117th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most precious and Oh sovereign God, the giver of both life and the giver of strength, it is before You that we bow our heads and humble our hearts, that this august assembly may reverence You. We realize that is truly the day that You have made, and we honor it, and we honor You. So, we call before Your most holy presence and we offer You our hearts, we offer You our minds, we offer You our lives. Father, we cast upon You all of our cares. We cast upon You all of our worries. We cast upon You all of our weaknesses. And we ask You, awesome God, for Your great strength, Your infinite wisdom, and Your divine guidance. In this we ask in Your precious Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Jones."
- Jones et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that

 Dan Burke is excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Bost and Representative Poe."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 present, a quorum is established. Mr. Clerk."

"Committee Reports. Representative Nekritz, Clerk Hollman: Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action taken on April 07, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5919. Representative Phelps, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on April 07, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5633. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on April 07, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4795. Representative Jackson, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on April 07, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4983, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5623, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 5785. Representative Golar, Chairperson from the Committee on Housing reports the following committee action taken on April 07, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4113. Representative William Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Health & Healthcare Disparities reports the following committee action taken on April 07, 2014: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution #77. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on April 07, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3958, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 5926. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on April 07, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4811, and House Resolution 922, and House Resolution 934. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the April 07, following committee action taken on recommends be adopted is House Resolution 770. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on April 07... correction... April 08, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4956, Floor Amendment #1 to House 5567. Representative McAsey, Chairperson from the Committee on the Environment reports the following committee action taken on April 08, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 House Bill 4687. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on the Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on April 08, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1452, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3664, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4124, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4916, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5526, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5710, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5815, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5862, House Resolution 824. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on April 08, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3939, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3948, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4207, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 4612, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 5330, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 5892. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 990, offered by Representative Flowers. And House Resolution 992, offered by Representative Kay. These are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jones, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Jones: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Sir."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, let me start off by saying and thanking Members of this General Assembly who came, not only and visited me, but for your prayers. You know, sometimes God has a funny way of telling you to slow down and I think I got the message. So, I not only want to thank you guys for the prayers but also the staff, who was not only courteous but also to my seatmate, Greg Harris, of course you, Leader Turner, for your support during my time of emergency, but also to Tim Mapes. I appreciate not only the outpouring of support. But I just want to thank you from my family to yours for the prayers that you guys gave to me that helped me through. It's nice to be back in the House. So, thank you, Leader."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative, and welcome back.

Members, an announcement. The deadline for Amendments will be
Tuesday, that's today, April 8 at 3 p.m.; today, April 8 at

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

3 p.m. Representative Lang, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would that be today at 3 p.m.? Would that be the deadline?"

Speaker Turner: "Today, April 8. That's correct, Sir."

Lang: "All right. All right. So, thank you very much. Today at 3 p.m.?"

Speaker Turner: "Today, 3 p.m."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "You got it. Members, we're going to begin on Third Readings. Please be prepared to present, as we'll be moving down the line in alphabetical order. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4225, Representative Jakobsson. Out of the record. House Bill 5938, Representative Beiser. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5938, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a Bill initiative of the Illinois Bankers Association and basically what it does, it takes people that have mobile homes as their place of residence, it'll gives them the option of converting it to real property for the… for them to be able to access lower interest loans on their mortgages."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Right now, when you're talking about a mobile home, Mr. Beiser..."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Beiser: "Yes."

Franks: "...isn't that deeded through the Secretary of State like

a car title?"

Beiser: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. So, what would this Bill do?"

Beiser: "It would give the owner of that manufactured home or mobile home the option of opting out of that situation, that you just described with the Secretary of State and making it more like a conventional piece of real estate, a home, like we do, and then it would be considered for tax purposes that. The... the main thrust would be that these people that own these homes, like any of us, if they try to refinance or get a mortgage or refinance, like I said, they're not able to access mortgage loans as you and I would with the lower interest rate. So, that's what we're trying to attempt with this."

Franks: "No, I think it makes perfect sense. My... my question, though, however, really deals with how creditors would be treated. Because under the... if you're a manufactured home, you have a... a car title basically, a vehicle title, and there are UCC provisions. However, if you become titled through real property, would then the foreclosure provisions kick in if there has to be a... an action on the property such as the homeowner not paying? Because right now, if the... if the motor home owner does not pay, it's a UCC action, which is much different than a foreclosure action. And I'm wondering whether that would trigger the foreclosure provisions?"

Beiser: "Jack, did you say motor home or did you mean to say mobile home?"

Franks: "I... I meant to say mo... mobile home."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Beiser: "Oh. Because there is a provision in here that clearly makes sure that this does not apply to recreational vehicles."

Franks: "For motor homes."

Beiser: "Yeah."

Franks: "Okay. I mean for manufactured homes..."

Beiser: "Yeah."

Franks: "...that I know they're fixed to a permanent..."

Beiser: "Right."

Franks: "...location. But I'm just... I'm concerned 'cause I'm not sure this is laid out whether this would change it to the foreclosure code or not, which could be very expensive."

Beiser: "To be honest with you, I don't have the answer to that question. I'd be happy to take it out of the record and talk to you about this so we can come to some understanding of the answer to your question."

Franks: "Okay. If we just talk for a few minutes, then?"

Beiser: "Sure."

Franks: "Thank you."

Beiser: "Sure. Sure."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill out of the record. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6005, Representative Chapa LaVia. Out of the record. House Bill 4914, Representative Hatcher. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4914, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hatcher."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Hatcher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislature. This House Bill is actually one of the oldest pieces of working legislation in the State of Illinois. It was first begun right after the Civil War whenever the Legislature came forward and said that each county in this state shall be entitled to one scholarship at the University of Illinois for the benefit of descendants of the soldiers and seamen who served in the Armies and Navies of the United States during the Late Rebellion. Now, this was written in the late 19... 1800s and it wasn't 'til the mid-1900s that this was updated so that it actually referred to the Civil War rather than the Late Rebellion. It hasn't been updated for many, many years and was brought to me as an opportunity to also include the Beirut siege and the Grenada Conflict. It does not expand the number of scholarships; it remains one per county throughout the state. It simply expands the pool of opportunity because, at this point, we don't have any descendants of the Civil War who are using scholarships. I would urge your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4914 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Feigenholtz, Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4914, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4558, Representative Drury. Out of the record. House Bill 5684, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5684, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. The Bill does two things. First, it reflects an agreement between the auto and truck dealers and the Department of Revenue so that there are specific taxes which, left unpaid, would result in the Secretary of State's denying a license renewal. Secondly, it corrects a technical error in the long-term auto leasing tax Bill that we passed about a month ago. There were conflicting dates. This measure fixes those dates. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for a 'yes' vote on this measure."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5684 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5684, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brauer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Brauer: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Shaun Lewis, our pastor of our Capitol is here with his fourth grade class and his son, Caleb. And they are the Springfield Christian School fourth grade and they are taught by Mrs. Jakaitis and Mrs. Moore. Let's give them a warm Springfield welcome."

117th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Welcome to your Capitol. Mr. Clerk, the status of House Bill 5537."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5537 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Please move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5537, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. The Amendment would cap the number of districts that are subject to State Board of Education intervention at four at any given moment. This was a request of the Illinois Association of School Boards. I'd appreciate your support to adopt the Amendment." Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Majority Leader yield?" Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."
- Franks: "Representative, I'm... I'm reading the Bill and House Floor Amendment #1. Has that been adopted?"
- Currie: "That is what we are adopting now."
- Franks: "Oh, that's what we're adopting. Okay. Let me ask you this."
- Currie: "Or at least I hope we are."
- Franks: "Okay. Oh, I didn't realize this was Second Reading. Okay.

 Well, let me ask you a question on this Bill... on this... on
 this matter. Why are we limiting the amount of school boards
 at any one time that can be removed to four?"
- Currie: "It was not... as you know, the Bill as originally introduced did not... did not include that limitation. There

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

are a couple of reasons why this Amendment does include the limitation. One is that there was very significant opposition from school boards across the state to the unlimited opportunity, which of course is part of current law. But the reality is the State Board of Education doesn't have adequate resources to do more than this number at any given time. So, it was not a major give on the part of the advocates of the Bill and it did assuage some concerns among stakeholders."

Franks: "And what's the definition of at any one time? I mean, how often do this... does this group meet? Can they do four this week and four next week, or four this month and four next month?"

Currie: "It's... it's a much... it's a longer process than that."

Franks: "Okay."

Currie: "So, it would be a question of whether the state board, the intervention is over, finished, back on track at the local level. Once that happens, then that would no longer count and you would be able to add another."

Franks: "Have they ever dissolved more than four at any one time anyway?"

Currie: "Not to my knowledge. As I say, it's a resource question as much as anything else."

Franks: "Thank you for answering those questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Does the speaker yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Mayfield: "Okay. Representative, can you give me an example of a provision bullet... provision number four, to conduct itself with professionalism and care in a legally, ethically, and

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

financial responsible manner, and under what circumstances would an entire board, not just a board member, but an entire board have met this particular provision so that the entire board is removed?"

Currie: "Well, right now, of course, the board has... the State Board of Education has unlimited authority to remove local boards of education if they had failed in their mission adequately to educate their pupils. This would limit the board to only it... at any given time, only involve themselves in that significant intervention in four districts at a time. So, this Amendment significantly narrows the scope of the underlying Bill."

Mayfield: "You did not answer my question."

Currie: "Perhaps you would restate your question."

Mayfield: "My question is under what circumstance would an entire board meet the provisions of bullet point number four?"

Currie: "Well, right now, the provisions that the state board could use to invalidate an entire school board are not clearly specified in statute. Under this Bill, not the Amendment, but under the Bill, there are clear procedures the state board would have to follow, not present in today's law, would have to follow before they could engage in that kind of intervention."

Mayfield: "Again, you did not answer my question."

Currie: "Yeah. So, the answer is that this is limited opportunity for the state board. Today, it is in their discretion to determine that a local school board has failed. This would require intervention; it would require all kinds of counseling."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Mayfield: "Representative, I asked you specifically about bullet point number four. You did not answer the question. Under what circumstance would an entire board be removed under bullet point number four?"

Currie: "When... and this is true under current law and true under the Bill, except under the Bill..."

Mayfield: "Can you give me an example, Representative."

Currie: "...this would apply to... Yes, I will give you an example.

When a school board has consistently failed to make sure that
the youngsters in its school system are achieving or
learning."

Mayfield: "That is not what bullet point number four says, Representative."

Currie: "This Amendment only covers the number..."

Mayfield: "Representative, are you aware what your Bill is asking and what it states? I'm ask... I'm looking at the analysis, bullet point number four, please take the time to read it and answer my question."

Currie: "The answer to your question is that the Bill that's the current law gives the state board wide discretion in replacing boards of education. This Bill..."

Mayfield: "So, you do not have an answer..."

Currie: "...limits, limits..."

Mayfield: "...for my question."

Currie: "...limits the circumstances in which that would apply.

This Amendment says only four at a single time. So, the

Amendment is limiting, the Bill is limiting."

Mayfield: "You still did not answer my question, Representative.

I'm going to ask you another question. Can you explain the

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Supreme Court's decision that stated that when the removal of a school board is unconstitutional and how that affects this Bill?"

Currie: "I'm not familiar with that Supreme Court decision. But...
but that's not relevant to the Amendment, so perhaps we could..."

Mayfield: "It is relevant..."

Currie: "...discuss that..."

Mayfield: "It's relevant to the Amendment and it's relevant to the Bill because you are looking to remove school boards and the Supreme Court ruled that it is unconstitutional."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Members. I'd just like to remind everyone that this Bill is on Second Reading and it will have a chance to be debated on Third Reading. This is just for the adoption of the Amendment. Could you..."

Mayfield: "Okay. Well, at this point, I would rec... Representative, please read and understand your Bill because I will have more questions. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5537. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 5613, Representative Brauer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5613, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brauer."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this basically takes the county clerks and lets them come into the 21st century. It allows them to buy electronic real estate transfer tax stamps. There's no opposition to this. I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5613 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5613, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4418, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4418, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This simply indicates that if you're going to dissolve, only dissolve, a fire department in your municipality that you would have to go to a referendum. Currently, fire protection districts have to go to a referendum in order to dissolve a fire district. We amended the Bill to say that very small fire districts, municipal fire districts under 500, would not have to go to a referendum. This simply says that if your fire district is going to be dissolved in a municipality or a village, and you're a municipal fire district, the voters will have a say. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Representative, we talked a little bit about this Bill a couple days ago. Does this Bill... well, my analysis says it limits Home Rule. Do you know if it overrides Home Rule? Or preempts it?"

Hoffman: "It says that any municipality, city or village, Home Rule or non-Home Rule, if they want to dissolve their fire district, the people would get a choice and they would have to vote on it."

Sandack: "So, it'd go to referendum?"

Hoffman: "Through a referendum, yes."

Sandack: "All right. And so, to... to your answer, I guess this does preempt Home Rule, then, yes?"

Hoffman: "Every city and municipality, so I... I guess the answer's yes. Yes."

Sandack: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I... I assume this requires a 71-number vote? The Heather button has been pressed. I like that."

Speaker Turner: "Just a moment, Representative. We'll get your question answered. Representative Sandack, it will take 60 votes for this Bill to pass. Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Yes. Thank you. This is a very simple Bill. It's an initiative of the Associated Firefighters of Illinois. It simply says that if you want to dissolve... dissolve a fire protection district, the voters get to decide. If you want to work together with another municipality, you can do that. You can do that by an intergovernmental agreement. It doesn't say

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

that you can't do that. Currently, a fire protection district has to go to a referendum to dissolve. This just says if you're a municipality and you want to dissolve your fire district, you would have to go to referendum. The people get to decide. It does not in any way preclude you from agreeing with other municipalities to have an intergovernmental agreement. I ask for a favorable vote."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4418 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
 is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourself.
 Representative Hatcher, Martwick, Welch. Mr. Clerk, please
 take the record. On a count of 93 voting 'yes', 20 voting
 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4418, having received
 the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House
 Bill 5707, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. House
 Bill 5949, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please read
 the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5949, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy. Excuse me, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5949 is an initiative of adoption advocates and the Chicago Bar Association. It cleans up some language about an... an advisory committee. It also provides a remedy to a group of adult adopted persons who are entitled to their birth certificate, but there is no birth certificate for them. I'd be glad to answer any questions. There's no opposition to this Bill."

117th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5949 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Cabello, Hatcher. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5949, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reboletti, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 4418 I wish the record to reflect that my intention was to be 'yes' on the Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. The Journal will reflect your request.

 House Bill 4995, Representative Bill Mitchell. Mr. Clerk,

 please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4995, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4995, all it does is for the City of Monticello, it allows, or excuse me, the school district in Monticello, allows them to, if they choose, and I don't... they haven't decided yet whether they're going to do it, is run a referendum and increases their bonded by... to... up to \$35 million."
- Speaker Turner: "Now, we have Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. To the Bill. I... I want to say that we're in strong support of this. Wherever we can help out when districts with, especially

117th Legislative Day

- downstate Members, we're willing to do that. It's a fine piece of legislation. It allows and it... please go ahead and vote 'yes' on it. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell to close."
- Mitchell, B.: "I urge an 'aye' vote and I want to thank the chairman; I appreciate her comments."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4995 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kosel, Representative Mitchell. Christian Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 83 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4995, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4636, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4636, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill, also an initiative, to clarify definitions in the Adoption Act by the Chicago Bar Association. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4636 pass?' And with a late light, we have Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Representative Feigenholtz, would you tell us what your Bill does in reference to the relatives?"

117th Legislative Day

- Feigenholtz: "It... Representative, you'll... it... the Chicago Bar Association is working to rewrite and clarify the Adoption Act. It's something that lawyers like to do every once in a while. So, if you look at your analysis, you'll see how it includes stepparents, related cousins, issues relating to termination of parental rights, custody, et cetera. It's been discussed and negotiated. If you have any specific questions, I'm glad to answer them."
- Davis, M.: "Well, are they seeking other relatives? Is that what your Bill is saying? It's going to seek other relative... 'Cause you know, I have a Bill that says relatives have to be... you should attempt to find other relatives before you place children for adoption to see if other relatives want to take their children. So, my question is does your Bill address that?"
- Feigenholtz: "It... it doesn't address what... it does... your Bill addresses seeking out relatives prior to final placement.

 This Bill defines relatives."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Representative.

 I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."
- Feigenholtz: "I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Turner: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 4636 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 102 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 4636, having received the Constitutional Majority,

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2544, Representative Osmond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2544, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2544 creates an Accountable Care organizational... Organization Clinical Laboratory Testing Advisory Board. And this makes recommendations to the accountable care organization on guidelines and protocols for clinical laboratory testing. This has been brought forth by the Illinois Society of Pathology... Pathologists and I know of no opposition."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Franks: "Representative, our analysis indicates that AETNA is an opponent. Has their opposition been removed with House Floor Amendment #2?"

Osmond: "Yes, it has."

Franks: "Okay. Is there any cost analysis on this Bill?"

Osmond: "I don't believe so."

Franks: "Is there any chance that this will increase the cost of health care?"

Osmond: "No. It's just strictly an advisory board to the doctors and the hospitals, so it wouldn't have any..."

Franks: "Oh, okay. I wasn't sure if they were requiring certain testing."

Osmond: "No. It's... it's strictly to collaborate the information across the board for people."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Franks: "All right. So, there's no opposition, everybody's on board?"

Osmond: "Everybody's on board."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond to close."

Osmond: "I wish an 'aye' vote, please."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2544 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ford, Morrison. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2544, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention, Members. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4083. Out of the record.

 Mr. Clerk, House Bill 5547, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5547, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4021, Representative Evans. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4021, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Evans."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #1 is a gut replacement Amendment. It's an initiative of the Department of Human Services. It just adds financial exploitations to some of their other criteria for being added to the health care worker registry to protect folks."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4021. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 4983, Representative Bill Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4983, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Bill Mitchell."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a busy day for me. What... what the Amendment does is we had a situation and... becomes the Bill, rather. We had a situation in Macon County where a township official, a township supervisor, approp... misappropriated \$30 thousand from the township fund. In essence, he stole it. And this Bill says it requires two signatures rather than just one as it is at present. Now, the Township Officials of Illinois, I've agreed to work with them. They'd like a little bit more specific language, so I've

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

agreed to try to work with them this week to get the language that... that they agree with, which is technical in nature."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

- Osmond: "Representative, are... I guess I'm a little confused on this Bill. Are you saying that you're still working with the Township Officials?"
- Mitchell, B.: "Yes. The Township Officials came to me yesterday in committee. And right now, the Bill says it requires another signature for bills."

Osmond: "Correct."

- Mitchell, B.: "They would prefer the language to say another elected official. I said that's fine with me. We're going to try to work on it and get it out another Amendment this week. They said they'd be fine to work in the Senate, but I want to try to get it out this week."
- Osmond: "One of our concerns is the fact that that other person will have to be bonded."
- Mitchell, B.: "That would be... that is a... that was not a point mentioned."
- Osmond: "And the third thing would be are you going to put a cap as to a certain level of, like a \$50 check, is that going to require two signatures?"
- Mitchell, B.: "It was not in the Bill, but they're going... I would be not... I would not be opposed to have some threshold like that."
- Osmond: "I think that that's needed, because I'm hearing from a lot of the townships that this is a little bit aggressive."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Mitchell, B.: "And let me ex... and I appreciate and I'll be glad to incorporate that into the language. Let me talk. This is a very small township of about 1200 people. The township supervisor took \$30 thousand and so the township attorney came to me with this language. I'm... and the problem with it, even though this supervisor is bonded..."

Osmond: "Right."

Mitchell, B.: "...the bond won't cover the forensic audit for this small township. It'll cost about \$25 thousand, which for a township of 1500 people, is quite a lot of money."

Osmond: "Well, and in my townships that are a lot higher it would cost a lot more money. So, I'm glad to see you're still working on it."

Mitchell, B.: "Oh, yes."

Osmond: "Thank you."

Mitchell, B.: "Absolutely."

Speaker Turner: "Members, again, just a reminder. This Bill is on Second Reading and will be debated on Third. Representative Yingling. Thank you. Gentleman moves that the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4983. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 08, 2014: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1922."

117th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "House Bill 4083, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4083, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's really nothing substantive in this Bill. This Bill simply delineates between the Department of Juvenile Justice and the Department of Corrections who gets to propose rules about what issues of the Act that has been murky. There is no opposition to this Amendment or this Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4083. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Osmond."
- Osmond: "I think I'm calling caucus in Room 118? Okay. May we please have a Republican Caucus in Room 118?"
- Speaker Turner: "The Republicans will caucus in Room 118 immediately. And the House shall be in recess until 12:00."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 991, offered by Representative Acevedo. And House Resolution 993, offered by Representative Flowers."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's a cell phone here that somebody lost. It's got pink elephants on one side; it's very lovely. Anyone lose a pink elephant telephone? Okay. We'll get it... we'll get it to you. I won't say... I won't say the name but somebody that likes pink elephants is getting their phone back. Representative Osmond is recognized. Representative Osmond has now changed her mind. Mr. Meier is recognized."

Meier: "Yes, for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Meier: "I would like to recognize our Pages for the day from my...

my district and John Cavaletto's district. From the Breese

Central High School we have Bridgette Novy, Alex Striker,

Sarah Jansen, Lydia Rehkemper, Nick Dall, Ben Grapperhaus and

Brendan Menietti. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome, happy you're here. On page 19 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1922. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1922, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3, 4, 5, and 6 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan on the Amendment."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we'd like to go to Amendment #6."

117th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Amendments 3, 4 and 5 and please read Amendment 6."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #6 is offered by Speaker Madigan and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan on Amendment 6."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... Mr. Speaker, is the matter on Second Reading? Could we... I would move to adopt the Amendment and then debate the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Sir."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1922, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1922 reforms two of the Chicago pension funds, the Municipal Employees' Annuity and Benefit Fund and the Laborers' Annuity and Benefit Fund. The City of Chicago has engaged in a series of discussions with labor and as a result, the city has asked the General Assembly to pass legislation that will significantly reform these two funds in order to achieve long-term financial stability. The legislation includes benefit changes for both Tier 1 and 2 Tier people, an increase in both the employer and the employee contributions and several other important reforms. As we all know, State Law establishes both the benefit levels and the

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

contributions required for employees and employers. Thus the General Assembly will be called upon to pass a law in order for the funds to implement the proposed changes. The Bill includes the following benefit changes. Tier 1 retirees currently receive an annual adjustment of 3 compounded. Pursuant to the Bill, beginning in January of 2015, the annual adjustment will be the lesser of one-half of the CPI or 3 percent simple. Retirees with an annual annuity of less than \$22 thousand will always receive at least a 1 percent increase. All annual adjustments will be delayed one additional year. Except for those with an annual annuity of less than 22 thousand, all annual increases will be suspended in 2017, 2019 and 2025. For Tier 2 employees, the retirement age will decrease from 67 to 65 and from 62 to 60 for early retirement. There will be no change in retirement age for Tier 1 employees. Both the City of Chicago and the employees will be required to gradually make greater contributions to the fund. Currently, the employee contribution is 8.5 percent of annual salary. The Bill increases contributions by onehalf a percent each year in 2015 through 2019 to bring the contribution to 11 percent. The contribution remains at 11 percent until the fund reaches 90 percent funding level, at which time it drops to 9.75 percent so long as the fund remains at or above 90 percent. City contributions to both funds will be substantially increased. From 2016 through 2020, the city will be required to make contributions based on an increase multiplier. For the Municipal Fund, the city currently contributes 1.25 times the total amount of employee contributions made two years earlier. The Bill increases the

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

multiplier to 1.85 in 2015 and it will continue to annually increase until it reaches 3.05 in 2019. For the Laborers' Fund, the city currently contributes 1 times the total amount from employee contributions made two years earlier. The Bill increases the multiplier to 1.6 in 2015 and it will continue to annually increase to until it reaches 2.8 in 2019. Beginning in 2021, the city will make contributions based on an actuarial funding schedule to reach 90 percent funded by 2055. Unlike the Bill as introduced, the legislation does not, does not, mandate a property tax increase. It will solely be up to the Chicago City Council to determine how they will fund the increased contributions. Additionally, the Bill provides two mechanisms to ensure that the city makes its full pension payment. Number one, if either fund fails to receive its full contribution by December 31 of a given year, the fund may bring a mandamus action in the Circuit Court of Cook County. The court may set a payment schedule for the city to pay any amounts due and all payments are subordinate to the debt payments of the city. Number two, the Bill includes intercept language that is identical to what is currently provided for by law for the Illinois Municipal Retirement System, for Downstate Police and Fire, and for the Chicago Police and Fire Funds. If the city fails to make its payment, the fund may certify the delinquent payment amount to the State Comptroller. The Comptroller must deduct from state grants to the city the certified amount or the portion of the certified amount set for that particular year. In 2016, the Comptroller may offset one-third of the total grants from the state, two-thirds in 2017, and the total amount going

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

forward. Further, the Bill provides that the funds will be prohibitive from using pension fund money to pay health care costs other than those required under current law, ending December 31, 2016. Mr. Speaker, I move for the passage of the Bill. And I'm available for questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Speaker. Will Speaker Madigan yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. Speaker, obviously, that was a lot of information. I have a couple questions with respect to the proposed Bill. First of all, in your opinion, is this Bill constitutional?"

Madigan: "I would answer your question by saying that those who drafted the Bill, drafted the Bill with the clear intent that it would be constitutional. They've constructed their arguments and their drafting in such a way to meet the anticipated requirements of the court. Number two, that's a matter for the court to decide."

Sandack: "Certainly it is. But similar to SB1, when we had discussion and dialogue on the propriety of that Bill, it's certainly your intention that this pass constitutional muster?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Sandack: "You made mention of the previous rendition of this Bill or better, the Amendment now on the floor with the Bill. It had property tax, permissive property tax information in the... in the Bill. You spoke that that's not mandated. Isn't it the fact, Speaker, that it's not in the Bill at all anymore?"

Madigan: "That's correct. The answer is yes."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Sandack: "So, the propriety of a property tax is for the City of Chicago and its elected officials exclusively?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Sandack: "Some folks on my side of the aisle are somewhat disappointed that we're only dealing with two funds rather than the additional funds, Police, Fire and the Chicago School Teachers. Is it your anticipation that the... that we'll have a similar Bill as... as similar as it can be with those funds down the line?"

Madigan: "Mr. Sandack, I can tell you that in my personal conversations with Mayor Emanuel, he would like to correct the fiscal problems with all five city pension systems. And he's offered this legislation that would correct the problems with two of the systems and I presume that he's continuing to work on the other three systems."

Sandack: "And with respect to the Bill that we have before us, is it your opinion that we're making incremental progress towards addressing Chicago's pension crisis?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Sandack: "To... to the Bill, Speaker. Similar to SB1, I think many people will find that this is not a perfect Bill. Folks on our side of the aisle may want bolder, more strong pension reform. Folks on the other side of the aisle may suspect this is too much, too fast, and it's too intrusive and too disruptive. Again, as we are here today, I think this is incremental progress to the good. I think we are taking the right steps to address the financial difficulties this state has and that includes the financial difficulties with our biggest, most important city, which is the City of Chicago.

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

I suspect no one wants to see the city fail; I suspect no one wants to see its financial condition get worse. Therefore, I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "He will yield."

Dunkin: "Mr. Speaker, what's the average age of the... of the annuitant for this respective piece of legislation and... and who it'll be affecting or impacting?"

Madigan: "Sixty-two is the average retirement age."

Dunkin: "This... this pension fund covers the Chicago Public School systems, some of their staff as well?"

Madigan: "Well, Representative, the... in the case of the municipal system, certain of the members of the municipal system are employees of the Chicago Board of Education. They're not school teachers because the teachers of the Chicago Board of Education are members of the Chicago Teachers' Retirement System. I would also point out that for the employees of the Board of Education, who are members of the municipal system, the employer cost of the pension payment is done by the City of Chicago, not Chicago Board of Education."

Dunkin: "Has there been an actuary on these particular numbers that impact, sort of, this disproportionally low-income annuitant? I believe the average is about \$22 thousand per worker."

Madigan: "Well, Representative, you... you've gone to an interesting part of the Bill which would provide that for an annuitant drawing an annuity up to \$22 thousand a year, on the COLA adjustment there will always be a floor of 1 percent for those

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

up to 22 thousand. So, the general rule on the COLA would be one-half of the CPI or 3 percent simple. Under that formula, it could happen that the COLA would go below 1 percent, but for those that have an annuity under 22 thousand, that would never happen because there'll be a floor in the Bill of 1 percent."

Dunkin: "Is there a..."

Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin, could I add that... that the provision that I just spoke to covers about 38 percent of the members of the fund."

Dunkin: "The entire fund of the... of the current retirees."

Madigan: "The current members."

Dunkin: "Active and retired?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Dunkin: "Is there a clearer understanding of what the City of Chicago plans to do to generate revenue to help offset the large low-funded pension fund that would fa... that they're faced with... we're faced with?"

Madigan: "Well, that'll be a budgetary decision for the mayor and the members of the Chicago City Council. They're like us; they do budget making once a year. They're very familiar with difficult budget making and this will be another cost item in their budget making that they'll have to work with and they'll have to reconcile so that they have sufficient money to pay their bills."

Dunkin: "So, is there any revenue required up front to initiate this or go into this... this change with this pension reform?" Madigan: "The answer is no."

117th Legislative Day

- Dunkin: "And there hasn't been any particular plan that the City of Chicago has offered to generate... generate on the revenue side to close this gap?"
- Madigan: "Well, again, that's part of their budget making. So, this very year at the State of Illinois, we're looking at the expiration of the increase in income tax in January of 2015. That'll bring on difficult budget making for those of us in the Legislature working with the Governor. And like the City Council in the future, we'll be called upon to make difficult decisions, either to cut spending or to raise revenue. That'll be the same question put to the members of the Chicago City Council working with the mayor."
- Dunkin: "Just for clarification's sake, the requirement that was...
 or the Amendment that was removed or added, did that take out
 their ability to raise property taxes in the City of Chicago?"
- Madigan: "The Bill as amended is not concerned with raising property taxes. The City of Chicago as a Home Rule unit, pursuant to the Constitution, has the authority to levy real estate taxes and to impose other taxes. So, this Bill simply changes the contributions required by the employer, the City of Chicago, plus the employees and it reduces the benefit level. That's what this Bill does."
- Dunkin: "Has... have they presented a revenue generation plan or complete plan at all?"
- Madigan: "No. No, they haven't."
- Dunkin: "So, what happens if... I know you... you made mention of this in your opening remarks. What happens if they don't pay their full portion into the fund?"

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Madigan: "Well, that's where we get to two Sections of the Bill which are very significant. So, number one, if the city fails to make its required payment before December 31 of a given year, either fund can file a mandamus action in the Circuit Court of Cook County to compel the payment of the appropriate amount of money. Number two, as currently happens for the Illinois Municipal Retirement System, Downstate Police and Fire, and the Chicago Police and Fire, there's language in the Bill identical to current language in the statute which provides for an intercept, where pension funds could file an intercept with the State Comptroller who would intercept money flowing to the City of Chicago but divert it to either of these two pension systems."

Dunkin: "And that would be automatic from the Comptroller's Office or would we have to make a special or reduce appropriation because certain municipalities are not paying their full share in the... into the pension fund?"

Madigan: "This would not get concerned with appropriations. This is a diversion of money which is on its way to the City of Chicago and would be diverted to the pension systems. This is the arrangement that's in place today for the Illinois Municipal Retirement System. History shows that it works very well because IMRF today is funded at 96 percent, 96 percent, due in large part to the presence of the intercept language in the statute."

Dunkin: "Have we done this before with the City of Chicago?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes because Chicago Fire and Police Funds have the intercept language today."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

- Dunkin: "So, those funds are fully funded today? Is it fair to say that?"
- Madigan: "No. No, they're not. No, they're not. They're... they're in very poor condition."
- Dunkin: "So, the intercept is... are you saying that's... that's not working or we've just been somehow missing the... the investment or the allocation to the intercept which should go directly to the fund?"
- Madigan: "The intercept authority for the Chicago Police and Fire is of recent origin. They haven't had it for that many years and the intercept language only gives authority to intercept amounts due and owing. So, in the case of the Chicago Police and Fire, they're under the Illinois statute and the amounts required to be paid by the city are set by the statute. Those funds are in a position to compel the payment of that money but only the amount that's provided for in the statute."
- Dunkin: "So, just for clarification's sake, the City of Chicago is going to have multiple ways to generate revenue including a potential property tax increase, including possibly raising services on... and fees on various... from haircuts to lawn services, et cetera. They'll have that option in this legislation as well, Sir?"
- Madigan: "The answer is yes, not necessarily because of this legislation but because they had that authority pursuant to the Constitution. But the answer is yes."
- Dunkin: "What happens if we don't pass this legislation?"
- Madigan: "Well, if we don't pass the legislation, then we will continue with a municipal system which, as of December 31 2012, was funded at 37 percent and the laborer system which

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

is funded at 55 percent. And for purposes of comparison, one is 37, the other is 55, the Illinois Municipal Retirement System is at 96. So, the numbers alone would behoove us to take action and pass this Bill."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Speaker, to the Bill. Let's don't kid anybody. What we're talking about today is a massive property tax increase. The mayor's deputy mayor was here last week and I specifically asked the question about what the plan is. The plan is to raise property taxes by \$50 million in 2016, 100 in 2017, 150 million in 2018, 200 million in 2019, 250 million in 2020. That's \$750 million over the next 5 years. Then it's at least \$250 million after that. So, for the next 10 years, we're looking at a \$2 billion increase in property taxes. That is the mayor's plan. The mayor has said that publicly. It is based on tax increases, and what we're doing in this Bill, and let's be very specific because the Speaker did a great job going through this, the multiplier in both funds is increasing. That is what is facilitating this major property tax increase. This Bill is predicated on a tax increase. That is why I oppose it. This Bill also has not been scored by We've seen this movie before, passing legislation without having a full review by our independent analysis. And most importantly, this is not a comprehensive solution. What is the next property tax increase for the CPS, for the teachers, for fire, for police? We comprehensive solution to help solve the problems of our greatest city. So, please, let's don't pretend that this is

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

not a massive property tax. If you vote for this Bill, you are voting for at least \$2 billion of higher property taxes over the next 10 years. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. One of the previous speakers asked the question what happens if we don't take action on this legislation. And the Speaker laid out the... the Sponsor laid out the... the current status of the systems themselves, but I think what's more important right now is the trajectory of the funding level for those systems. When we... when we were looking at the state systems and reviewing the... the legislation that we ultimately passed, the Senate Bill 1, we were well ahead of where these systems are in terms of our solvency because back in 1995, as ... as many of you know, we passed legislation to put the state on a plan to get to 90 percent funding by 2045. So, we were... we were on that plan. We had taken some holidays, no doubt, but we were on that plan and so we were on a trajectory to get there. It was going to be unaffordable for us and it was impacting all of our other spending priorities, but we were definitely on that plan. These systems are on no plan to get to full funding. They are in fact on this multiplier system that the... that the Speaker has described. And these plans will be out of money, insolvent, bankrupt, unable to pay any of their obligations in somewhere between 10 and 15 years. And not only has the city testified to that, but the ... but I believe that the municipal system and the... really speaking more to the municipal system, it's the larger system here, it will... they've indicated that as well. So, to do nothing will put

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

all of the participants in the system and the ... and the retirees, which are at least 50 thousand people, at risk of receiving no benefit. And I tell you, if I'm that... in that system and I'm 60 years old and I'm told that when I'm 75 I am no longer going to be getting a benefit check, that's not something I want to see happen. So, there's a big difference between these systems and some of the other systems we've dealt with. These are in much worse shape and the ... the trajectory they are on is in totally the wrong direction and there is no plan, no hope, no ability to correct that unless we take this action today. So, for the benefit of the retire ... of those that are already retired and those in the system, we need to take action on the ... on these systems. I unders ... it ... the increase that would have to take effect in the city's payments in order to be able to move to an actuarially... an actuary-required contribution, I believe, just on the municipal system alone would today be a \$700 million increase, which is clearly something that's not affordable. So, I think this is a good plan to put us on a schedule, put us on a plan to get to the point where we are on a closer to an actuariallyrequired schedule to protect the retirement security for those that are depending on this. And... and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor." Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, are you familiar with the situation...
the financial situation in the City of Detroit?"

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

- Madigan: "Somewhat, through the media. Take that for what it's worth."
- Harris, D.: "As reported by the <u>Chicago Tribune</u> that you read every day, I'm sure. As we know, the City of Detroit is in bankruptcy. From you... from what you are aware of, is the issue of pensions one of the situations, one of the conditions which caused Detroit to suffer the situation that it's in now?"
- Madigan: "Mr. Harris, the answer is yes. And help me with this, but my recollection is that a Federal Court in Michigan said that the pensions were not protected."
- Harris, D.: "And that is my, that's what I understand as well. And to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, many officials have written that Chicago is not Detroit, that Chicago has a much greater economic base than Detroit, which was built on the automotive industry and thus Chicago is more diverse and it's not Detroit. Well, my friends, unless the laws of economics have somehow been overturned, Chicago could become another Detroit. Quite frankly, I think they are on that path right now. You've seen what's happened with their credit ratings. The credit rating agencies don't care whether it's Detroit or Chicago or Harrisburg or Mission Viejo, California. They look at it in terms of what can the city afford, how much money do they have, and can they meet their payments. And all these other cities couldn't and they filed bankruptcy. It could happen, to my mind at least, it could happen in Chicago and they're on that path right now, it seems to me. Now, I'm here to tell you that I voted 'no' on Senate Bill 1, second version of Senate Bill 1. And I did that for particular reasons which I won't rehash here, but during the debate on Senate Bill 1,

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

I made the statement that I believe the State of Illinois had sufficient funds to pay... to make its pension payments. It would have been tight, we would have had to skimp on appropriations in other areas, but the state had enough money to make its pension payments. Chicago does not have enough money to make its pension payments. They don't. And they need reform of their pension system in order to make those payments. The state cannot go bankrupt. We know that, but cities can and cities do all the time. And with the magnitude of the pension problem in the City of Chicago, they need reform. Now, it comes down to where are they going to get the money. One of the previous speakers says it's going to require a property tax increase and it very well may require a property tax increase. And I'm here to tell you I've seen my property taxes go up, they've doubled in five years. They went up 11 percent last year alone. Maybe the City of Chicago and the officials in the City of Chicago should have taken action prior to now to do what they needed to do to make the funding available. And if that required a property tax increase, maybe they should have done it before now. So, while I'm sympathetic, I don't want anybody to pay more property taxes. I sure am. I'm funding my schools to a much greater degree through my property taxes than I was five years ago. So, if it requires more money via a property tax increase, that doesn't concern me nearly as much as the great international City of Chicago simply cannot go the way of Detroit or Harrisburg or Mission Viejo or any other city that has declared bankruptcy. It is too significant a city for us to let that happen. There are problems with this Bill, it's

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

not perfect, but in this case, I think Chicago deserves a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Mr. Speaker, going back to the interception of grant money by the Comptroller, page 33 of the Bill lines out in (a-10) the mechanism by which it will happen over the multiple years. I want to drill down a little bit more to the actual grants potentially that could be used to make the required contribution should the city not make it. Can you go over some of the thoughts you have in regard to what funds, what grant funds, are in or out of the potential sweep to pay the required contributions?"

Madigan: "Yeah, Mr. Sullivan, thank you for the question. That's a very good question. But let me just step back a bit and repeat that the intercept language in the Bill for the city... municipal and city laborers fund is the same language in the statute for the intern... for the Illinois Municipal Retirement System, Downstate Police and Fire, Chicago Police and Fire."

Sullivan: "Yes."

Madigan: "The funds... the funds that are flowing to the City of Chicago today that would be subject to the intercept would be the Local Government Distributive Fund, which... in which case the city receives approximately \$250 million; the Personal Property Replacement Tax Fund, where the city receives about \$150 million, and the Municipal Retailers Occupation Tax Fund, where the city receives about \$300 million. The total of those three funds is \$700 million and the total payment

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

required for these 2 funds after the passage of the Bill is estimated to be about 286 million in 2016."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Madigan: "So, again, the requirement in 2016 would be about 286 million. The availability from state grants would be in the neighborhood of 700 million."

Sullivan: "And so, we anticipate potentially other funds or other types of systems being reformed and we think that that'll be enough down the line to capture even the next systems potentially that we vote on in the next month."

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Sullivan: "Okay. I want to just clarify, because it's never been done on rule or in law, we're not talking about potential CPS funds?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes. Could you restate the question?"

Sullivan: "So, yes. We're not talking about potential of the Comptroller sweeping Chicago Public School funds?"

Madigan: "No, we're not."

Sullivan: "Okay. I just wanted to get that on the record that is indeed what we were talking about. I appreciate your... your clarification."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few questions of the Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Speaker, I think you've probably gleaned by now that I may be a better businessman than a politician, so you're going to have to bear with me a little bit because I'd like to dig

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

down a little bit on this issue. So, we've been on extended debate... Speaker, what are you laughing at?"

Speaker Lang: "I'm just smiling, Sir."

Kay: "I know. Okay. So, you agree with one of those statements. And again, Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that you understand that my questions are... are genuine. I don't mean for you to wear the collar with respect to these questions. So, if I need to rephrase them or be a little gentler and kinder, I'll be that. Let me begin by just simply asking, how did we get in this position?"

Madigan: "We got in this position because of two concurrent events. Number one, the City of Chicago did not make payments pursuant to an actuarial-based formula, rather, it made payments based upon a multiplier formula which is set out in the statute. Number two, legislation was passed by the General Assembly, signed by a Governor, which improved the benefit level in these funds without adequate funding to pay for the changes."

Kay: "So, to drill down just a second. Is that a Chicago problem
 or a Springfield problem?"

Madigan: "Well, I would say it's both because, yes, it's a problem for Chicago, but it couldn't have happened without action of the General Assembly and the signature of Governor. Let me go back and give an example of some of the benefit levels. So, for a Tier 1 person in either of these systems, the... the current retirement age is age 50 with 30 years of service, 55 with 20 years of service, and 60 with 10 years of service. So, somebody could start with the City of Chicago at age 20, get to age 50, time to leave, and start drawing the pension.

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

That was a benefit increase recommended by the city, approved by the Legislature and a Governor, but not paid for in the legislation that granted the benefit increase."

Kay: "So, without belaboring the point, it's fair to say that we have, whether it's here or in Chicago, we've not managed the City of Chicago and the particular need we're addressing today very well. Is that fair to say?"

Madigan: "Could you restate the question?"

Kay: "Sure. It is fair to say that with respect to the General Assembly and the City of Chicago that we have not managed the affairs of the city too well. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "There's been some... trying to think of the right word,
Mr. Kay. So, there's been some... there's been some problems."

Kay: "Okay. I'm going to move on here. Is it fair to say that with regard to those who would support this Bill, that they might do it in contemplation of you breaking loose a few Bills having to do with workers' compensation reform and tort reform?"

Madigan: "Nobody's talked to me about that in terms of a deal on the pension Bill."

Kay: "Well, I'm not cutting a deal..."

Madigan: "Suffice to ... suffice to say, Mr..."

Kay: "...I'm just asking a question."

Madigan: "Mr. Kay, let me say that I've read the summaries on all the Bills you've introduced and I don't think there's one that I plan to support."

Kay: "There's not one that what?"

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Madigan: "I've read the summaries on all the Bills that you've introduced and I don't think there's one that I plan to support."

Kay: "Okay. Well, you... I gathered that because none of them are out of committee... or out of Rules so... but you do think I'm a good businessman, don't you?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Kay: "Okay. Fair enough. I won't blackmail you; I was just curious. Let me... this is a political question, but I'm curious as to why or... or if you think this Bill is better than SB1? And if you don't, explain, and if you do, explain."

Madigan: "You've taken me to a question that I wanted to address. This Bill and what's provided for these two systems is different than Senate Bill 1, but that's to be expected because Illinois has approximately 14, 15, 16 pension systems. They're all different. They all serve a different constituency. The benefit levels and the payment requirements are all different. We've had some experience to date. So first, the Water Reclamation District in Cook County came to the Legislature and said our pension fund is in financial trouble. We think we have a solution to the financial problem of the system. We're going to put it into a Bill. Would you pass the Bill? The Legislature passed the Bill for the Water Reclamation District, the Governor signed the Bill. Later, the Chicago Park District did the same thing. They came to the Legislature and said the pension system's in trouble. We think we've got a solution to the problem. Put it into a Bill, the Bill was passed, the Governor signed the Bill. I view these two systems as local pension systems somewhat similar

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

to the Water Reclamation District in Cook County and the Park District in Chicago, where the local system with local trustees, local officials, looked at their problem, came to the Legislature and said we think this would solve the problem, please pass the Bill. We did it for the Water Reclamation District. We did it for the Park District. I think we should do it for the Chicago Municipal and Chicago Laborers' system. You're completely stunned. You're ready to vote 'yes'."

Kay: "Well, I was just looking for a yes or no, but I take that as... as saying that you believe that this Bill is better than SB1. I'm just reading between the lines, though."

Madigan: "The best answer is this Bill is good for the Chicago Municipal system and the Chicago Laborers' system."

Kay: "Sure. Fair enough."

Madigan: "Okay."

Kay: "Let me... let me ask you some... some more detail. And I want to talk about enhancements that have kind of been entailed since 1970 that I think we may have lived with and I'm curious as to whether your Bill now forecloses on these. Eighty-five sick days allowed for early retirement. Does this Bill fix that?"

Madigan: "I'm sorry, Mr. Kay. One more time, please."

Kay: "Yes. Eighty-five sick days this... which was enacted in 1972.
Half year of service allowed for early retirement. Does that fix that?"

Madigan: "Mr. Kay, I think you're referring to a Section of the statute which would relate to workers for the State of Illinois, not the people working for the City of Chicago."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Kay: "So, none of those provisions, all of those enhancements that I would have on this sheet, which I'd prefer not to read down unless necessary, don't apply to Chicago?"

Madigan: "I presume that's the case. Now, I don't know what's on your piece of paper, but I presume that's the case."

Kay: "Well, let me go down it, then. How about survivor benefits
 paid at age 50 instead of 55?"

Madigan: "The answer is that that applies."

Kay: "And has that been changed?"

Madigan: "No."

Kay: "How about in the... in 1978, the General Assembly raised the COLA to 3 percent from 2 percent not compounded. Has that been changed? It has, hasn't it in this Bill?"

Madigan: "There will be a change there. The answer is yes."

Kay: "Okay. And how about early retirement, is that still optional
 or not?"

Madigan: "Well, it's optional with a penalty."

Kay: "With a penalty. Okay. The retiree health insurance program that was established in '80. How is that changed by this Bill?"

Madigan: "This Bill would provide that the statute would contain language which would prohibit these two systems from providing retiree health care, providing that health care could continue to be provided until December 31, 2016. Mayor Emanuel has already announced that the city is going to discontinue the provision of retiree health care in these two systems on December 31 of 2016. So, the language in the Bill acknowledges the mayor's intent to continue retiree health care until December 31, 2016, but thereafter the Bill would

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

- prohibit these two systems from providing retiree health care."
- Kay: "Good. Okay. How about 1983 when we pa... or the General Assembly allowed unmarried children over 18 eligibility for health care insurance. Has that changed?"
- Madigan: "Well, Mr. Kay, we... we think, again, that that's a state matter, not a city matter."
- Kay: "Okay. Fair enough. How about sick leave, has that been upped
 or diminished?"
- Madigan: "It's not changed by this Bill and in Chicago they don't use it for retirement purposes."
- Kay: "Okay. Good. And we've addressed the... the compound COLA issue. How about survivors receiving COLA. Does this Bill address that?"
- Madigan: "I'm advised that the survivors don't get a COLA today."
- Kay: "Okay. And this may... we may have already addressed this here, but how about disability and pensions added for part-time and substitute teachers. Is that... is that a carveout here?"
- Madigan: "Well, this Bill doesn't affect teachers."
- Kay: "Okay. All right. That's all I have on the particulars. It looks like you've covered about... you've omitted about four or five cost items that might be cost drivers and that's what I was trying to get to. Let me... let me continue. What actuarial method did you use when you were running your numbers to... or Chicago was running their numbers to determine the effectual savings to this plan over a given number of years?"
- Madigan: "Entry age normal method."
- Kay: "Entry age normal method. Okay. And is that the best way to do it or is that just the way you picked?"

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Madigan: "That method is recommended by those that are recognized as experts in the field."

Kay: "Okay. There's been a number of questions today about property taxes and I think, maybe on our side of the aisle there's some concern about that. I've heard some say that it may be necessary, some rail against property taxes. I personally don't care for increases, but I am concerned about whether or not you have a built-in firewall or walls that prohibit the city from making numerous monetary changes to this plan. So, as I look at that, I didn't see that particular concern addressed with a... a firewall or some step that says in another year we won't pull back or we won't return to our old ways. How... how would you answer that?"

Madigan: "It would require legislation from the General Assembly signed by the Governor."

Kay: "But that's happened before."

Madigan: "Yes."

Kay: "Yeah. Okay. Did you give any thought at all, and I'm pretty big on local control, but it seems to me like we're in a free fall here in Chicago. And I agree with Representative Harris that there is not any other way to... to really characterize this. But have you given thought to partic... to the potential of really assigning somebody that would have the same effect of a special master to overlook what happens to the pension system or the pension plan in Chicago?"

Madigan: "I'm sure it would be the desire of Mayor Emanuel to work with us in the General Assembly and solve the financing problems of the five pension systems in Chicago. From what I know of Mayor Emanuel, he would prefer to solve the problem

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

himself and not go to a court or a special master seeking a solution."

Kay: "Okay. Speaker, I... I appreciate your time and... and because
I'm a... a better businessman than I am a politician, I'm going
to support your Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker, the one thing that I think that I've been concerned about in this debate, as I've heard a lot of questions about what the City of Chicago could do, and I just want to be clear about it is that is there any point in time, presumably if payments are not made, that the State of Illinois would ever be on... on the hook for making up any difference in the payments that are not made by the City of Chicago?"

Madigan: "The answer is no, understanding that the intercept gives authority to the pension systems to intercept money that begins from the state and is on its way to the City of Chicago but then is diverted over to the pension system. But the immediate answer to your question is no."

Davis, W.: "Okay. But when... when you talk about the intercept, those are dollars that would otherwise be going to the City of Chicago anyway?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Davis, W.: "Okay. And one of the previous speakers talked about, I think, the level of payments. And you're confident that the amount of dollars that would otherwise go to the City of Chicago would be more... would more... would surpass, more than

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

surpass, what would be required of the pension payments to pay, correct?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes. And one more time, we're estimating that there's about \$700 million available in grants to the City of Chicago and the estimated cost in 2016 would be \$286 million."

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Speaker Madigan, going off on the idea of the interception of the state funds, would you agree that when the state is granting the funds to the City of Chicago, that we're doing it for reasons that we want to see something happen in a particular area? Would you say that we're giving a grant for a particular reason for something that's going to be beneficial to the state as well? Would you agree to that?"

Madigan: "The... the answer is yes. So ..."

Ives: "So, the interception of..."

Madigan: "...the state provides money..."

Ives: "Right."

Madigan: "...to the city, the city hires a police department, fire department, provides water, sewer. It's good for the city; it's good for the state."

Ives: "Right. I would agree with that. So, any state grant money that's intercepted is really going to... not for the cause that was originally intended, which was to provide whatever it is, a park upgrade or whatever it might be, correct?"

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Madigan: "I... I think the answer is yes. I think you're saying that, in the ordinary course, this money would not be used for pensions, but if the pension system files an intercept, it's going to be used for pensions."

Ives: "That's right."

Madigan: "Right."

Ives: "Okay. The other thing is when do you foresee, or do you foresee us doing pension reform with police, fire, and CPS?

When do you think that's going to happen?"

Madigan: "My plan would be to do what I did with these two systems. My position has been that, in the case of local pension systems, I would call upon them to come forward with recommendations. I think that the local people in charge of the pension systems are best able to understand their problem and then to make a recommendation to the Legislature for enactment of a Bill that would solve the problem. And so, as I work through that position on Chicago Laborers and Chicago Municipal, I would do the same with Chicago Police, Fire and Teachers."

Ives: "So, when..."

Madigan: "I would call upon them."

Ives: "Right. When do you expect that to happen? I mean, their funds are failing dramatically too. They're actually in worse shape in many cases than the funds we're... we're dealing with today. So, when do you think that might happen?"

Madigan: "I... I would say that the passage of the Bill and the signing by the Governor would help them along."

Ives: "Do they need to do it probably within six months?"

Madigan: "They should do it as soon as possible."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Ives: "They need to do it quickly, though, right?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Ives: "Okay. Because my concern is that we're doing this piecemeal and we're really not telling the taxpayers the whole story by rolling out first the Water Reclamation District and then the Chicago Park District, which I did vote for but which I feel is different than this one. And then we're doing these two funds and then we still have to deal with the three biggest funds. And we're not really telling in totality what is going to happen to the taxpayer. So, Mr. Speaker, just to the Bill. And this comes from a very respectable magazine, Barron's, from October 14, 2013, and it lists the top 20 most populous U.S. cities and it gives you their debt load based off of both direct debt and pension liability as it relates to the percentage of government revenue. So, looking down the list, number 12 on the list is actually Detroit and their entire debt and pension liability as a percentage of government revenue is 372, 372 percent of the government... government revenues. Of course, last on the list, 'cause that's where Illinois tends to be, is Chicago. So, 20 out of 20 of the most populous cities is Chicago with its debt and pension liability 683 percent of its government revenues. So, for almost seven years, you could take every single dollar in the City of Chicago that's generated for government revenue and still just finally pay off your pension, unfunded liability, and your debt. And my worry here is that, although I'm glad that we have a start to a solution, it's not commensurate with the scope of the problem. The problem is much more severe than even Detroit faced. The problem is greater than what the

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

State of Illinois faced. And this reform does not arrest it. It takes five years to even ramp up to where you're doing a full... where you're starting to fund it at a higher level. It's a 40-year funding plan, which is usually you use 30 if you're doing best practices. And we're not showing the entire picture to the taxpayers in the City of Illi... the City of Chicago what they're really going to owe 'cause we're leaving out the three largest pension funds. And that... that does a disservice. I would rather we come back and if we have to do pension reform for the other three within six months, and I truly believe we need to do it, then why don't we do it altogether and do a real... a solution that's commensurate with the problem? 'Cause Chicago is really in bad shape and we're kicking the can down the road. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As a member of a district that entirely enco... is encompassed by the City of Chicago, I am deeply concerned about the fiscal stability of our city. Without intervention, I think we all know there will be no retirement benefits left for city employees, a devastating outcome. Though the Bill has been agreed to by a majority of the member unions even those who are not in agreement have agreed that without intervention we will be out of money. The majority of these groups have weighed in... weighed in on the cost and benefit analysis of doing nothing or risking... taking the deal, doing nothing and taking the risk that pensions will be completely devastated and... or... and/or cuts be made even more drastic. Similarly, for the remainder of the pension systems not addressed in the Bill,

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

specifically teachers, fire and police, I will await agreement of those, just as the Speaker mentioned. Whether this Bill passes today, the fact is the city remains obligated for this debt. As someone that represents the city, I called all seven of my aldermen to get their opinion. They all agree that doing nothing is not an option. I would encourage the city to sit down with the aldermen and listen to their creative ideas for revenue options other than raising property taxes. Raising property taxes should be a last resort and all other options considered prior to imposing a property tax increase. Where the city will find the revenue to pay for is not... to pay for this is not addressed in the Bill, but it's absolutely critical that the city fully explore all its revenue options with the help of the aldermen rather than relying on property taxpayers to shoulder the majority of the burden. I will be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Speaker yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question with respect to what we've done with the MWRD and the park district. How does this piece of legislation compare to what the employee contributions were for those two measures? And is this a higher percentage of... of additional employee contribution towards a solution or is this commensurate with it? If you could help me with that."

Madigan: "Mr. Reboletti, in all three cases the employees were called upon to contribute more or will be called upon to contribute more. In this Bill, and in the case of these two

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

systems, the percentage of employee contribution is greater than it was with the park district or the Water Reclamation District."

Reboletti: "And the other concern, obviously, is the property tax increase. And that's... we've talked a lot about local control on the House Floor in the last few days or the last couple weeks. This isn't taking away any local control from the aldermen. They could choose to leave the property taxes where they're at right now. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Reboletti: "And would you agree, Mr. Speaker, that the health of the City of Chicago is... is directly in touch and in tune with the health of the economic well-being of the State of Illinois?"

Madigan: "I believe that."

Reboletti: "And it's also possible that if we did nothing and the system collapsed that we would have people expecting pensions that would get zero. Is that also a potential?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. You know, it's always difficult to govern in tough economic times and bad public policy has been covered up by a number of years of good economic times and now the chickens have come home to roost. And while it's never easy to vote for pension reform, we voted for about five or six different measures, I can tell you from the county of DuPage that thousands of people get on a train to go to work in a number of corporations and businesses and manufacturing with the hope that those businesses will continue to thrive. And if we do nothing, we already have the

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

roadmap to that, it's called the City of Detroit, where people in the pension system got 18 cents on the dollar. And the City of Chicago could file bankruptcy and that would be an embarrassment to this entire Body, our friends across the hallway, and to the people on the second floor. We can't let the City of Chicago fail. And if the aldermen there choose to do nothing or choose to raise taxes, that's their business. When I was an alderman in Elmhurst, we did the same thing. You dealt with the issues as they came to you. So, we have a choice. You can vote for this, protect people's pensions so that they will have something in retirement, or we can throw our hands up and say I don't want additional property taxes, I want a perfect solution. I don't want a property tax hike; I don't want any of those things. Well, I'm not a Chicago alderman and I know they have a lot of power over there and that they make a lot of money. And we all get paid to make tough decisions. And while I wish that we weren't in this position, we are. And it appears that this is a Bill that's been agreed upon by almost every union and that we try to do the same thing with those other pieces of legislation and I don't consider this to be piecemeal. Negotiations take a long time. And if we do nothing, we become Detroit. We can all point fingers at each other and say why didn't somebody 25 years ago do something? Well, we're in the present right now. We have an opportunity to do something and while not everybody may agree with it, it's better than doing absolutely nothing. So, I will be supporting the measure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "The last speaker is Leader Durkin."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

"Thank you. To the Bill. I take the position that many Durkin: other speakers have taken, that doing nothing is not an option. No one relishes to be in this position. We've had to take some tough decisions over the past few months, but the realities of the world right now are that we need to take significant steps to be able to resolve the fiscal and the financial problems that we have with our states and also our municipalities. And at some point, it's going to be our local communities, but today, we're left with dealing with the City of Chicago and they are certainly in a financial crisis. It's not a crisis that was... was created, that manufactured. It's real. And determining how they got there, we're not at a point to even discuss it anymore. Finger pointing is going to go on for a long time. But I live in the west suburbs and a great number of my constituents, myself, we work in the City of Chicago. My constituents also send their children to go to high school, some grammar school, in the City of Chicago. Constituents also send their children to go to college, some to go to graduate school. There's so many things that this great city offers to the State of Illinois. And I'm going to take the politics out of it, sometimes the people on our side of the aisle don't agree with it, but we cannot ignore the fact that the City of Chicago is the economic engine of this state. You talk to anywhere, you travel anywhere in the world, anywhere in the United States, and you tell them that you live in the suburbs or you're from Illinois, people will rave about the City of Chicago, about what it has to offer. But however, the position they're in right now is very fragile. I want to make sure that we do the

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

best we can to ensure that the City of Chicago will be vibrant, that it's a place that we will be able to feel safe and secure about sending our children, encouraging our international friends and also friends from out of the state to come visit, spend your money in the City of Chicago, 'cause everyone in this chamber, we spend time in the City of Chicago. They've got a hospitality industry that's better than any... anywhere else in the United States. It's... it's a jewel. But I don't want to see the City of Chicago fall in line with Detroit. New York, in the 1970s, if anybody was in New York back in the 1970s, maybe the Gentleman who's behind and the Speaker right now was there, but it was ... it was a bad situation. And we rattled off those towns, also Vallejo; Central Falls, Rhode Island; Harrisburg; Detroit; Bernardino; Stockton. Chicago cannot fall into that status. I will say that last week the Bill was presented to us and there were reservations by my colleagues on this side of the aisle about this issue regarding property taxes. And I'm pleased that the recommendations from my colleagues, which were relayed to the Speaker and also to the mayor of Chicago, remove that language 'cause we're... we're a caucus of local control, put that issue of the revenue side firmly within the hands of the city council. And I think that's the responsible thing to do. But I appreciate the fact that the Speaker has made those accommodations on behalf of the House Republicans, and with that, I support this. And I think it's an important Bill for us to pass. I don't like the piecemeal nature of this as well, but the fact is the realities of the time and the place, they are what they are. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen for your attention. Let me reiterate one more time. These are two more local pension systems that are acknowledging they've got a severe financial problem and they've come to the Legislature with a proposed solution, asking us to enact it into law. I would request a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Drury. Please take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Riley is excused for the remainder of the day." Speaker Lang: "Thank you very much. Mr. Tryon."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Tryon: "In the gallery tonight... today, we have the House of Representatives District 66, my district, student advisory council members in our gallery from Crystal Lake South, District 155 and Huntley, District 158 and Jacobs/Dundee-Crown, District 300 in our gallery. Please welcome them with me to Springfield for the day."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Clerk, on page 22 of the Calendar there appears HJRCA52. This has already been read a third time. Is that correct, Sir?"

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Clerk Hollman: "HJRCA52 was read in full a third time, as amended."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan on the Constitutional Amendment." "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Madigan: HJRCA52 proposes an Amendment to the Illinois Constitution that would ensure that no person is denied the right to register to vote or cast a ballot based on race, color, ethnicity, status as a member of a language minority, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or income. The purpose of the Amendment is to ensure that all citizens have an opportunity to register and vote and to prevent the passage of inappropriate voter suppression laws and discriminatory voting procedures. If adopted, neither the General Assembly nor local election officials would be permitted to impose restrictions that would impose discriminatory burdens on an eligible citizen's right to register or vote. Simply put, adoption of this Amendment sends a strong message that in Illinois we believe that every eligible voter should be treated equally and shall have the ability to vote for the candidates of their choice. Mr. Speaker, before we proceed, I would like to provide that the sponsorship on this Amendment would be myself and then Representative Ford, then Representative Durkin, Representative Will Representative Thapedi, if the record could reflect that request."

Speaker Lang: "The record will so reflect, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "I want to thank Mr. Durkin for joining us in the sponsorship of this Amendment. And I think his involvement is very appropriate because the beginning of the story behind

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

this Amendment goes all the way back to 1964. President Kennedy had been assassinated. President Johnson was serving as the President of the United States. Congress was Democrat. President Kennedy had attempted to enact a major change in the Federal Voting Rights Act. He had not been able to move that through the Senate because Southern Democrats were staging a multiweek filibuster preventing the call of the legislation. President Johnson, who had been the very experienced Majority Leader in the Senate, decided that he would give every ounce of his energy to passing the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1964 and he laid out a strategy to, what they call vote for cloture, which is to shut down the filibuster that involved the engagement of the Senate Minority Leader, a Gentleman from Illinois, Senator Everett Dirksen. There's a statue of Senator Dirksen in the lawn outside of the Capitol Building and along 2nd Street. The statue is there, in part, because of the role that he played in enacting the 1964 Voting Rights Act, where, after a long lobbying effort by President Johnson and President Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, Senator Dirksen eventually made available for the cloture motion Republican Members of the United States Senate. He requested certain changes in the legislation, changes were made, 33 Republicans voted for the Motion for cloture, the Senate went on to enact the legislation. It became the law of America. Subsequently, and in recent times, the United States Supreme Court, through judicial action, has somewhat modified the effect of the '64 Voting Rights Act. And that modification by the Supreme Court has apparently brought on efforts in other states to enact

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

legislation that some of us would consider to be voter suppression legislation, such as requiring photo IDs and other strident requirements before people would be permitted to vote. The intent of this Constitutional Amendment is to that, in Illinois, constitutionally, provide suppression laws would not be permitted. Some might say, well, today in Illinois you don't need this. Voter suppression wouldn't happen in Illinois. Well, we don't know that. We don't know what the future holds. But what we do know is that we can constitutionalize the protection of the right to vote regardless of a variety of factors. That's precisely what this Constitutional Amendment would do and I think it's very, very appropriate that Representative Durkin joins me in this effort, given the history of another Illinois Republican, Senator Everett Dirksen of Pekin, Illinois. I would move for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Sandack: "Speaker Madigan, we had a nice discussion in Judiciary about your proposed Amendment to the Uni... to the Illinois Constitution and I just want to go through a couple of the questions for this Body. First of all, is anything you're proposing here today different than what existing Federal Law is as we stand here today?"

Madigan: "The answer is no."

Sandack: "So, this is a reiteration, if you would, a reiteration of current law and some additional classifications to make

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

- sure no one's barred from registering to vote or casting a ballot?"
- Madigan: "The answer to the question is yes, but let me add, as

 I said previously, we're building insurance into the

 Constitution, the Illinois Constitution."
- Sandack: "And... and let's... what is the... the additional insurance or assurances?"
- Madigan: "That the... the language that we're concerned with is part of the Constitution, not just part of a statute which could be changed by action of the Legislature and a Governor.

 As you know, to amend the Constitution requires an extraordinary vote in both chambers and then the vote of the people."
- Sandack: "Yes, Sir. As we are here today, are you aware of any instances in Illinois of anyone being denied the right to register to vote or cast a ballot because of their classification, their gender, their origin, their skin color, anything of that nature or sort?"
- Madigan: "The answer is no, but there have been instances where people were turned away from schools where there was a polling place because they didn't have an ID when they wanted to vote."
- Sandack: "And with respect to an ID, there is no requirement as we are here today for a voter to show an ID in order to cast a ballot. That's not the law of the land in Illinois as we are standing here today?"
- Madigan: "The answer is yes except for early voting, I presume all over the state, but I know when I go to vote early, I have to show an ID."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Sandack: "Interesting, isn't it? But Speaker, you made some comments about voter suppression. I don't think there's a person in here that's in favor of that concept. It's... it shocks the conscience. But if a future General Assembly wished to impose reasonable identification upon voters, your Amendment would not stop that, would it?"

Madigan: "Our purpose here is to prohibit any type of intentional discrimination."

Sandack: "I..."

Madigan: "Or that has a disparate impact."

Sandack: "Fair enough. But nothing about your Amendment stops a future General Assembly from imposing reasonable requirements upon casting a ballot?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Sandack: "To the Bill. Speaker, I stand in favor of this proposition, this Constitutional Amendment. It was in Judiciary. We had a lively discussion about what is best for the future of this state when it comes to being open to registering, to being open to casting a ballot. Those are fundamental rights to which I think every U.S. citizen and every good Illinois citizen ascribes. So, I'm suggesting a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "I just want to ask one more time, could a voter ID law be looked as... at as potentially discriminatory under this Constitutional Amendment? Yes or no."

Madigan: "Yes."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Ives: "Okay. The next thing, I'm reading from our Constitution, the State of Illinois. And right now, it says that if you are 18, that you're a permanent resident of the state for at least 30 days, that you're a citizen... a U.S. citizen, then you have the right to vote, correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Ives: "So, if I am black, a U.S. citizen, 18, and have lived here for 30 days, I still have the right to vote, correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Ives: "If I'm Catholic and I'm 18 and I'm a U.S. citizen and I've
 lived here for 30 days, I still have the right to vote,
 correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Ives: "How about if I speak Spanish as my primary language and I
 meet those other qualifications. I still have the right to
 vote, right?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Ives: "So as far as I can tell, I still have the right to vote even disregarding any of these... the information that you want to put on. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Ives: "The additional qualifications."

Madigan: "Yes."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We... we do a lot of legislation on this floor, but I'm not sure that there is an issue more important or more timely than this one. In the wake of what's happened at the Supreme Court level in terms of the Voting Rights Act and the wake of implementation across a broad swath of states of voter ID laws and other suppression tactics across the states, which have proven to be costly and do nothing but disenfranchise broad swaths of voters, many of them black and brown, this Amendment reaffirms what it is Illinois is about. That is we are an open democracy, that we understand that deliberate voter exclusion harms our democracy and undermines the progress that we've made historically, that many when... many men, many women, many children of all backgrounds and races have fought and died for. This is not a partisan issue; this is about the integrity of our voting process. I want to commend the Speaker for this legislation. I stand in strong support. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, we've always been told that during the course of an election you can only have three Constitutional Amendments on the ballot. Is that true? Measures?"

Madigan: "Mr. Reis, the... the provision would provide that you can only amend three Articles of the Constitution. You could actually have four Amendments if two of them amended the same Article."

Reis: "Okay. So, we have three that are going through the legislative process. We have another one that could go through

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

- the legislative process and we have two that are going through the petition process. Based on the three that are moving... currently moving through the legislative process, could we add any other?"
- Madigan: "I believe the answer is yes. So, I would say again, that in terms of the constitutional language on legislative-initiated Amendments of the Constitution, you can only amend three Articles in one election, three Articles."
- Reis: "Okay. Let me be more specific. Should the folks get the needed signatures for term limits for Legislators, could that be added based on the three that you're carrying?"
- Madigan: "Yeah. Mr. Reis, I would say again what I've said previously, that the Legislature is functioning under this constitutional provision where you can amend three Articles."
- Reis: "So, is that... if they gave... they got the needed signatures and the signatures were proven to be legitimate, could they add that one on as a fourth based on the... this Constitutional Amendment, the surcharge and the... the other third one that you're running? Well, I mean... I'm going to this because it's only fair that maybe they get their Constitutional Amendment on the ballot as well. The... this other one is..."
- Madigan: "Well, it's... it's a different process. It's a different process."
- Reis: "I understand it's a different process, but I just want to make sure they can get their question on the ballot."
- Madigan: "Well, that's... see, that's up to them. I'm concerned with matters that are emanating in the Legislature."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Reis: "As I am, Representative. Another one that's in the process of gaining signatures is redistricting and changing how we redistrict each 10 years."

Madigan: "My answers would be the same."

Reis: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Amendment. It's pretty clear... it's been made very clear to us that only three questions can be on the ballot. And I... I think that, while this is important, Federal Law already prohibits this. We have no, as people have told me for years with my photo ID Bill, Representative, you got a solution looking for a problem. This is a Constitutional Amendment looking for a problem. All we're trying to do is clog up the... the three slots so that the... the people that are trying to get term limits, the people that are trying to change how we redistrict in this state. And on our side of the aisle, we've introduced a Constitutional Amendment to end lame duck Sessions. We won't have a chance for those three. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields."

Ford: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to say you are an all right guy regardless to what other people say. Thank you for this. And I think that my forefathers and the ancestors of most of us here would appreciate this measure. And so, I just say thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Kay: "Just a few questions, Mr. Speaker. I am... I'm in support of this Amendment, but I'm wondering if we're not saying to Legislators or to the general public that there is no way to tackle, in a comprehensive way, voter fraud. And I'm just wondering."

Madigan: "I'm not attempting to say that."

Kay: "Okay. You're basically just saying that we don't want to discriminate against anybody for any reason, but if there is wrongdoing, you would certainly want the wrongdoing handled in an appropriate prosecutorial manner. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "Pursuant to the Illinois statutes."

Kay: "Right. Okay. Very good. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "It says that a people without vision shall perish. And the notion that the vision of many parts of this country is to keep people from the very, most basic fundamental of democracy, the ability to vote, is shocking to me. We should be looking for opportunities to get further voting, to increase voter turnout. In this age of information and technology, why is it that there are parts of this country which are trying to keep people from voting? And so I stand in strong support of this Constitutional Amendment and the message it sends and the visions it sends for the State of Illinois, that we are a democracy and we encourage people to vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I was going to say amen to Representative Bradley, but would the Speaker yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I know that you've referenced the term voter suppression with respect to the use of identification for voters at some potential future time. Are there any Illinois court rulings that would state that it is unconstitutional or illegal to ask for voter identification besides those already used for early voting?"

Madigan: "The answer is no because we have not had a voter ID requirement."

Reboletti: "And that wouldn't preclude a Legislator at some future time, be it tomorrow or today or 15 years from now, from filing such a piece of legislation. And then it's your interpretation that this Constitutional Amendment would ban voter ID for voting purposes outside of early voting."

Madigan: "My opinion is yes."

Reboletti: "But that would be left up to the courts eventually.

Is that fair to say?"

Madigan: "Sure. Sure. Yes."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Again, thank you for the support from Mr. Durkin and from others. And I would request a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Constitutional Amendment will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Jakobsson, Tracy. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Correction of a Committee Report from earlier today. The Elementary & Secondary Education Committee

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

reported back Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3948, not Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Cabello: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a special guest here today. Back behind me I have a coworker from the Rockford Police Department who is also a detective with me and worked with Phil Harris for 17 years and he's got his lovely daughter, Jackie with him. Please welcome them to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Members, we're going back to the list of priority Bills where we left off. The next Bill is House Bill 5925, Representative Feigenholtz. Read the Bill, please, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5925, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the committee... of the floor. This is the second part of the Illinois Health Information Exchange. We passed a piece of it last year. This Bill addresses the AIDS Confidentiality Act, the Blood Bank Act and the Genetic Information Act. It's moving to the Senate for one or two little tweaks. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Brauer, Leitch, Phelps, Williams. Please record yourselves. Mr. Brady. Mr. Phelps. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this record, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5290, Mr. Franks. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5290, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill will amend the Criminal Code by changing the offense of grooming and defining the term child. This has been a... an amended Bill which is now an agreed. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5697, Mr. Pritchard. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5697, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Act amends the disability database Section of the Human Services Act and the Illinois Public Aid Code and deals with providing the dependents of military service members the possibility of continuing that developmental disabilities services even though they may leave the state but as long as they are

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

permanent residents of this state due to their assignment in... in their military service. It is an initiative of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and we have worked out agreements with the Department of Human Services and the Department of Family and Healthcare Services. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chapa LaVia. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5584, Mr. Mautino. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5584, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. House Bill 5584 is an initiative of the beer distributors and it amends the Liquor Control Act which would allow the distributors to give retail licensees promotional materials for nonalcoholic beverages. I know of no opposition and would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chapa LaVia, Harris, Hoffman. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5348, Representative McAsey. Please read the Bill."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5348, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 5348 seeks to ban crib bumper pads here in the State of Illinois. Bumper pads are a hazardous product that are thick, padded fabric that are placed inside the crib and have been linked to Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, to strangulation and suffocation deaths as well as limb entrapment and choking injuries. In 2011, a policy statement from the American Academy of Pediatrics noted that since 1992 an educational effort for placing children to sleep on their back, that there has been a decline in SIDS-related deaths, but concurrently, at the same time, an increase in other sleep-related deaths including specifically linked to crib bumper pads. For these reasons, I would ask for the support of the Body and let's take this important step like the City of Chicago did three years ago and the State of Maryland with a ban that went into effect last June. I ask for your support and I will take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, is there any analysis specifics other than what you testified to about what this... what bumper pads do, supposedly, that are detrimental to children? Obviously babies."

McAsey: "Yes. I can point to numerous things. One of the things that I have right here is the 2011 policy statement from the

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

American Academy of Pediatrics, which I mentioned a moment ago. This 2011 policy statement entitled SIDS and Other Sleep-Related Infant Deaths: Expansion of Recommendations for a Safe Infant Sleeping Environment. Specifically, there is a statement in that policy that says because there is no evidence that bumper pads or similar products that attach to crib slats or sides prevent injury in young infants and because there is the potential for suffocation, entrapment and strangulation, these products are not recommended. The American Academy of Pediatrics made that recommendation, as I said, given many, many sleep-related deaths and injuries. In fact, even today is the anniversary of the death of a young child, 8-week-old child, Preston, who passed away in 2010 on this day. His... his picture is on information that was distributed to many people here in this chamber."

- Sandack: "Representative, I was looking for, other than what you put in your opening statement with respect to this Bill, I'm looking for analysis, actual numbers of supposed deaths, injuries, with respect to this product."
- McAsey: "So, there has been other data gathered by the Consumer Product Safety Commission that concluded that from 1985 to 2005, they are citing 27 accidental deaths, another 25 nonfatal injuries. I have other data stating that there were 48 deaths that were reviewed in that same study by the Consumer Product Safety Commission that the medical examiners and the reviewers who had access to all of the data concluded that the bumpers were at fault in these infant deaths."
- Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor just identified the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission. That very

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

commission has found there is no evidence of a direct causal connection between traditional crib bumpers and suffocation when the product is used as intended. The IMA has attempted to work with the Sponsor to try and find a reasonable way to come to a conclusion on a Bill that would be reasonable. This Bill, as it exists, is unreasonable. It... there is no scientific data, there is absolutely no meaningful analysis which should be accepted by this Body at this time to ban bumper... baby bumper in cribs. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pihos: "Yes. Representative, I stand in strong support of your Bill. I think medical science and practical knowledge has come a long way. I think Representative Sandack said it well, as intended. Unfortunately, as intended is not always what happens in the installation of these particular items. And if you go to any pediatrician nowadays, so many new products have been manufactured as a result of what we found out. You don't use blankets in a bed. You don't put stuffed animals in a bed. You put children in zipable blankets so it doesn't cover their head. Car seats are safe if they're installed as intended. Fortunately with car seats, checkpoints with our police and other places where we can find out if they're installed as intended. With crib bumper pads, we don't. And so many parents, all pediatricians, practically advise parents not to use bumper pads, blankets, not to put anything in the crib but the baby and I think that that is advice well-heeded. When bumper pads were first

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

manufactured and conceived, we had a different issue with the width of the bars on a crib. That has since changed to protect children and I think we need to provide these further protections. For parents who have lost a child, generally it is if I only had known. And they lose these children because they were naïve in their knowledge on any particular subject matter. So, I think it's really important to think about this carefully. We have breathable bumper pads for the purpose of protecting... protecting arms and legs from coming out of a crib. And I think the Sponsor has worked very hard on this Bill over a number of years. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there are still six speakers on this Bill. I don't want to put the timer on, but I would ask you to be as brief as you can. Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Are we actually moving now to ban blankets in the bed?"

McAsey: "Representative, this Bill is to ban crib bumper pads, specifically defined in the legislation. The... the particular padded bumpers that have been linked to children's death, the same item which is banned from use in child care in the State of Illinois, the product that pediatricians have said is not safe for use in the crib and parents are counseled not to use these products. That is what the legislation seeks to ban."

Ives: "Are we going to ban stuffed animals in the bed?"

McAsey: "This legislation is banning the crib bumper pad. You make a good point that there are many other things that are linked to children's death..."

Ives: "Are..."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

McAsey: "...and injury, but this is one particular thing. And... and safe sleep..."

Ives: "Are we... are we going to fine parents that don't follow doctors' recommendations? I... 'Cause, you know what, I don't know how my five kids survived. We had bumper pads, we ride bikes without helmets and we have a trampoline in the backyard. I mean, at some point it becomes the parents' responsibility to follow doctors' advice and to decide for themselves what they're going to do with their children. I urge a 'no' vote because this absolutely does nothing about bringing jobs back to Illinois, about taking care of our unfunded liabilities, about paying down our back bills. We're working on something that parents can decide on their own not to do. And let's get back to the business of the State of Illinois, which is actually solving our fiscal disaster. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McAuliffe: "Representative, if this Bill would pass and would be signed in law by the Governor, could someone still be able to buy bumper pads over the Internet?"

McAsey: "Yes. That... that would be... so, the legislation specifically bans the sale in the State of Illinois, so by an Illinois retailer."

McAuliffe: "Okay. To the Bill."

McAsey: "Which..."

McAuliffe: "As time changes, so do people. Grandparents, mother-in-laws, grandmothers, their tradition was to pass on bumper

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

pads to their daughters or daughter-in-laws. I think that this is a step in the right direction to let people know that bumper pads can suffocate a child. I heard a story once about a long hair that wrapped around a... a child's toe and it was turning blue. Whether that child would have lost his toe or what would have happened to him, I don't know. I think that less things inside the bed are better, and as a new age dad, and seeing how the transformation of things that happened in the '60s, '70s, and '80s are different than today that we should heed and listen to the doctors and pediatricians. So, I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones in the chamber? Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "I have a four and a half year old and an almost two year old, he'll be two in two weeks, and they survived just fine with a bumper. My wife is a labor and delivery nurse and I don't think she would've allowed us to have that in our house if it... if she thought there was a... a concern. My question is, is there currently a disclaimer on... on these bumper pads that says possible choke hazard, possible SIDS hazard, anything like that?"

McAsey: "So, presently... a couple years ago, actually, this chamber passed legislation for educational efforts, to make sure that new parents, when they're leaving the hospital with their newborn, are educated about safe sleep, about how dangerous bumpers and their use are. Now, there's a problem because, as much as new parents are being educated, people are... are being...

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

are shown the different risks with using the bumpers. Even if there are disclaimers on the product, parents are going into the marketplace and their pediatricians are telling them don't use this, yet it's still available for sale. That's the exact reason why this ban is so important, is to... to make sure that this dangerous product that does not have any real purpose is not there to cause these injuries and fatalities."

Davidsmeyer: "You know, I... I think that this is a parent's choice to make. I think that a disclaimer would be better off on there, whether it's, you know, as big as the case or however you want to make it to make sure that it's legible, that people see it. I don't think that banning it's the right way to go. And I think that this just is... is an effort to lock in the fact that we are in fact a nanny state. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, there were some discussions about some bumper pads that might be okay and through the IMA they talked about a group called ASTM, which stands for American Society of... for Testing and Materials."

McAsey: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "Do you recall those discussions?"

McAsey: "Yes, I'm aware of ASTM."

Sullivan: "So, this is a group that tests these materials and say what are good and bad. And they believe that there are some bumpers included in your legislation that still would fall into the safe category."

McAsey: "So..."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Sullivan: "Why do you exclude those from this legislation?"

McAsey: "So, this legislation, again, it bans the thick, padded bumpers, the ones that have been linked by the American Academy of Pediatrics, other groups, Kids In Danger, SIDS, to... to child death. The ASTM, I am familiar with the ASTM and ASTM standards; that is actually an industry... a manufacturing industry created group. So, the people who are making the product are getting together and are making a decision about whether or not the product is safe. I have a letter from the American Academy of Pediatrics. The ASTM actually had reached out about two years... three years ago now to the American Academy of Pediatrics when they were creating the most recent ASTM standard. And the letter reads in relevant part; however, the AAP cannot cast a vote in favor of measures to improve the safety of a product that we deem inherently risky and unnecessary. And they cite the 2011 policy statement that I mentioned to you. So, the ... again, the ASTM is an industry group saying that their product is safe, which is in direct contradiction to what we know from medicine and from the experiences of families like the family of Preston who passed away four years ago today."

Sullivan: "Well, thank you for that explanation. To the Bill.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we have certain amount of bumpers that are still deemed as safe. We also have bumpers that are deemed as safe if they're used properly. We cannot legislate people using products properly. And this is so, instead of trying to figure that out, we're just banning everything with a hatchet as opposed to trying to work things through in a commonsense way. I certainly would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you. To the Bill. Many of my colleagues have talked about how on earth did our children and how did we survive. We weren't as educated as we are now. I didn't ever... I never wore a bike helmet. I didn't fall down and die, but I certainly made sure my children wear a bike helmet, and as I have grandchildren, I will make sure that they wear a bike helmet. My children didn't... were born just at the time when the seat belt laws came into effect. Growing up, I never wore a seat belt when I was in the back seat of a car. My children did all the time. We've learned through experience. This is one of these Bills. This is something we've learned through experience. Why would we ever want to have a family suffer through a SIDS death or a death due to a bumper pads if we have it in our power to stop that from happening. I encourage this entire Body to vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack. Did you not speak in debate, Sir?" Sandack: "I did but my name was used during that debate."

Speaker Lang: "Yeah, it should not have been, but go ahead, Sir."

Sandack: "It should not have been, indeed. To the Bill. There's been commentary about the unintended consequences of the use of this product when it's used in an unintended manner. Surprise. Products can be misused in almost every endeavor. We don't go banning products because of what they might do if they're misused. That leads to a series of poor consequences. A previous speaker's talked about we're not going to ban putting blankets in baby cribs. We're not going to ban doing certain things that many of us think are just bad parenting. That's nanny state on steroids. This Bill is well intended,

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

but it is mis... it's a mistake. A previous speaker talked about how this product is still available over the Internet. Well, that's a problem, isn't it? Because all we're doing now is shutting down Illinois business so we can let other manufacturers and retailers bring product into our state. This is a bad Bill. It's well intended. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey to close."

"Thank you. In response to statements, many people have made statements today that if used properly this product, the bumper pad, has no risk. That statement is a statement that the industry... that the manufacturers are making. I would, again, remind... or reiterate what the American Academy of Pediatrics has said. They have said nothing, no bumper pads in the crib whatsoever, whether installed properly or not properly. Again, because there is no evidence that bumper pads or similar products that attach to crib... crib slats or sides to prevent injury in young infants and because of the potential for suffocation, entrapment and strangulation, these products are not recommended. We, in Illinois, have the opportunity to take the next step, to ban the sale of a product that we know is so risky we don't allow for its use in child care. We have taken steps for educational efforts. And also, in response to many people saying how did we all survive, we have learned over the years, even the American Academy of Pediatrics has said that from 1992, the changes in sleep... safe sleep recommendations until now that the incidents of these sorts of child deaths has increased. I would ask for the support of the Body to ban the sale of crib bumper pads. Let's take the next step. Let's join the City of

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Chicago where this has been going on for three years as well as the State of Maryland. Thank you for the... the debate and for the comments."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Cross, DeLuca, Pritchard, Reboletti, Thapedi. Please yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1322, Mr. Hoffman. I understand Mr. Hoffman wishes to move the Bill to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, please place the Bill on the Order of Second Reading and hold it there for an Amendment. An introduction, Members. We have a former Member of the House up on the Republican side of the aisle in his famous red jacket, Randy Ramey. Representative Hatcher."

Hatcher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege. As we all..."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Hatcher: "...know, there are many communities that are in town today specifically speaking with Legislature about their local community needs. I'm happy to announce a couple of city managers and council member from my hometown of Yorkville."

Speaker Lang: "Hello. Welcome. House Bill 4205, Representative Moeller. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4205, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 4205 removes the word 'responsive' from the requirement for notice on contract awards for the Capitol Development Board. Currently, right now, the... any bidder on a project... only responsive unsuccessful bidders are listed on their website. They're asking that the word 'responsive' be removed and all unsuccessful bidders be listed on their website. This will conceivably increase the amount of information available and also reduce staff time in coming through responsive versus whether those were unrespons... unresponsive, unsuccessful bidders. Be happy to take questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "What... what is the definition of 'responsive' under this law?"

Moeller: "That a bidder meets certain criteria in order to bid on state contracts for construction."

Davidsmeyer: "And what are those... what are those requirements?"

Moeller: "I... I don't have the specific requirements in front of me."

Davidsmeyer: "Can... can you find out what those requirements are?"

Moeller: "Sure."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Moeller: "Yes. This doesn't change the process for bidding or... or contracting. This is just a change to providing information on their website on the... the bidders who bid on their projects, the unsuccessful bidders on their contracts. This

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

would increase the... the number of bidders that are listed on their website because, in addition to responsive, they would also be listing those that were considered not responsive."

Davidsmeyer: "And so, is that... is listing the nonresponsive bidders, is that like a... a slap on the wrist or is that a penalty? I don't understand the reason for listing nonresponsive bidders."

Moeller: "I think it's to save staff time so that they don't have to go through and determine who's... they're listing all of the bidders and not having to comb through and only list those that are responsive."

Davidsmeyer: "Can I ask that you take this out of the record and until you can answer my questions?"

Moeller: "Can you re... in terms of the definition of what a responsive bidder is?"

Davidsmeyer: "Responsive bidder, yeah. And what the... I don't understand the reasoning for listing these. You're saying on their website?"

Moeller: "Okay. Yeah. We can... we can get back to you. We've got..."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Thank you. I really appreciate it."

Moeller: "...information coming."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Bill will be taken from the record. House Bill 5819, Representative Senger. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5819, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5819 creates the Collar County Economic Development Task Force. It's composed

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

of 18 members. Each county chairman will appoint two members from... two from DuPage, Grundy, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, and Will and Kankakee. The Governor will appoint two members, one from DCEO and one from the general public. The members will serve without any form of compensation and will report issues such as transportation, skills, unemployment, state regulation, text policy. The report will be completed by January 1 and the task force will then be ended on... on January 1, 2016. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, can you tell me why DCEO is an opponent?"

Senger: "DCEO has a report due on January 1, which is House... a response to House Bill 1544. They asked if this report could come out first. My response is basically it doesn't hurt to put this in place because that could help augment and... and finalize the report, which is not done yet."

Franks: "What report are they... I'm not sure I'm following you. What report are they putting out?"

Senger: "It's... it's basically Senator Manar put a... passed a Bill, House Bill 1544 in the 98th General Assembly. What that report is doing, it's doing a couple things. It's creating a transparency report for credits and incentives that we put together. It's also doing a business council that is to work with DCEO and devi... and advise on a five-year strategic plan to basically put incentives and... and processes together to bring business in the State of Illinois."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

- Franks: "Well, our... our analysis indicates that there's no proponents other than yourself and the counties that would be affected, Lake, DuPage and Kane, among some. And the Illinois Municipal League have no position. How did this... why are we trying to pass a law that would require these counties to be involved if they don't even care?"
- Senger: "Actually, there is one, Will County Economic Development...

 Economic Development Commission did slip a... as a proponent.

 And I did talk to the other economic development councils and they... they are in support."
- Franks: "But... so, only Will County wants it. But I know Lake County, DuPage, Kane; there's nothing from McHenry County. I just... I'm not sure what we're trying... why we'd create a new task force..."
- Senger: "Yeah. Only Will County was able to slip in time. They came into this committee at the end. This is actually a process I've been working on for several months. I've had meetings with DuPage County, talk... conversations with Will County. Kankakee, I just got off the phone with again. And McHenry and... and Kane."
- Franks: "I... I haven't heard from anybody from McHenry in support of this. I'm just wondering why we need to pass a law. I mean, we've already got some economic development commissions and right now, we're doing a joint hearings with the State Government Administrative Committee along with Revenue. And we're looking at business climate; we're looking at ways to help create jobs. And we're doing that now and working on our tax incentives and our tax bases. I'm wondering why we have

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

so many different commissions and why we just don't focus on one."

Senger: "And... and you know, basically this is... the genesis of this and the conversation originated from the work we were doing last year. And DCEO did a good job here with the merger of OfficeMax and Office Depot and how we weren't able in the... to succeed in competing for that new business. So, it doesn't, you know, we're... we're one large sate... state. We have Chicago, we have the collar counties, we have downstate. Each component is somewhat differently. So, it doesn't... doesn't hurt to basically network, have a group that will basically say here's the issues in the collar county, let's see how we contrast and how we complement each other in the State of Illinois."

Franks: "I... I appreciate your comments; I just think it's redundant. I just think enough of the task forces. And we've done so many of these that it seems we see so many Bills on these things. I... I haven't seen benefits on many of them. You were in committee yesterday trying to expand another commission and I know this is a new one, but I don't even know when these things meet. And I know you didn't know whether they even met, you didn't know when the last time they had met, you didn't know whether they had ever met. We don't even know what they do. And I just, it seems to be window dressing. I don't think we're getting to the issue when we're creating more task forces on this type of thing, honestly. And perhaps you see it differently, but I think it's a redundancy. I think it's a waste of effort and I would prefer that we work together through the committee structure that we have right now, that we're working on right now. We've

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

got committees tomorrow morning at 8:00 on these very issues. I don't want to wait 'til 2016 to get some more opinions. We can't wait that long. I'd like us to work together starting now. Come tomorrow morning at 8:00 to the Revenue Committee and State Government Administrative Committee, 'cause that's where the work's going to get done. This is window dressing. Our work is here, now. So, I'm going to... I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of my colleague from DuPage's initiative, here. I think economic development is something we should be focused on in this chamber. The collar counties have been tied together economically for years, especially when you're a border county and you watch letters come into your businesses from Governors in other states asking them to locate in their state because their taxing structure and their labor laws are more favorable. It's not China and Mexico we're competing with, it's Indiana, it's Wisconsin, it's Iowa, it's Kentucky, it's Missouri and to have the opportunity for collar counties to get together and talk about economic development is a good thing. When I look at the latest census data for McHenry County, McHenry County happened to be the only collar county in the last two years that lost population. It lost 1400 people in the last two years. The first time in the 30 years that I've lived there that our county has lost population. So, to be opposed to getting the economic development groups together in the form of a task force to make recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly about how we can be

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

more competitive, about how we can get more jobs, would be ludicrous to vote 'no' against this. I... I respect the work that the Revenue Committee and the State Government Committee do, but have you ever had a Bill in the Revenue Committee? It goes to subcommittee. The only guy I know that's gotten a Bill out of the Revenue Committee is the Speaker. His doesn't go to subcommittee. I've been working on a job creation Bill in that committee for years and I can't ever get it out. So, having this conversation for economic development in the collar counties that is, in my opinion, something that should have been done a long time ago. And I thank the Sponsor for bringing it forward. We have a lot of issues to talk about that we share together and certainly being competitive with our neighboring states is one of them. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the House Bill. As I'm looking at House Joint Resolution 69, sponsored by a previous speaker that creates a joint task force on Turkish and Illinois relations, I believe I supported that measure and I'm not a, trust me, I'm no fan of... of task forces because I've been appointed to serve on about 50 of them in my tenure here. But if it's going to create jobs and it's a good idea for all the collar counties, of which I'm a resident, then why not? But maybe at some point we should have a ban on task forces but not until Representative Sandack passes his. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger to close."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... again, the intent of this Bill is not window dressing, it's working with the Economic

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Development Task Force throughout the collar counties. There is a lot of significant resource in the collar county and it... this Bill is talking about jobs and job retention and new jobs for the State of Illinois. So, I ask for a 'yes' vote." Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kay, Moeller, Thapedi. Mr. Kay. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes' and 3 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. DeLuca."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

DeLuca: "Ladies and Gentlemen, in the gallery I have Maureen Kelly, along with 100 students from Governor State University in University Park in my district. And I'm going to introduce them one at a time. No. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Hello. Enjoy yourselves in the gallery. Returning to House Bill 4205, Representative Moeller. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4205, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker. Thank you for allowing this to come back. I think I've satisfied the questions that were raised regarding this Bill from the previous Representative. If there are any other questions, I'd be happy to take them."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "I just want to thank you for taking it out of the record so we could talk about it. Basically, all this is doing is saying that once they found the winning bidder, they don't have to go through the responsiveness of the following bidders. So, I appreciate you bringing this. And... and I rise in support. 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? Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5593, Mr. Cross. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5593, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that I've been working on with Senator Bertino and Natalie Manley, Representative Manley, involving an issue in the City of... or the Village of Plainfield. And this involves a park district that has become taken over by three of the five members that have not done a very good job, I would say, in running the park district over the last year. They are according to newspaper reports being investigated by the State Police, the State's Attorneys Office. They've been found to be in violation of the Labor Relations Act by hiring... or by firing people that wanted to form a union. And they were found guilty of that by the Labor... Labor Relations Act. They have started

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

to question the credit worthiness of the park district. They're spending a good bit of their money and they are under, as I said, intense investigation. The goal here is to change the makeup of this park district board from five to seven. For a period of time there would be a... an... not for a period of time... there would be an initial appointment by the Senator and myself to create the board of having seven members versus five. Then in 2015 there would be an election and one would be... be an election continuing subsequent to then or past then. And this is specifically designed just for the Plainfield Park District. I know there's some questions about whether or not we should be involved with a unit of local government, but this is a unit of local government, quite frankly, that has been run erratically and poorly and deceptively by a number of folks from Plainfield, three of them, who are Republicans and are not working in the best interests of the Plainfield Park District, its residents, the adult residents, the kid residents. And they're destroying a park district. It may seem a rather intense approach to solving a problem, but it's one I don't think can wait. As I said, I... they are in the process of destroying an otherwise excellent park district. I'll be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I understand this is just for one organization, the... the Plainfield Park District?"

Cross: "Yep."

Franks: "Are they an appointed or an elected body?"

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Cross: "Elected."

Franks: "Okay. How can an elected body, then, be changed to have additional members appointed by Members of the General Assembly? Is their... isn't there a constitutional issue there?"

Cross: "You know, Representative, I'm not aware of one. There may be one, but I... we did a lot of research on how to address the issue of these three renegade board members. One of the approaches was do you put in some recall language? Do you... do you...?"

Franks: "Yeah. Can I stop you there, Tom? 'Cause..."

Cross: "Yeah."

Franks: "...I... when I first was reading this, I wrote down recall. And we don't have that ability. We did ... we passed it a few years ago for the Governor. But this seems like it'd be a perfect case. I mean, let's assume all the allegations are correct and there's been a... a no confidence vote. Unfortunately in this state, we don't have a mechanism between elections to be able to remove someone from office who's derelict of duty or ... or malfeasance or misfeasance, whatever it may be. I think it would make more sense to maybe have a recall provision in some cases. I just... I'm scared of setting the precedent because of how... how bad the situation is here to allow the General Assembly to insert themselves and parachute in to a duly elected body. 'Cause we always talk about local control but we have to really mean that, you know, and at least a recall provision, you'd have that local control."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Cross: "My... and maybe on a broader scale, Representative, the idea of recall makes some sense. We can have a debate about that, I suspect at another time. My fear was if we did recall that almost all units of local government would have objected to it, and right or wrongly. And again, that's a discussion and a debate from a policy standpoint that maybe's worth having at another time. But this is a situation that, as each day goes by, it gets more dire as ... as I guess would be the best way to say it. And I was looking for the quickest way and I think, the cleanest way to change the makeup of this board. I'm not opposed to having a discussion on... on another approach, but I knew if I put in a recall language, this association would come in, this association would come in. I worked with the Park District Association on this language. The way we really, originally did it, we were going to have some appointments made by mayors. They were concerned about that. So, this was their idea. I've tried to work with anyone that opposed it and the only group that originally, initially opposed it was the Park District Association. And to their credit, they worked with me to make this, I think, a better Bill."

Franks: "I know... I know that we do have some limited recall provisions. I know that in the Village of Buffalo Grove a few years ago there was a trustee who was actually recalled. So, I'm wondering if that provision could be extended here, because my concern is I just don't want to pass a law that then, if people are unhappy with their locals for whatever reason, we'll have set this precedent that the General Assembly will come in and stack the boards."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Cross: "Yeah."

Franks: "It's sort of like Roosevelt trying to make the Supreme Court larger so he could put his own folks on. So, I understand the situation is dire, but I also understand the long-term consequences, but if we pass a Bill like this, I think we're setting a terrible precedent. And I'd prefer instead to look to see how we could extend the recall provisions to the park district much like what some of the municipalities have used. So, I'd like you to consider that approach."

"I... I'm always... I will always be open, as long as I'm a Member of this Body, but you know, some would argue that if you're, you know... look, here is my challenge on this, Jack, and to be honest with you, I think that we have difference of opinions with... with school boards or village boards. People are unhappy if a slate of candidates gets elected on the school board 'cause they want to spend less money or they want to spend more money or they want charter schools or they don't want charter schools. This isn't a policy fight that's going on in the Village of Plainfield. These are three folks that are doing anything but what's in the best interest of the... the park district and the residents of that park district. And one of the reasons that I... I felt compelled to actually do some legislation instead of waiting is these are park district terms; these park district terms are six-year terms."

Franks: "Well, that's why we need a recall, because you know what, sometimes we deserve the... the people who we get. I mean, they're elected. And... and I know you're talking about they're

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

not doing anything, but has the state's attorney instituted any... any proceedings against these folks? Has anybody been charged with any crime?"

Cross: "The... according to the newspaper reports, I'm just repeating what I've read in the paper, the State's Attorneys Office is investigating, the State Police investigators are involved. Again, just what I've read in the paper. So, I don't want to make any allegations, but..."

Franks: "Because what... what we've seen here, and you and I work closely together, is when we had a roque leader, that we impeached him and we threw him out. And that policy worked and that worked, but... and that's a very rare occurrence as is the recall Bill that we passed as well. It's a very rare occurrence. But when someone's duly elected, I think there has to be safeguards, because then what's to say that the Governor might not like your Bills, Mr. Cross, and decide to maybe add an additional Rep from Oswego to parachute in because he's not happy with what you're doing? So, I just don't think that's how we should go and I'd like to hear more of the debate, but I'd encourage you to ... to go a different direction because of the unintended consequences of the Bill. And perhaps there may be even be an impeachment provision by the park district and they may have a malfeasance provision in this place as well. And maybe we should talk to their lawyers and perhaps do something more from that side than the legislative side."

Cross: "Look, I... if you've got the ability to get a recall provision passed in this chamber and in the Senate and signed by the Governor before this Legislative Session ends, I'm

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

open to listening to it and that it applies. I just... I don't feel like, look, park districts are creatures of the General Assembly. We create them. Most, as we do, most units, if not all units of local government, we can treat them however we want to. I... I get the precedent issue and people have brought that up to me, but I just don't think you can sit by in... in a pretty... pretty grave situation where we're trying to approach this in a bipartisan manner to address this situ... a grave situation. I just don't think in the short time we have that a recall approach would work."

Franks: "I appreciate it and I think... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker and to the Members. I really appreciate what this Sponsor's trying to do and I... if I'm in his position, I'd probably try to do something similar. I'm concerned, though, for the longterm ramifications to the state and that's why I reluctantly I... I'm going to oppose this. I think a better way to do it is to have a policy that would allow for recall or... or allow an impeachment type of proceedings at a local level if people are considered to be malfe... committing malfeasance or misfeasance. However, I don't think it's the proper approach to have the General Assembly insert themselves in an area where people are duly elected. I think it's a terrible precedent and I think that bad fact patterns will create bad laws. So, don't be swayed by this specific fact pattern the unintended consequences, I think, unimaginable. So for that reason, I'd encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

- Martwick: "Representative Cross, will these appointed members, will they have, until their term sunsets, will they have the ability then to participate in... in levy discussions in terms of levying taxes?"
- Cross: "They would be members of the park board until the next election and they may run or they may not. There'd be an election in 2015. So, they would be full-fledged members until then."
- Martwick: "So, full-fledged members with levying authority, obviously, as members of the… voting members of the board. Same thing with spending authority, bonding authority, the… the full… the full rights of a… of an elected board member?" Cross: "Correct."

"I'll be brief. I think that Representative Franks Martwick: pretty much summed up my position, which is interesting 'cause we've differed on these issues at times. But while I have great respect for the Sponsor and the cosponsor in this and I have the greatest sympathy for what is going on, I do think that this measure sets a bra... bad precedent. I think we should look at shorter terms. It think maybe, perhaps, six-year terms for park board members is bad, but it... it would seem as though this is not the only option. As much as we would want to correct this situation, for us to do so up here in Springfield is probably not appropriate. The state's attorney is investigating, the State Police are investigating. If they find criminal activity, I would hope that they would pursue that. But short of that, if there is no criminal activity, then this really is a... a policy dispute and... and the voters of this district elected this board, right or wrong. The price

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

of democracy is that you have to live with your decisions. I think this is a bad precedent. I agree with the previous speaker and I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Manley."

Manley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Manley: "Representative Cross, do you and I do a lot of legislation together?"

Cross: "I can't recall either one of us doing a piece of legislation together ever."

Manley: "Well, and I think this speaks to the severity of the situation. In the last 10, 15 years, has Plainfield... the population of Plainfield expanded? I mean, the numbers are, in the last 10 years, would you say that the population has grown?"

Cross: "Immensely, from one high school to four."

Manley: "Okay. So, I guess aside of the terrible things that are going on, and I wanted to let everybody know that my constituents, we share constituencies that... that are part of the Plainfield Park Board. And my phone has been ringing off the hook about this. It's... when I was trying to explain the situation to many of the Members, it's almost like a fictional story. I mean, it's just, the details are almost... they boggle the mind. And in addition to population expanding, I think having a larger board might be in order to give better representation to the numbers. But also, Representative Cross, would you... do you typically get involved in situations like this?"

Cross: "No."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Manley: "So, it's not common practice for you to get involved with other elected bodies?"

Cross: "Absolutely not."

Manley: "So, that also speaks to how extreme the situation has gotten. For the last year and a half we've asked them to deal with it, to find solutions to the problem, but they... they're out of answers. Would you agree?"

Cross: "They are... they are at their wits' end."

Manley: "Okay. To the Bill. I know we don't like to do this. My constituents have begged me to help them. They don't know what else to do. They have come to us to help restore order and dignity back to this park board that has functioned beautifully over all these years. Please support us in trying to help this one situation. I know, as Representative Franks said... I know, I used his name in debate. I know, I know. I'm sorry. As he said, you don't want to set a precedent. I think once in a while, we have to get involved. Once in a while, we have to help. That's what we're here for. I encourage a 'yes' vote on this in support of the people in Plainfield. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Sir, has the park district board responded to this legislation at all?"

Cross: "Two of the five have."

Willis: "And what was the response to this?"

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Cross: "Two of the five were ecstatic... are ecstatic and are supportive of the legislation. The three others haven't gotten ahold of me."

Willis: "Okay. So, the... I'm going to assume that the three that did not respond are basically the problem of the board, correct?"

Cross: "Correct."

Willis: "Okay. To the Bill. I know that six years is a long time for someone to be in office on a park district board, certainly, if they're not doing their job appropriately. So while we do depend on the local community to elect them in, a lot of damage can be done in that amount of time. We're looking at a board that has members that could be on there for an additional four to five years before their term's up. We cannot allow this to continue on. If we have it in our power to assist this board and we have a basically a cry for help from some members of the board, I think we should do our best to help them. I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cross to close."

Cross: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a minute, and I...

I think Natalie made a good point for the... the fact that the two of us, along with our Senator, Jennifer, to be working together. While it's not unusual, it's not something the three of us have done together. But we are working on it because it is a situation that I have not seen before. And at the end of the day, at the end of the day, precedent or un... not a precedent, this General Assembly, with the House and the Senate, can make a decision whether or not they want to do something. Whether I do a Bill and this becomes law, you will

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

have an opportunity to vote other ideas up or down if you have municipalities or townships or counties that are acting out of line. This is a situation involving a park district, a park district that is to provide services to a community, a community that has grown, as Natalie said, quickly, rapidly, and has done a good job with that growth. But they provide services to adults and kids. This is a park district that's actions have re... have ranged from sophomoric to perhaps borderline criminal. To changing meeting dates so one of the members can't show up, to not letting people speak before park district meetings, to calling the police to have people removed, to questionable activity about bidding contracts, to utilizing the ... the services or the companies of some of these board members and using them to sell their products. The list goes on and on and on. We cannot sit here, in my opinion, and let that go on. And that's why I'm moving forward or trying to move forward with this legislation. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Currie, Franks. Please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Ford: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, so often we hear about negative things from the west side of Chicago, but today we are privileged to have a school from the west side of Chicago where Representative Lilly and I serve and that is the Catalyst School Circle Rock. And I want everyone to recognize the school right over here on the left, on the Democratic side. They came all the way from the west side to lobby. And one thing I have to tell you, young people, you are the best lobbyists in the whole wide world. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for coming to Springfield today. Thank you very much. Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Members. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed please, Sir."

Crespo: "Let me take a moment to acknowledge and please welcome with a warm embrace my good friend, the Mayor of Hanover Park, Rodney Craig and our Village Clerk in Hanover Park, Eira Corral. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. House Bill 5657, Mr. Tryon. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5657, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5657 is a Bill that will provide some consistent regulations throughout the state as it relates to farmers' markets. Across this state in almost every county throughout the state we see a renewed interest in specialty crops and locally grown food and farmers' markets emerging as some of our small towns lose grocery stores on Main Street.

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

And what we find from our vendors is that it's hard to move from county to county and jurisdiction to jurisdiction because of the difference in health Codes. So, this will set up a universal health Code as it relates to food sampling and identify the sources of the food and some food labeling requirements and... and create a deadline for the task force to make a recommendation on a statewide Code for farmers' markets that will be taken up by JCAR. So, this is a Bill that started with a lot of opposition. We had opposition from the Illinois Public Health Association, several of the counties and we had concerns from Farm Bureau. But we were able to work all that out and there... there is no opposition and it is agreed to. I would be glad to answer any questions. Otherwise, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Brady, Crespo, Jackson, Mautino. Crespo, Mautino. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3744, Representative Wheeler. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3744, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3744 provides that when a person is charged with a felony domestic battery or certain other violent offenses he or she

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

may be placed under GPS monitoring. The court shall document in the record the reasons for making those determinations. The cost of the electronic monitoring shall be paid for by... on behalf of the defendant. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Beiser, Rita. Please take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5852, Representative Bellock. Please read the Bill. No running, Representative."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5852, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And this is House Bill 5852 and what this Bill does is to promote the independence of the new wave of seniors who want to remain in their homes and people with disabilities. So, this doesn't create any new services, but what it does is it puts all of their rights and services for home health care and community services within one bill of rights for community seniors and people that are disabled. I don't know of any opposition. We worked with the Department of Aging on this and I think it's a good way so that seniors can go on a website and see what their rights are in home health care. We have addressed abuse and neglect before, but this ensures them of their rights. I appreciate your support."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Crespo, Currie. Leader Currie. Please take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5438, Representative Sandack. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5438, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the Governmental Account Audit Act, the County Code and the Illinois Municipal Code, providing that the amount of fees owed by a governmental unit for delinquent audits or reports may be reduced, yes, I said reduced, at the Comptroller's discretion. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "So, I noticed this Session, maybe after March 8 or something, that you've been giving a lot of voice on a lot of issues. Are you like the new Assistant Majority Leader Spokesperson for that side of the aisle?"

Sandack: "I'm the new Dennis Reboletti."

Dunkin: "The new Dennis... Oh, my gracious. Well, where are your glasses? Where... where's your stomach? Where's your hair? Where's your hair? And why is your voice like this, I'm a former prosecutor. And so, I don't think Dennis Reboletti, who is my friend, would appreciate you being the new Dennis

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Reboletti. 'Cause listen, you, my friend, are no Dennis Reboletti. So, can you tell me about this audit here? What's up with the audit report? You want the… the Comptroller to do what now?"

Sandack: "This Bill gives the Comptroller the ability to reduce fines and penalties for any unit of government that doesn't promptly give an audit to the Comptroller."

Dunkin: "Aha. So, what happens if... if the audit takes maybe six months to a year? What should be the recourse?"

Sandack: "The Comptroller has the discretion to give an extension or not impose fees. Of course, if it's not a valid excuse, they... the Comptroller can impose fees, which are already prescribed by statute."

Dunkin: "The Comptroller can't do that already now? We have to mandate it?"

Sandack: "No. She's... we're giving her the... the ability, or any Comptroller, to reduce expense and fees if there's a valid excuse for not giving an audit in a timely manner."

Dunkin: "I would think that our government, given that we're...
we're striving for efficiency, could do that right now,
Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Is that a question?"

Dunkin: "Can she do that now?"

Sandack: "She cannot."

Dunkin: "All right. Then it's done. So, what do you think we should do with this legislation?"

Sandack: "I think you should keep asking really good questions."

Dunkin: "Aha. See? I knew there was something about you that I liked. Does the Senate miss you, Representative Sandack?"

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Sandack: "Undoubtedly."

Dunkin: "Well, you know we love you over here. And we're going to find a way to work with you because although you're no Dennis Reboletti, you're the new Ron Sandack that everyone in this chamber's going to try to emulate at some point in time, correct?"

Sandack: "That's a frightening thought, but I appreciate it."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Meier. Mr. Meier. Please take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Want to thank Mr. Reboletti for his restraint. House Bill 55... 5331, Representative Zalewski. Please read the Bill. 5331, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5331, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5331 is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation. It makes three changes to the Residential Mortgage License Act and eight technical changes to the Residential Property Disclosure Act. Effectively, for the Members knowledge, this basically brings us in line... brings our statute more in line with the Federal Laws with... with respect to mortgage lending and real... real estate. The Amendment cha... restored some information that some of us felt

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

would be better, more beneficial than being kept in the law. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Davis, Feigenholtz, Nekritz, Walsh. Feigenholtz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5522, Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Dunkin. Out of the record. House Bill 4496, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4496, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4496 provides that DCFS... I'm sorry. This is dealing with the Department of Juvenile Justice and current law provides that DCFS set forth some type of procedures when a child come before the court, but it doesn't say what's in the plan. And this would just say what's in the plan that DJJ has to provide to the judge. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions that anyone may have about the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Walsh. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving... There are a few Second Reading Bills we still need to move, Ladies and Gentlemen.

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

The first is House Bill 5547. Representative Nekritz is not at her desk. House Bill 4725, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino. Out of the record. House Bill 5488, Representative Bellock. Please read the Bill."

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5488, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This... Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Bellock, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

 Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And what Amendment #1 on 5488, which becomes the Bill, does it eliminates a duplicative process that HFS was using. And so what it does is that they will use the federal CMS care tool for medical assessments for LTAC patients and there will be only one care tool used from now on, so that will be a money savings."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4795, Mr. Cabello. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4795, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cabello, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."
- Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Amendment, Floor Amendment #1, which creates a new Illinois Vehicle Code violation for negligent driving.

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Illinois has had negligent driving before. This Bill will no longer make it a suspended or revocable offense; it'll make it a petty offense for \$25. I requestfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5919, Representative Ives. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5919, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill.

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

- Ives: "Mr. Speaker, Floor Amendment 2 becomes the Bill. It allows the Public Pension Division of Insurance up to three years to correct the miscalculation of a pension. If the benefit's too low, the fund will repay the beneficiary with interest. If the benefit's too high, they'll take just a correction of 10 percent per year to correct it. This models the SURS procedures for miscalculation of a pension. There's no opposition. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin, are you rising to speak on this Amendment? Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

 Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes Mr. Dunkin."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Dunkin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to welcome in my own home district the ACE Tech Charter School Bobcats who are visiting us here in Springfield. They're right up above my head here. Let's welcome them. Thank you for coming out. Welcome to Springfield."
- Speaker Lang: "Hello. Happy you're here. House Bill 4725, Mr. Mautino. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4725, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 4327, Representative Harris. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4327, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #3 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5522, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill. This is Third Reading, Ladies and Gentlemen."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5522, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5522 simply is very similar to House... Senate Bill 2773, which was sponsored by our dear colleagues over there. It simply allows us... establishes a Long-Term Services and Supports Disparities Task Force. That's basically it."

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "A few... a few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed. Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "This is a task force?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Sandack: "How many task forces have we been dealing with over the last couple weeks, Representative?"

Dunkin: "Either... I believe 12 or a dozen."

Sandack: "Does this task force have any travel opportunities, here or abroad?"

Dunkin: "I'm not sure. That'll be for the... the task force to determine."

Sandack: "Are you a member of the task force?"

Dunkin: "No. But I'm going to recommend to the Governor or the Speaker that I become a task force member."

Sandack: "And should you become a task force member, would you recommend travel to..."

Dunkin: "Absolutely."

Sandack: "...like, a Caribbean island..."

Dunkin: "Sure."

Sandack: "...by any chance?"

Dunkin: "Especially in this weather."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Franks, McAuliffe, Senger. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

- Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5512, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5512, a Bill for an Act concerning..."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative, is there an Amendment you need to adopt on this Bill?"
- Nekritz: "Yes. I need to adopt Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill on Second."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5512, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment... Floor Amendment #1 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Nekritz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The second Amendment removes the opposition to the Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting at 3:00.

 Labor & Commerce is meeting in Room 114, the Appropriations—
 General Services Committee is meeting in D-1, Health Care
 Licenses is meeting in C-1, Personnel and Pensions is meeting
 in Room 413, Transportation: Vehicles & Safety is meeting in
 Room 118. At 4:00, the Agriculture & Conservation Committee
 is meeting in D-1, Higher Education is meeting in 118, Human

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Services is meeting in 413, Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges is meeting in C-1, and Revenue & Finance is meeting in Room 114."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Moffitt: "And then you can determine if it's really a point of order. We just passed another Resolution to create another task force, but a few years ago we created a task force to study task forces. Had that committee on task force approved this additional task force? Can we get a... have a report back on that?"

Speaker Lang: "As soon as I understand your question, Sir, we'll get back to you with the information."

Moffitt: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "And now, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Wednesday, April 9 at the hour of 10:30 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned 'til Wednesday, April 9 at the hour of 10:30 a.m."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 08, 2014: recommends be adopted for the Floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3885, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4080, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 4495. Introduction and First Reading of

117th Legislative Day

4/8/2014

Senate Bills. Senate Bill 499, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 500, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3044, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3055, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 3267, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law, which may be referred to as the Incentivized Education and Family Support for Community Corrections Amendments. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."