dunkin: "In whose?"

Evans, M.: "It's located in..."

Dunkin: "Well..."

Evans, M.: "Well, actually..."

Dunkin: "Wait, now make up your mind, is it mine or Kim du Buclet's?"

Evans, M.: "It's partially located in Representative Ken Dunkin's district and the other side of the building is located in Representative du Buclet's district."

Dunkin: "So, did you get permission to engage or come to our district and talk with one of our constituents from either Kim du Buclet or myself?"

Evans, M.: "No."

142nd Legislative Day

- Dunkin: "Why not? You didn't think we saw you come into the optometry school? I've been getting calls all weekend when you were there. What did you see?"
- Evans, M.: "I learned a lot about optometry, Representative."
- Dunkin: "Did you learn about what jackets to wear? Were you wearing that pink jacket?"
- Evans, M.: "No."
- Dunkin: "Really now. So, Representative Lou Lang asked a very serious question about ophthalmologists and I'm really curious as of why they're not on this board because this is pretty significant. This is a health board, you say?"
- Evans, M.: "Yes, the Board of Health, Illinois Board of Health."
- Dunkin: "Is it a plastic board or is it corrugated, is it wood or... what kind of board is it? Is it a plank?"
- Evans, M.: "It's a board of 20 health professionals including physicians and other health professions in..."
- Dunkin: "Dietitians and... any veterinarians on the board?"
- Evans, M.: "No. There's one veterinarian on the board, yes."
- Dunkin: "One veterinarian. Who else? Any... any manicurists on the board?"
- Evans, M.: "No."
- Dunkin: "What's the difference between a optometrist and ophthalmologist? I think that question may have been asked, but I didn't hear the response."
- Evans, M.: "An ophthalmologist focuses more on surgical procedures, an optometrist focuses mostly on vision and basic eye care, your glasses. So an ophthalmologist would do more of an extensive surgery on an individual. Once you

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

see your optometrist, you'll be generally referred to a ophthalmologist."

Dunkin: "Once you see your optom... ophthalmologist. So, is there someone who is pre-identified to serve as this optometrist on this board? This even number of 20?"

Evans, M.: "No."

Dunkin: "So, who's going to make the selection?"

Evans, M.: "The Governor will make that selection I'm sure. The Governor."

Dunkin: "Do you know what criteria the Governor's going to use?"

Evans, M.: "No, other than being an optometrist."

Dunkin: "So you're just giving the Governor all of this extra power to do what he needs to do and we don't know who he's going to pick, where they're going to come from and... do they have to live in the State of Illinois?"

Evans, M.: "Yes, I believe so."

Dunkin: "You believe so. So, it's a 'may' or a 'shall', which one is it?"

Evans, M.: "Yes."

Dunkin: "Oh, it's a yes. Okay. So what is the length of stay or the length of term for them to serve? Is it two years, four years?"

Evans, M.: "I'm not aware of a term limit."

Dunkin: "Oh, really now. So, they serve on this board for life? Three years, 10 years, no years, dog years?"

Evans, M: "No, it's not for life. I'm not aware of a term limit."

142nd Legislative Day

- Dunkin: "You know, we don't like that term... that word or that term, term limit here, so... term limit is every election. So..."
- Speakers Lyons: "Representative, I have about 25 more speakers, so..."
- Dunkin: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Evans, M.: "Thank you, Sir."
- Speaker Lyons: "Our final speaker will be Representative Dennis Reboletti. It worked. It worked."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Reboletti: "Representative, I was trying to follow up on a previous question. How did you get this Bill? You came here a little bit late into the game and I don't think you filed this Bill. So, I was wondering where you took this Bill from?"
- Evans, M.: "Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Reboletti: "Why... why did she give you this Bill or did you take the Bill?"
- Evans, M.: "It was given to me and I happily accepted the Bill.

 I learn..."
- Reboletti: "I was wondering why the House doesn't get to be involved in this advice and consent stuff. You... you trust us to be able to make good judgments here, don't you?"
- Evans, M.: "Yes."
- Reboletti: "So, why don't you amend the Bill? I'm sure that the Speaker will pop it right out of Rules for you and we could add us to do some advice and consent as well."
- Evans, M.: "What would you like amended, again?"

142nd Legislative Day

- Reboletti: "If you could... if... we just want the House to be able to be part of the advice and consent process. So, you'll... you'll... you could bring that Amendment along, can't you?"
- Evans, M.: "It may be... I like the Bill as it's currently written."
- Reboletti: "Are there… are there any audiologists or ear, nose and throat doctors? Do you hear that… do you hear that noise, Representative? Do you know what that noise is? Do you know what that noise is?"
- Evans, M.: "No, I do not, Sir."
- Reboletti: "I can tell you it's not the noise of success.

 That... that is the... that sounds like failure,
 Representative. That means the Century Club. Are you
 familiar with that? Representative Dunkin has been a
 lifelong member of the Century Club. How many... how many
 vacancies are on this board?"
- Evans, M.: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you, Sir."
- Reboletti: "How many vacancies are on the board? Are all the positions filled right now?"
- Evans, M.: "Yes."
- Reboletti: "My understanding is that there are five vacancies.

 My learned Representative from down south has advised me differently. Can you pull the Bill and let me know when you get back to me on what positions are open?"
- Evans, M.: "I'll get back to you on clarification of the vacancies."
- Reboletti: "You'll pull the Bill out now?"
- Evans, M.: "No."

142nd Legislative Day

- Reboletti: "Well, how's the Governor going to fill this new position if he hasn't filled the other five positions?"
- Evans, M.: "I'm not sure how the Governor is going to work that out."
- Reboletti: "It says here that there's two citizens at large that are appointed. What does that mean?"
- Evans, M.: "There's two individuals that aren't health care professionals."
- Reboletti: "Are they, like, running around, they're at large, we can't find them? Is that what that means? They're on the lam? I would suggest you might want to amend this. We could add... it says that one shall be a senior citizen, age 60 and over. Maybe we could add Representative Lang to that and that would be your twenty-first person. What do you think about that?"
- Evans, M.: "I have no comment on that, Sir."
- Reboletti: "Well, that's probably a good... that's probably a good answer, but I hear a lot of whistling. I don't think this Bill has much success, so. Well, good luck to you on your next Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Marcus Evans to close."
- Evans, M.: "Again, this is my Bill to add a member to the Board of Health. You know, I believe that... I believe it's a good Bill only because an optometrist, they definitely play a key role. I found out visiting the College of Optometry that I'm nearsighted myself, so, and I'll be, you know, soon wearing glasses. They service a lot of individuals in my community of low income. So, I request that you vote 'yes' on my first Bill. Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's request. He's looking for 'yes' votes on his first Bill. All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those against vote 'no'. The voting in open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gordon, Morrison, I don't think you're recorded yet. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 105 Members voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations, Representative Marcus Evans on Bill number one. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee schedule. The Human Services Committee is meeting at 5:45 in Room 114. The Human Services Committee is meeting in Room 114 at 5:45 p.m."
- Speaker Lyons: "Members, I've been advised that the House will stand at ease. We will be back together probably about 6:15, so don't go too far away. We'll stand at ease 'til the hour of 6:15."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. Representative Lang in the Chair. On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 4866, Representative Mathias. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4866, a Bill for an Act concerning business. This Bill's been read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Mathias, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mathias."

142nd Legislative Day

- Mathias: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if it's necessary to withdraw the other three Amendments that are presently on the Bill, 1, 2 and 3? If we can withdraw those."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Amendments 1, 2 and 3, please?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendments 1, 2 and 3 have been referred to committee."
- Mathias: "Yes, can we..."
- Speaker Lang: "They have not been adopted. You can withdraw, table or ignore them as you wish, Sir."
- Mathias: "I guess we'll table them."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to table Amendments 1, 2 and 3.

 Is there leave? Leave is granted. The three Amendments are tabled. Proceed on Amendment 4, Sir."
- Mathias: "Yes. Floor Amend... Floor Amendment 4 becomes the Bill. We could debate it when the Bill the Bill comes up, but I think it's an agreed Bill and it has to deal with gas station pumps and notice for people with disabilities."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4866, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mathias."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Mathias: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just one second, my computer seems to be very slow here. House Bill 4866 is an agreement between many of the groups and I actually want to thank them because they not only withdrew opposition to prior Amendments but they also actually signed in the committee today in favor of this Amendment. So I wanted to thank Bill Fleischli from the Illinois Petroleum Marketers, wanted to thank also Dan Eichholz from the Petroleum Council, Mark Strawn from the Bowick Consulting Group and also Rob Carr from IRMA who all have signed in favor of the Bill. What the Bill basically does and this Bill has been around for a number of years. As you know, we do have a Americans for Disabilities Act which is Federal Law; however, we have found out and we had testimony in committee that many individuals disabilities are unable to leave their automobiles even though they're able to drive. But they're unable to either handle the gas pump because of, for example, individuals who have MS or other individuals who just make it very difficult to get out of their automobiles. What House Bill 4866 does, basically, is to require that every gas station designate at least one pump and that pump if the gas station already has ADA compliant dispensers, they would designate the one that's marked with the international symbol for people with disabilities as a pump where they will place a telephone number of the station on the pump. If it's a station that has not had a pump that's in full compliance, they can designate one of their pumps to have this phone number placed on the pump. I also wanted to

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

thank the MS Society for also agreeing to the Bill because we've had many discussions on it on both sides of the issue, and finally, we have come to an agreed Bill after actually many years of attempting to come to an agreement. So, thanks and I... I'm ready to take your questions. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill.

I just want to say thank you to Representative Mathias for doing this Bill. This is something that the majority of us all just take so for granted, and yet by doing this Bill it will help so many disabled people through the State of Illinois just be able to have assistance in doing the simple thing of getting gas at a gas station. And I want to thank the Petroleum Marketers and IMRA and everybody else that helped to work out the problems with the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Paul Evans."

Evans, P: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Evans, P: "I rise to speak on behalf of this Bill. I do not know if anyone remembers last week when I had my daughter here with me who's been paralyzed since birth, who's in an electric wheelchair and cannot get gas for her vehicle. We always have to arrange to make sure she has gas or that someone is there with her. So, I simply can testify that this is a problem for anyone in a wheelchair. We always have to work in advance. I do not want her to be ever

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

running out of fuel. I think this is an excellent Bill and I strongly encourage all of you. If you do not have a person in a wheelchair in your life, you don't know that this simple aspect can... can stop your daily activity and this is something that's needed. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representatives Dugan and May. Please take the record. On this question, there are a 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Committee Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Greg Harris, Chairman from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 24, 2012: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 5 and 6 to House Bill 5007; and recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3261."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1081, offered by Representative Jackson. House Resolution 1082, offered by Representative Jackson. House Resolution 1083, offered by Representative Jackson. House Resolution 1084, offered by Representative Jackson. House Resolution 1085, offered by Representative Leitch. House Resolution 1086, offered by Representative Leitch. And House Resolution 1087, offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, on the Supplemental Calendar #1, under the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 5007. Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move Currie: to concur with Senate Amendments 5 and 6 to House Bill The measure would provide authority for the Department of HealthCare and Family Services to ask for a waiver from the state Medicaid rules so that the County of Cook could participate in a shared Medicaid program with people who are uninsured and are low in income and who, should the Supreme Court approve the new federal health care law, would become eligible for Medicaid in 2014. Today these individuals are charges of the County of Cook, its health and health care system and the cost of their care is paid for entirely by the citizens of Cook County. Under the waiver, the cost would be shared 50 percent between the county and the Federal Government. Were we to approve this opportunity and were the Federal Government to approve the waiver, the state itself would be able to save some \$36 million because we supply certain kinds services, breast and cervical cancer, AIDS drugs and so forth. And so, therefore, if we approve this we can ask for the waiver for Cook County, the state can save \$36 million and people who live in Cook County would be able to find care at Cook County Hospital for the next five years. would be happy to answer your questions. This to me is a win-win, win, win, win, it's a win for the citizens of Cook County. It's a win for the taxpayers of Cook County.

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

It's a win for the State of Illinois and it is a win for better health care for the people of Cook."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the... Concurrence on the two Senate Amendments. The Chair recognizes Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Durkin: "Representative, a lot of us were coming in a little bit late and I know you gave a... you know, your synopsis of exactly the savings that are going to be incorporated with this Bill. Could you... for a resident of Cook County, could you tell me how Cook County benefits financially from this Bill and what are the approximate savings that the taxpayers will realize if this waiver is implemented by the Federal Government?"

Currie: "Right. Right now I can tell you that Stroger Hospital, we spend 419 million at Stroger, that doesn't count money that the county is spending at its clinics and in various agreements it might have with other health care providers. So if most of those people I would think would be Medicaid eligible, perhaps not all of them, but even if... even if a third of them are Medicaid eligible that is a very significant savings to the taxpayers of Cook County. And as I say, the state taxpayers would be off the hook for some 36 million a year that we are now supplying to Cook County residents through programs like ADAP and breast and cervical cancer screening and treatment."

Durkin: "Now, will Cook County be doing income and income verifications on these individuals? Will they be implementing..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Currie: "I think..."

Durkin: "...residency income verification?"

Currie: "I think they would have to in order to establish eligibility for the federal program."

Durkin: "Do we have any idea approximately how many people who are currently in your system would be disqualified based on the income and also residency verification?"

Currie: "I have no idea, but I can tell you that we know that about 100 thousand people who do not have insurance and who seem to meet the income eligibility requirements but are not eligible for Medicaid because the new federal program hasn't yet called them eligible. We know that the county serves about 100 thousand people at that income level. We think that there are maybe as many as 250 thousand people in Cook County who could meet those income qualifications. As I say, I think about 100 thousand are being served today. I'm sure that if this waiver were to be approved, you would see a significant increase in the willingness of people to use county health care services."

Durkin: "Has a waiver of this nature been requested of the Federal Government or would this be the first of its kind?"

Currie: "No. We... Texas, New Jersey, California, all of them have asked for waivers very similar to this and all have been approved."

Durkin: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "There being no further debate, those in favor of the Lady's motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mathias, Pihos, Pritchard. Mr.

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Pritchard. Please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes' and 55 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #s 5 and 6 to House Bill 5007. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

"The following committees are Clerk Hollman: meeting immediately after Session: Judiciary I-Civil Law is meeting in Room 413; Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges is meeting in Room D-1; Personnel & Pensions is meeting in Room 115; and Agriculture & Conservation is meeting in Room C-1. Correction. Judiciary I-Civil Law will be meeting in Room 114. Judiciary I-Civil Law is meeting is meeting in Room 114. Tomorrow morning the following committees are meeting: at 8:30 the Appropriation - Elementary & Secondary Education Committee is meeting in Room 114. Appropriations - Higher Ed is meeting in C-1. Those are at 8:30. At 10:00 the Executive Committee is meeting in Room 114."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Again, Members of the Judiciary Committee the committee meeting's been moved to Room 114 immediately following Session. Members, I have an announcement regarding scheduling. That ought to quiet the room down for a second, but you won't like it. The current… the current plan which could change, the current plan which could change is for the House to be in Session on Saturday. More silence. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk… Sorry, Mr. Mathias."

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Mathias: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry I was... my finger slipped and... could the record reflect that on House Bill 5007 I was suppose to be a 'no' vote. I was... wanted... my intention was be a 'no' vote."

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

Rose: "Mr. Speaker, the schedule that was previously handed out had the Approp Committees at 9:30. The Clerk just said 8:30. I want to clarify that in fact it is 8:30 'cause what was handed out said 9:30?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, is it 8:30?"

Clerk Hollman: "The Appropriation Committees will be meeting at 8:30 tomorrow morning."

Rose: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Sorry, Mr. Rose. Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, what about plans for Sunday Session into Monday?"

Speaker Lang: "The best I could do is the announcement I made for Saturday, Sir, we're not even totally sure about that."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Anything further? And now leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Friday, May 25 at the hour of 11 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion passes and the House does stand adjourned 'til Friday, May 25 at the hour of 11 a.m."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

Committee Reports. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law reports the following committee action taken on May 24, 2012: do pass

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Short Debate is Senate Bill 1355; do pass as amended Short Bill 3171. Representative Beiser, Debate is Senate Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 24, 2012: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 88 and House Joint Resolution 89. Representative May, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 24, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3438. Representative Dugan, Chairperson from the Committee Conservation reports the Agriculture & committee action taken on May 24, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1566. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1088, offered by Representative Bradley, is referred to the Rules Committee. First Reading of Senate Bill 2404, offered by Senate Bills. Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2455, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2461, offered by Speaker Madigan, Bill for Act а an concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2621, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning Corrections. Senate Bill 3695, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning wages. These are referred to the Rules Committee. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 410, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 551, offered Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1355, offered by Representative

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1556 (sic-1566), offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2971, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3177, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3241, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3320, offered Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3389, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3438, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill government. Senate 3479, offered Representative Marcus Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3497, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning the lottery. Senate Bill 3616, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. These Bills will be held on the Order of Second Reading. House Perfunctory will come Session. Second Readings of Senate Bills. Second Readings of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 3171, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. This Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Senate Bill 3171, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Second Readings of House Bills. House Bill 5192, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill

142nd Legislative Day

5/24/2012

for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."