119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 89, offered by Representative Ford, is referred to the Rules Committee. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 10, 2014: recommends be adopted for the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 802, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 3820, Floor Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 4075, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 4094, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4558, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 5567, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5660."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will please be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Dr. Casey Tygrett, who is with Parkview Church in Orland Park. Dr. Tygrett is the guest of Representative Kosel. Members and guest are asked to refrain from stating their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Dr. Tygrett."
- Dr. Tygrett: "Would you pray with me? God, today is sacred. It's sacred because this day will never happen again. It's sacred and unique in its simplicity, in its individuality and in the miracle of our simple presence here. Our words and our actions, our attitudes will never be repeated. We have this day. This day that You have created. This day that You have given us, so may we use it well. May we use it with wisdom and grace and humility. May we use it for the sake of those we represent. May we use it for the sake of those who cannot speak for themselves, for the poor and the oppressed and the

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

marginalized. May we use it on behalf of a world that is in need of leadership, is in need of people who will stand in the middle and call people to them. Father, I thank You for my friends in this room. I thank You because their job is often a thankless one. I thank You because they have chosen to stand and to lead to... read legislation, to support legislation, to be a voice on behalf of those who can't be here, and to act gracefully and humbly on their behalf. And so, You... may You bring us together today. Regardless of where we may stand, regardless of whether we are Sox's fans or Cub's fans or Cardinal fans, draw us to the center. And in Your grace, and Your goodness do a batch of ordinary miracles through us today. And we pray this in Your true and good and strong name, Amen."

- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Anthony."
- Anthony et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Dunkin, Jefferson, Jones and Sims are excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bost and Schmitz are excused for today."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 111 Members present, and we do have a quorum. Mr. Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution please."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution #90, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 10, 2014, the House of Representative stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 16, 2014 in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 29, 2014 at 12:00 o'clock noon, or until the call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday, April 23, 2014, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 29, 2014, or until the call of the President."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Adjournment Resolution will say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. They 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on April 10, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4065, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4068, Senate Joint Resolution #50. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on April 10, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

5079, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5080, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5082, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5085. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on April 10, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5622. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1002, offered by Representative Cavaletto. House Resolution 1003, offered by Representative Sims. And House Resolution 1004, offered by Representative Cavaletto. These are referred to the Rule Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cloonen."

Cloonen: "Good morning, Speaker. Thank you. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

- Cloonen: "This is not a House Resolution, but it is a question. As I walk from the Stratton Building to the Capitol, I am appalled by the state in which our American Flag, our Illinois Flag, and our MIA Flag, they're tattered and torn. And if I need to purchase or procure flags for the State of Illinois, for the Stratton Building, I will. But I would like to see new flags at the Stratton because I think it's embarrassing that we have a tattered American Flag. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, I did not state this, but for the record, the Motion for the… to adopt the Adjournment Resolution was made my Leader Currie. The Chair recognizes Mr. Davidsmeyer for an introduction, and a Resolution. House Joint Resolution 60, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 60, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that we designate the section of Old U.S. Route 36 along Morton Avenue in Jacksonville from west of U.S. Route 67 to north of I-72 at Exit 68 as the Staff Sergeant Matthew Ward Weikert, U.S. Army/United States Marine Corp Memorial Highway."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask everyone to pay attention today. We're paying tribute to a fallen soldier." Speaker Lang: "The Members will rise."

Davidsmeyer: "Today we're paying tribute to United States Army Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert, who was born on May 15, 1981, in Sioux City, Iowa. Staff Sergeant Weiker ... Weikert was a 2000 graduate of Jacksonville High School, my alma mater. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in August of 2001, and served three tours in Iraq in only four years. He later enlisted in the United States Army where he completed another tour of duty in Iraq. He was serving in Afghanistan in the First Battalion, 187 Infantry Regiment, Third Brigade Combat Team for the 101st Airborne Division out of Fort Campbell at the time of his death. As a military leader, he had the courage to endured five deployments in support of Operation Iraqi and Enduring Freedom and considered it his personal mission to properly prepare the soldiers under his command and keep them safe from harm. After his dismounted patrol encountered an IED, Staff Sergeant Matt Weikert was wounded, but he was able to radio coordinates of their group. Helicopters were deployed to the scene, and he saved two soldiers in this

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

process. Matt Weikert was the recipient of many members ... or many medals and citations, decorations. The Combat Action Ribbon - Navy/Marine, the Presidential Unit Citation -Navy/Marine, the Meritorious Unit Commendation, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the Marine Corp Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Korean Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Iraq Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Navy Reserve Sea Service with two stars, the NATO Medal, the Combat Infantry Badge and the Combat Action Badge. He was also awarded the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star. Staff Sergeant Weikert gave his life defending America's freedom on July 17, 2010, in the Pakistan province in the southern ... Paktika Province in southern Afghanistan. That day we lost a true hero. It's not very often that you see a gentleman who serves in the Marine Corp as well as the Armys ... Army. Most of the time we ask what branch of service, and this was a gentleman who ... who thought it best to serve our country in multiple service arenas. Today, we're here to designate the section of Old U.S. Route 36, in my home town, along Morton Avenue in Jacksonville from west of U.S. Route 67 to north of I-72 at exit 68, as the Staff Sergeant Matthew Ward Weikert U.S. Army/USMC Memorial Highway. And I ask for the adoption of this Resolution. I would also like to mention that today we have his dad, Dick Weikert, his mom, Susan Weikert, and his son Jase up here with us. And I would like to give these ... his family a round of applause."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question,, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Thank you, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Members, we begin down the approved Bills for today. House Bill 4600, Representative Andrade. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4600, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."

- Andrade: "Thank you very much. Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 4600 amends the Medical Assistant Article under the Illinois Public Aid Code. In provisions concerning a new nursing services to reimbursement methodology, utilizing the RUGs reimbursement system. This is more just of a technical Amendment. If someone has any questions, please feel free. I'll take the 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? Senger. Please take the record. There are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3902, Mr. Beiser. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3902, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill... is an initiative of the Carpenters Council of Illinois. It's supported by the

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Carpenters, of course, IML and the Operating Engineers. And basically, this says that if... if you're a member of a Taft-Hartley Pension and you're working for a project in a unit of local government you do not have to participate in IMRF."

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? Burke, Franks. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3668, Mr. Turner. Out of the record. House Bill 4916, Representative Bellock. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4916, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4916 is a Bill that helps children in the DCF system. And what it does is provides that an unfounded report of a child abuse cannot be closed until the guardian ad litem for that child has the opportunity to go through the process to appeal unfounded reports."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1452, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1452, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1452 is a set of changes to the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. It incorporates many of the recommendations of the bipartisan Illinois Family Law Study Committee, which was created by this Body in 2008. The Bill makes changes to aspects of the statute, notably improvements regarding disclosures of attorney's fees. It focuses on reducing litigation by removing grounds for divorce and eliminating heart bound remedies. It helps litigation, in that it provides jud... that judges must issue decision within 60 days of closing of proofs of the case. And it sets a framework for a more interactive role with parents in determining a parenting plan for their children during their divorce case and when the case is finished. Makes important changes to the law regarding maintenance, payment of college expenses, and support for disabled children. There are many other smaller changes to the statute, but the result is a comprehensive approach to improve the legal process of divorce and provide more efficient fair divorces while better protecting our children. The committee worked extensively with many groups, both law ... from the law profession, government agencies, and advocates. There was a tremendous amount of back and forth and negotiation on this Bill. And I thank the members of the State Bar Association, the Cook County Public Guardian, the Chicago Bar Association, and HFS and DCFS for giving us input on this and making some important improvements. We have one

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

unresolved issue that we're going to work on the… with the ISBA in the Senate. But I think this Bill is a big step forward and an improvement on a 30-year-old dissolution statute. I welcome any questions, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

- Sandack: "Kelly, there was a lot of discussion. We had subject matter hearing after subject matter hearing, and I know that it was a very collaborative process at first, but then there were some areas of disagreement. And the one that I want to talk to you about is the 35 percent presumption. Is that still in the Bill?"
- Burke, K.: "That is not in this Bill. It was taken out and it's in a separate Bill."
- Sandack: "Okay. So, as this Bill... and by the way, the Bill is not done, there's still continued discussions and it's your intent to work with the Senate Sponsor to try and make it as agreed as possible."
- Burke, K.: "Yes. We have a couple small issues and then one issue where I... where we're in discussions, we just haven't come to an agreement on the best way to handle it. But I think that will get done in the Senate."
- Sandack: "And do you know of any strong opponents still, as we stand here today?"

Burke, K.: "No, I don't."

Sandack: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I want to commend the Sponsor. It's been an arduous process. She has done a yeoman's job of moving a really difficult piece of legislation

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

forward. I saw some hearings on this. There were strong opinions all across the board from practitioners, judges, and advocates. However, I think she's framed the issues properly. I hope to continue to work with her in the Senate, but I think this is a good Bill. And I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join the previous Nekritz: Representative in thanking the Sponsor for taking on this very difficult task. I hold myself responsible for ... for making her... putting her in charge of this, with her experience in the family law area in her... in her private sector life. This... this is... there's nothing in this that's going to satisfy everybody because for every lawyer that practices family law in this State of Illinois, there's going to be someone who thinks it ought to be done their way rather than somebody else's way. This has been a very long, difficult negotiation. A process that's involved a lot of people. And I think this Bill deserves to get a positive vote today and then we can send it over to the Senate and get their input as well. And that will ... negotiation and that discussion will continue. But I think it's important that we say 'yes' to something today, and then let the Senate have their ... put their thumbprint on it as well. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "I just... Thank you, Representative Burke. I know this was a lot of work over a lot of time. I just wanted to know

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

if there was still opposition by the Illinois Family Institute, or the people who had had some concerns about it before?"

Burke, K.: "No, they're not opposed to this Bill."

Bellock: "Oh. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cross, Sullivan. Please take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4113, Representative Hurley. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4113, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hurley. Representative Hurley." Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4113 amends existing

statute to grant authority for sheriff's officers across Illinois to give boot camp participants vocational skills while addressing homelessness. This legislation would allow the sheriff's office to select nonviolent offenders, serving sentences in boot camp, to gain valuable construction skills in the rehabilitation of residential property. It's an initiative of the Cook County Sheriff's Department. I welcome questions. And 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? Hernandez. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5897, Mr. Brady. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5897, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Good morning Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5897 seeks to change the time frame of licensure from every year to every four years for telescopic bio optic lenses for nighttime drivers. Still has in provisions for the ophthalmologist to be able to issue a report every year to the Secretary of State's Office. Secretary of State's Office still holds the ability to discontinue a license if they see the need to do so. And the Illinois Secretary of State's Office and the Ophthalmologist Association, and Optometric Association are supporters. 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? Conroy, Hurley, Moylan. Conroy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5569, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. House Bill 5537, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5537, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Under existing State Law, the State Board of Education has the right and the responsibility to intervene in school districts where, over a period of time, youngsters fail to achieve. This measure would carefully constrain the authority of the state board to go into districts. And it would require the state board to do not only assessments of districts ability to cope, but also clo... pay close attention to governance issues. So, under this measure, we would restrain the state board so that it is not operating as it can today in 100 or more districts across the state at any given time. We would limit the number of districts that could be subject to state board intervention. We would require the state board to offer help and assistance to school districts that are on the watch list and we would not permit the state board to intervene in more than four districts at any given time. And only those districts where the school ... school board has shown an inability to attend properly to governance issues, would the state board have full authority. So, if you aren't happy with the state board having full authority to go into local school districts, this is the Bill for you. If you think there are times when we must intervene because the ultimate goal of our school system is making our ... sure our children have good opportunities to learn, then this is also the Bill for you. None of the stakeholders, educations stakeholders, the Association of School Boards, the Illinois Federation of Teachers, Illinois Education Association, none of those organizations is opposed to this measure. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I think this Bill will set our kids on the right course to make

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

sure academic success is within their grasp. Happy to answer your questions and I'd be grateful for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

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

- Hoffman: "Yes. Representative, you characterize this as a diminution of the rights of the state board, when actually, it's my understanding, there have been court cases. And in fact, there has been a consent decree entered into regarding the East St. Louis School District that specifically prohibits the state board from removing members of a duly elected Board of Education."
- Currie: "I believe that was a case that was settled by the board in St. East St. Louis and by the State Board of Education. So..."

Hoffman: "All right."

- Currie: "...I don't know what would have happened had there not been a settlement, but under the settlement the state board did take over the East St. Louis School System, and the results have been improved, academic success among the children."
- Hoffman: "But I also... First of all, let me just say this, I believe that the intervention in the East St. Louis District has been successful and they're going in the right direction. That's not my problem with the Bill. My problem with the Bill is saying that a duly elected school board that has been elected by the people, that has been voted on by the people, that has had the... a local community vote for them, can just

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

be removed by the State Board of Education. That's my problem with the Bill."

Currie: "And... and I don't..."

Hoffman: "And..."

- Currie: "...I don't disagree with that problem, but I would say that is current law, and that under this Bill it would be a much rarer circumstance in which the state board would have the authority to intervene the way you suggest. It seems to me that we all... we all agree with you and that's, I think, why this is a good answer to the problems that we face today. In addition, the Illinois Association of School Boards, which certainly shares your reservation, is no longer opposed to the Bill, once we limited the board, the state board, to four interventions at... at any given time."
- Hoffman: "Well, I'd view it a little bit differently. I view it as, because of their being lawsuits and because of there being some previous rulings that say you can't just remove, for no reason and not for cause, a duly elected school board that were legitimizing and saying under this Bill that that action is going to be legitimate. I have no problem with the current state board. I believe that they're doing a good job in many cases. I do have a problem, and it's a philosophical problem, and I understand what you're trying to do, that we should not be saying, okay, we're going to elect a school board and we're going to allow this arbiter, the State Board of Education, to come in and remove a duly elected board. That's my problem with the Bill. If that were taken out of this, I'd fully support you Bill. But as it stands right now, I'm going to vote 'no'."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Sandack: "Leader, you mentioned in your opening statement that this is the Bill for you if you wanted intervention and action by the state board, but you also said, it provided autonomy. Could you please elaborate a little bit..."

Currie: "Yes."

Sandack: "...so I understand these otherwise distinct concepts?"

"Under current State Law, the school... State Board of Currie: Education is required to go into about 100 school districts across the state, that's today. Under this Bill, the number of districts that the state board would be required to have a look at would be sig ... significantly reduced. In addition, the state board would not have the opportunity to do anything about a sitting school board, based only on the failure of the children to make adequate academic process... progress. The state board would have to, first of all, do a needs assessment. Second, offer support to the board to make sure that they have the tools they need to do a job that will help ensure that our children learn. Finally, the state board could only go into the school district, only four at any given time, and only if there are serious governance issues. That is not current law. Current law gives the state board a good deal more leeway in making determinations about replacing sitting board members and I... I appreciate the point that an earlier speaker made, you don't want to do that willy-nilly. You don't want to do it on a whim. You want to make sure that there are clear constraints and restraints in place so that that does

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

not happen, except rarely, and only when everything else has failed."

Sandack: "The restra... the cap on the number, four per year, and to use your..."

Currie: "At any given time, it's not..."

- Sandack: "Oh, so at one time, they can't be doing this for five or six districts..."
- Currie: "Right."
- Sandack: "...four at a time."
- Currie: "Right."
- Sandack: "And when there's four completed, they could do four more."
- Currie: "Right."
- Sandack: "Okay. So, it's not really a cap. It's just a pause, if
 you will..."
- Currie: "Well, right now..."
- Sandack: "...on current activities."
- Currie: "...right now they should be doing it in 100 districts across the state."
- Sandack: "Well... okay, that's a fair point perhaps. But Chicago isn't part of this Bill, correct?"
- Currie: "Chicago is not. Chicago does not have an elected school board."
- Sandack: "I... I understand that, but the powers that's be... that's being permitted now, the intervention powers that your Bill provides would not extend to the City of Chicago School District?"

Currie: "That's correct."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Sandack: "And is there a reason, other than that they don't have an elected school board, is there a policy reason for that exemption beyond how they run their schools or don't have elected boards"
- Currie: "In... in part, because it is not an elected school board. The State Board would still have to do a district needs assessment in the City of Chicago, with Chicago Public Schools. And I think that as much as anything else, in addition to the fact that the Chicago Board is not today elected, it's a question of resources and a question whether the Chicago Board of Education requires the kind of intervention that we saw in places like East St. Louis."
- Sandack: "All right. And last question. Because the… the notion that maybe this, the board, should be involved in more school districts is something I could probably accept. I guess I sa… I stand…"

Currie: "No, no, no. No, no, no. That's current law, under..." Sandack: "Right."

- Currie: "...current law, they ought to be. And what this would say is, let's be more discriminating about where the state board should intervene."
- Sandack: "Yes, Ma'am. I... I actually offered that in the inverse and I apologize for that. Because some... and I understand there's a difference with the... with the city schools, but many in this room would like to think the same powers to intervene and offer opportunities that reform, ought to be afforded to the Chicago schools too. And that the fact that they don't have an elected board is a distinction that makes no difference because on the opposite side of the coin, at

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

least elected school boards are responsible to the taxpayers directly. And the idea that the... the board doesn't have involvement or the same level of involvement opportunities with Chicago causes me a little pause."

- Currie: "And I would be happy to look at that down the road, but this Bill deals only with boards that don't meet the Chicago criteria. And I'd be happy to work with you on that."
- Sandack: "Thank you for the answers Leader. To the Bill. I'm going to listen to the debate. I've heard from people who have strong opposition about this, think there are potentially ulterior motives involved. So, I'm going to listen very carefully and obviously suggest my colleagues do the same. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jackson."

Jackson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. To the Bill. In June 2012, the Members of Illinois State Board of Education authorized state superintendent to replace the local board of East St. Louis District 189, with an independent authority. Because of an ensuing lawsuit, the local school board remains in place. However, the state has oversight due to provisions of a consent decree signed in May 20... 2013. House Bill 5537 clearly state show a local school board will be dismissed, how the district will be governed during the period the local board is dismissed, and how the board that is dismissed will be replaced. I stand in support of this Bill and ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I stand in strong support of this Bill because, quite frankly, the State Board

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

of Education does not have the resources right now to go into 100 school districts, 100 school districts. We are currently helping out in East St. Louis and in North Chicago, and that already has tapped out their ability to work in other areas. So, just from a resource stand point, I encourage you to vote 'yes' for this Bill. It takes them out of 100 districts and potentially only 30 districts, where they can focus and concentrate, and really look at the idea that the governance of the school boards are causing the problems in the school district. There are other problems in our school districts, we know that. We know that about two-thirds of them deficit spend right now. We have huge financial issues in our school districts. But, when it comes to governance, the state must get involved for the benefit of the children and this Bill helps them focus on a narrow set of people that need to be ... need to be reformed and taken out. So, I applaud the Lady on this Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you. To the Bill. This Bill was incomplete. When we have a Bill that allows the State Board of Education to come into my district, to come into your suburban district, to come into your downstate district and take over the responsibilities of your elected school board but does not include the ability to do that in the largest school district in the State of Illinois, that is by definition 'inequitable'. It's not okay. The nuance difference between being elected and appointed by the mayor, that's not good enough for me. I say, come back when this Bill is complete. If we're going to have this kind of discussion, why in the world would we exempt

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

the largest school district in the State of Illinois? It's not okay. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield. Representative, before you commence, Ladies and Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen, this would be a good day to keep some order in the chamber so that we can move through these Bills and head on home. Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

- Mayfield: "Representative, it is my understanding that Superintendent Koch asked you to hold this Bill. Can you please explain why you're running it, if you were asked by ISBE not to run it?"
- Currie: "I spoke with Superintendent Koch last evening and he did not encourage me to hold the Bill."
- Mayfield: "Okay. That is not the understanding that I received from the Governor's Office. As a matter of fact, I received two texts last night, and two conformation texts this morning that Superintendent Koch did ask you to hold the Bill, but you refused, and that you are running the Bill against the Superintendent's wishes."

Currie: "That... that information is not accurate."

Mayfield: "So, you're saying that the information from the Governor's Office is incorrect?"

Currie: "Superintendent Koch has not asked me to hold this Bill." Mayfield: "And no one else from ISBE asked you to hold the Bill?" Currie: "That is correct."

Mayfield: "Okay. Representative, I'm sorry, but I have to disagree with you. As I stated, I did receive several text messages

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

that ISBE has agreed to hold the Bill because there is opposition, outside of this chamber, and others have stressed that they wanted to work on this Bill. It was my understanding that this Bill would be held, and it would be brought back revised. But I understand you're willing ... your unwillingness to hold the Bill. So, to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. ISBE put out information regarding North Chicago School District that is totally incorrect. I am the Representative for North Chicago. The accomplishments that they would like to tell you were resulted in removing the school board are totally inaccurate and are actually the workings of a third party that has been in that district for a while and not ISBE. What they did is, they came into my district, they removed a newly elected school board, a school board that had not had an opportunity to do anything wrong. The only thing that school board did wrong was they contacted ISBE and said, hey, we recognize we need help. Will you please intervene in our district? It wasn't that ISBE said, oh, my gosh, this district is failing, let us intervene. They were asked to come in. And their response was, yes, we will come in, but we're going to remove your board and we're going to contact every local politician in the district, myself included, and ask them which friends and family members they would like to sit on the board. Now, please understand what I'm saying. We are removing duly elected school boards, voted in by the people of the district. These individuals are not paid, they are running and they are working for free. They were removed and put in pla ... and what they were replaced with were friends and family members of elected officials. Can anyone in here tell

09800119.docx

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

me what is wrong with that program? This Bill has some problems. It is not soup yet, and we still need to work on it. It's now do... are there school districts out there that need intervention? Absolutely. Is there parts of this Bill that are good? Yes. The school board piece is not. It needs to be removed. This Bill needs to be revised. And I am asking for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard. Mr. Pritchard is not in his chair. Mr. Welch."

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

Welch: "Mr. Speaker. I have the utmost respect for our Leader. So, I'm going to be asking questions because I'm receiving calls from the constituents that I represent. Leader, the Bill on the board is labeled 'Intervention Bill'. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Welch: "But when you read the text of the Bill, it actually gives ISBE an appointed school board, who appoints a superintendent, the power to remove elected school board members. Is that correct?"

Currie: "And that, Representative, is current law."

Welch: "I understand."

Currie: "Current law. This Bill does not change that law at all." Welch: "Under existing law, ISBE already has the authority to intervene in school districts. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Yes."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Welch: "They can intervene in a whole number of ways, including in panel, what is considered... called a financial oversight panel, correct?"

Currie: "And removal as well."

- Welch: "Under existing law, ISBE currently should intervene in over 100 school districts. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "Because there are 100 school districts where there has not been adequate academic progress over a three year period, the answer is yes. I don't think we want ISBE in 100 school districts telling us how we must run our local schools. That's why this Bill is important because it will constrain ISBE. It will not permit ISBE to run amuck in 100 school districts across the state at any given moment."
- Welch: "The list of 100 school districts, Leader, is currently a diverse list of school districts. They're black, they're Hispanic, and they're white. Isn't that correct?"
- Currie: "I believe that's right. I don't know each of the districts by heart."
- Welch: "Under this Bill, the list becomes a lot more narrow. Is that right?"

Currie: "It becomes smaller. It's about 30 districts, not 100."

- Welch: "So we go from 100 districts to about 30. And on that list of 30 school districts, aren't they predominately over 90 percent black and Hispanic?"
- Currie: "Not to my knowledge. But again, I'm not familiar with each and every one of these."
- Welch: "I have the list of school districts. I won't go over all of them. Are you familiar with Cicero Township?"

Currie: "I am."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Welch: "That's largely Hispanic, correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Welch: "Are you familiar with Proviso Township?"

Currie: "Yes."

Welch: "Largely African-American, correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Welch: "Bloom Township, are you familiar with Bloom Township?"

Currie: "No."

- Welch: "Largely hi… black and Hispanic, correct? Thorton? I can go on and on, Leader, but I know we have a number of Bills to get through today. The list goes from a diverse list of school districts, equal across the state and we narrow it to black and Hispanic school districts. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "I would not have thought so, Representative, but again I am not familiar with each of these districts."
- Welch: "Under the current criteria in this Bill, Chicago Public School District would have 69 percent of their schools qualify to be taken over by the school district. Isn't that correct?"
- Currie: "I don't know the number. But again, they're… Chicago is not covered under current law. It is not covered under this proposed law."
- Welch: "Under... understood. But I think they should be covered under this Bill."

Currie: "And you're..."

- Welch: "Because under… under the list of criteria that is listed in… articulated in this Bill, 69 percent of Chicago schools would be considered ready for takeover. Isn't that true?"
- Currie: "Representative, if you… when you look at this Bill, it isn't just a question of year over year academic success. The

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

key issue is governance. The key issues is governance. No school is subject to takeover because the children are not achieving year after... over year at a greater degree. The districts that are subject to takeover are those wherein the governance makes it impossible for the children to show the kind of improvement we want for all of our children."

- Welch: "And based on that, Leader, 69 percent of Chicago Public Schools would be on that list for takeover. Isn't that correct?"
- Currie: "Not to my knowledge, but I have not looked at that. Again, Chicago is not covered under current law. It is not covered under this proposal. But no district under this proposal is subject to any kind of takeover unless there are serious issues of governance, unless the school board fails to meet its basic responsibilities for ensuring that bills are appropriately paid and vendors are chosen subject to appropriate bidding requirements."
- Welch: "I'm... I'm asking our Leader questions based on a list provided to me by ISBE, and 69 percent of the schools that would meet their criteria is from Chicago Public Schools. But Chicago, one of the worst school systems in our state, is excluded from the list. The... are you familiar, Leader, with the Supreme Court case of Tully v. Edgar?"

Currie: "I am."

- Welch: "And that case is still the law of the State of Illinois. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "And that case involved a decision about removing elected members of the University of Illinois, Board of Trustees, for no compelling state interest. I would urge the Members, this

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

is entirely different. There is a compelling interest when school boards fail the very children they have been asked to serve. So, I would say that that's apples and oranges. I would say that... that we're not in any... any danger of following the Tully Principal, if current law is still current law, and if we vote to... to approve House Bill 5537."

- Welch: "The Supreme Court in Tully specifically held that removing an elected school board violated the right to vote under the State Constitution. And the Supreme Court said, it was... it violated the unconstitutional provisions and was re... severable from the rest of the law. Isn't that correct?"
- Currie: "Representative, I think I distinguished the Tully case from the present circumstances."

Welch: "That... that the uni..."

- Currie: "In Tully, the justification was the Governor wanted to do his own appointing. In this issue, we're talking about school boards that have failed their fiduciary responsibility to the children they are supposed to educate."
- Welch: "In Tully, the Governor, who was elected by the people, wanted to appoint his own school board. But under this Bill, Chris Koch, who's not even elected by the people, wants to appoint school boards across the state, everywhere except Chicago. Is that correct? Leader?"
- Currie: "If that was a question, the answer is, you're wrong. I don't think the State Board of Education welcomes the opportunity to go into districts. The State Board of Education welcomes the opportunity to help school districts meet their responsibilities. It is a painful circumstance in which the

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

State Board of Education, as an earlier speaker mentioned, in East St. Louis felt they had no other option."

Welch: "To the Bill. If you are a lawyer in this chamber, if you are African American in this chamber, and you are Hispanic in this chamber, if you care about the rule of law, fairness, and setting bad precedent, we should think twice about voting for this Bill. Tully v. Edgar is still the law of the State of Illinois. The Supreme Court said that the Governor could not remove an elected school board and appoint his own board. Here, we're being asked to give an appointed school superintendent the power to remove people who have been elected in their communities. Just two days ago, we had a Bill involving park districts. That Bill did not ask us to remove those elected park district members. What we did is we added members to that park board. Why did we do that? Because it is unconstitutional to remove elected officials. Imagine someone putting a board in place to remove all of us from the positions we were elected to by the people in our communities. These elected school board members have a right to those positions. I'm not making it up, the Supreme Court and Justice Bilandic said so. That is still the law of the land. That is the law. We should respect the rule of law. Let's not set bad precedent here today. Tell the state board to bring us a Bill that is constitutional. Give them the power to appoint people to the already existing boards. But let's not remove elected school board members from their positions. Ιt is unconstitutional. The law is clear and if we vote 'yes' on this, we are not respecting the rule of law."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to come back and be on the list. I was trying to verify one of the questions that was asked by one of the Representatives about whether the state superintendent had asked this Bill to be held. He definitely has not asked for this Bill to be held. He wants this to pass because the... a current authority that we have given him cannot be implemented. He wants to define and reduce the powers that he has to remove boards and to try to correct the school district. So please be clear about that. That the state superintendent is still very much in favor of this. Representative, we had some questions about the <u>Tully v. Edgar</u> case and you mentioned that it was not relevant to this particular situation. Isn't it true that the court is upholding something, interpretation of the law, where we are right here setting what that law is? Is that not correct?"
- Currie: "I think that's correct. Most important about that lawsuit was that the state made no compelling case. The state was not able to say, bad things happen if we... if we leave these individuals in place until their terms are over. This is a very different circumstance. Here there is a compelling state reason for intervention. School children are failing and the boards are not able to provide the kind of governance that would mean that our kids have a chance, a chance at a quality education. If that is not a compelling state reason, I don't know what is."
- Pritchard: "So, we ought to be concerned about whether our students are learning and progressing, whether there's accountability in our school districts. That ought to be our #1 concern."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Currie: "Absolutely."

Pritchard: "And... and in the two cases where the state has taken over the school district, not only were the students not succeeding, there was fiscal mismanagement."

Currie: "Absolutely."

Pritchard: "Those were compelling reasons that the state went into those two school district. There's been tremendous progress in both of them, but we don't have the resources to go into 100-plus school districts. So, this Bill is reducing the number of situations where we can take control in allowing the state to still intervene in the most egregious cases. Ladies and Gentleman, I would ask that you look at the facts of this case and support this Lady's Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Fortner: "There's been a lot of debate. I just want to make sure I understand clearly a couple of things, what this is changing, what this isn't changing. Currently, under current law, as I think you have already said, ISBE has powers to remove school boards and make adjustments for failing districts. Under current law, do they have that power with Chicago?"

Currie: "No."

Fortner: "So, this Bill doesn't change anything with respect to what they could or couldn't do to Chicago?"

Currie: "Correct."

Fortner: "So, it really just focuses on all those downstate districts. And as I see it, it limits the reach of what ISBE

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

would do in any given year, compared to what is in current statute."

Currie: "Correct."

Fortner: "To the Bill. I understand there're lots of reasons to be concerned about other things that maybe people would like or not like ISBE to do with respect to the various school districts that are failing our students. I think this Bill was not designed to deal with that. It's designed to deal with a much more narrow question related to how many districts can ISBE reasonably expect it to intervene in, in any given year, from the current pool of currently failing districts. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca. Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Sometime ago, I had the distinct honor to serve on the Board of Education in the historic Bloom Township. I served two terms. I was the Board President. And there's really three main responsibilities that the school board has. They hire a superintendent, they approve the bills, and they set policy. They're not elected to micromanage the school district. I ask you to please vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I can understand the angst that some Members have in situations. But I can simply just tell you from my experience as an appropriations chair, when we are talking about the dollars that we as a public Body have to dispense to school districts, I see no reason why that, if under very narrow circumstance, we know that individual school districts are not good stewards of the

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

dollars, not only that we provide for them or that they receive from the local jurisdiction through property taxes, that we would be remiss that if we didn't give ourselves the tools ... the tools to be able to go in and address those situations. We are on the verge of some very bad things happening to a lot of school districts. And in some respects, it's not their fault. Unfortunately, dollars are just the way they are, and finances are just the way they are. But unfortunately, we've seen examples where the people who are the experts in trying to work with school districts have offered suggestions to them to do things better, where school districts have simply refused. You know, don't worry, we're elected to do it. We can do it all by ourselves. And we've seen disastrous results from those type of situations. To one of the previous speakers who talked about newly elected school board members, I can understand that because those individuals probably were not responsible for anything that got that school district in that situation. And maybe there's a way to try to figure out how to mitigate circumstances like that. But we've seen a couple of examples where long-term school board members, who run school districts like it's their own pocket book, their own checkbook, they're giving contracts to unqualified vendors. They are doing a lot of things that are ultimately hurting the school district. And the school district's responsibility is to educate children, guess what, they're hurting children as well. I think a tool like this isn't necessary for our State Board of Education since that's the entity that we have to oversee school districts to some degree. We have to give them the

09800119.docx

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

ability to be able to come in and step in, in situations like that, to make sure that children, which we are all going to try to protect, to make sure that children are educated properly and that their current... and that the school board, whether it's the current one that exists or one that may be replaced, those replacements, that they are doing all the right things with the dollars that they have been given. So I strongly encourage for the sake of protecting our interest in local school districts, I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote on this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I think we've had a good discussion. I would just ... on a question about the racial composition of schools that would remain on the watch list. There are a fair number that are not minority, Kankakee, Decatur. I have another... another list, but that's not the central issue. The central issue is that this Bill will narrow the State Board of Education's current ability to go into school districts and throw out school boards. Today, the central question is whether youngsters are making yearly academic progress. Under this Bill, there has to be a showing ... that first of all, interventions from the state board don't help. And secondly, the school board has to show that it's unable to govern the school system, so that at the end of the day, the children do have a chance to learn. That's an improvement over current law. Under current law, the state board can willy-nilly, come into many districts across the state. Under this Bill, it will be limited, it will be constrained, it will only go into four at a time. And I urge,

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

for the children whose educational futures are at stake, I urge 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? Wheeler. Wheeler. Please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Chapa LaVia on a point of personal privilege."
- Chapa LaVia: "Point of personal privilege. I want to deeply apologize to my... my side of the aisle over here, my colleagues, my brothers and sisters for my... my personality meltdown yesterday. I love all of you, and I respect all of you here. And I deeply apologize for the words that came out of my mouth. The tongue sometimes is the most dangerous part of somebody's body. So, Leader Durkin, and all my colleagues, I hope you accept my apology from the bottom of my heart. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. Thank you. And Representative Chapa LaVia, I take you at your word. I thank you for those words. Very much appreciated. Just want to make a few comments. During the course of every session we all feel different levels of frustration. More so when we are getting close to deadlines, whether a Bill passes, when it doesn't pass. You know, we're human beings. We've... we understand that. However, we should never let that frustration ever translate to anything that can be perceived or is personal or hurtful. It's just not

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

worthy of this chamber. I just want to remind everybody that every two years in January, we're sworn into office. We take an Oath of Office. We follow the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of Illinois. But what's in that oas ... oath is our obligation inherent and responsibility to respect this chamber. To respect our... more importantly respect our quests who are visiting us, who are watching us make the laws of Illinois. Respect the opinions of others. And most importantly, respect all who serve and work in this Chamber. I think we need to keep that in mind. We're going to be moving on into May and we see that levels of frustration will continue on, on certain issues, but I'm just asking, let's be respectful, let's have civil discourse, civil debates and that's the way it's been. And I would just say that we have always ... always over the past two months, we've worked in a very collaborative matter with the Majority Party. And let's continue to do that and I think we can. We're all people who have good hearts, and we ... we try to do the best for our constituents and sometimes our emotions get the best of us. But I think we just need to be measured and be respectful of each other. Be respectful of this chamber. And again, thank you for your comments, I take you at your word."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Ford: "I want to thank Representative Chapa LaVia for her apology, but I also want to thank you for your courage to stand strong for the kids. And I think... I don't want the meltdown, that you call it, to discourage you from being passionate for the

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

kids of the State of Illinois. So, thank you for your apology and thank you for your passion."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 3861, Mr. Smiddy. Please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3861, a Bill for an Act concerning

finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy."

- Smiddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3861 will ensure that the State of Illinois will purchase or lease vehicles assembled here in the United States. This legislation will not require vehicles to be made by the big three auto companies here in the United States or by the Uni… United Auto Workers. As long as the vehicle is assembled in the United States, Illinois will be able to purchase or lease this vehicle. I would ask for your support. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Osmond for an announcement."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the record reflect that Representative Wheeler has left for the day."

Speaker Lang: "Record will so reflect. Mr. Sandack on the Bill." Sandack: "Thank you. A few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Mike, we had a lively debate in Labor yesterday, and it was enlightening. I know what you're trying to do, and I support what you're trying to do. But we're clear here, this isn't just a preference for American products, this is a mandate, correct?"

Smiddy: "Yes, it is."

Sandack: "And that mandate apparently comes at the expense, so says GM, of GM. Which is an American-made company, which

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

assembles cars in the states and foreign countries. And of course, is a strong union company. You heard the testimony from GM yesterday, correct?"

Smiddy: "Yes, I did."

- Sandack: "All right. And there was some pointed discussion. Their opinion is that this boxes them out of being able to competitively bid on... on cars and vehicles for the State of Illinois. You heard that too, right?"
- Smiddy: "Yes, I did. The… what I would say though is three of the four vehicles that they did talk about are now currently being made in the United States."
- Sandack: "Well, they clearly disagreed with you. And unfortunately neither you nor I are a... are capable of telling a manufacturer where they manufacture or assemble cars. They will tell us that. And I... and I heard you, and I heard the... your proponents take issue, but the GM sponsor... or GM representative clearly said that this hurts them. And what bothers me is... is we're going beyond a preference of saying 'buy American' or 'buy American products that are assembled in the states'. Heck, I'd put a preference on Illinois products if we could do that. But I think this well-intended Bill actually has an unintended consequence to American... American company that's strongly pro-union..."

Smiddy: "Well, to your..."

Sandack: "...and I think we should listen to them."

Smiddy: "...to your point, Sir. If we would just limit it to Illinois, it would take General Motors out of the equation altogether because they do not have a manufacturing or assembly plant in Illinois."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Sandack: "Well, my point is a preference over a mandate. Because I think when you mandate requirements for best bidding practices, you ... you invariably take certain potential winning bidders out of the equation. So, my preference is for a preference over a mandate. And I'm holding, Mike, a letter from the Council General from the Country of Australia, which takes great umbrage with your Bill. Not you personally, but the consequences of it because, surprise, with GM manufactures cars in Australia. And there are union workers there, and here, that assemble and manufacture vehicles and they'd like to be in the bidding process. Irrespective of whether it's assembled in the states, or in a free country like Australia, which is a great trading partner of our countries. Has it occurred to you that the potential downside of your Bill is actually to thwart international trade amongst friendly free market companies ... countries?"
- Smiddy: "With the economy that we have here in the United Sates, I believe that if we assemble these vehicles here in the United States, it does nothing but help our families and American workers. That's why I have put... brought this Bill forward. And with all due respect to Australia, they are not employing American workers."
- Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of the Gentleman's proposition, but not in the manner in which he executes it. This has an unintended consequence. To my strongly, fiercely pro-union brethren, on both sides of the aisle, be under no misapprehension. This Bill boxes out GM from being able to compete for bids, for vehicles in the state. And also, be mindful of the fact that many

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

municipalities bid though the state's bidding processes. So, this filters down to different units of government, including towns, municipalities, and cities. This is a well-intended, but misguided effort. This Bill ought to be a preference and not a mandate. Please think through your vote and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Ives: "Representative Smiddy, have you actually looked into whether or not this violates any trade agreements we have with foreign countries?"

Smiddy: "From my understanding, it does not, no."

- Ives: "Have you actually talked to people who would be knowledgeable about that subject? And do you understand whether or not we violate any trade agreements with this Bill?"
- Smiddy: "I have spoken with both AFL-CIO and the UAW and they feel that it does not violate."
- Ives: "I... you know, those are abs... those are the union sources. Have you talked to people in terms of international trade? Have you talked to anybody at the... you know, State Department that deals with trade initiatives? Do you know whether not this is going to be legal?"
- Smiddy: "I have not talked to anybody at the State Bar... Department."

Ives: "Okay."

Smiddy: "No, I have not."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Essentially, what this Bill has the potential of doing is really starting a trade war. What type of message do we send to our trading partners where we say we're not going to allow the purchase of any vehicles that were assembled outside of the United States? I think it sends a really poor message. I think that we could ... we could have Caterpillar be in jeopardy here. Why doesn't Australia come back and say we're not going to buy any Caterpillar equipment at all unless it's assembled in Australia. Or how about Japan says, we're not going to buy any other ... any item at all that unless it's assembled in Japan. This Bill is not well thought out from ... in terms of economic development and trade. Illinois, just as a matter of fact, placed fifth among 50 states in total exports last year with over 68 billion in international shipments. Trade is... supports almost 1.6 million jobs in Illinois in 2011, or 22 percent of total jobs. Twenty-four percent of all Illinois manufacturing workers, in Illinois, depend on exports for their jobs. In 2010, 245 thousand people in Illinois were employed by affiliates of companies that are at least 50 percent foreign ornd ... owned. I sit on the International Trade and Commerce Committee, we had extensive discussions about our ability to trade, and how important it is to our economy in Illinois. This Bill absolutely sends the wrong message to every single one of our trading partners, we... when we tell them we will not accept your pow... prop... your products unless they are manufactured in the United States. Additionally, what was brought out in committee is you could actually have the state purchase nonunion assembled vehicles that came out of Tennessee, they

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

are from foreign companies like Toyota, Volkswagen, and that would be just fine for procurement. So, this does the opposite of what's intended. And I think you have the potential to... to first of all, you may be legally violating trade agreements. We don't know that. But its potent... the potential's out there. And #2, you could be starting a trade war. And would... that's not something we'd want to get involved in when exports are a huge part of many companies that supply a lot of jobs and income to the State of Illinois. I really urge you to think about this again, go back to the drawing board. And please, I urge the rest of the Body to vote 'no' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Reis: "Representative, what kind of vehicle do you drive?" Smiddy: "I drive a General Motors vehicle."

Reis: "Where was it made?"

Smiddy: "Wisconsin."

Reis: "You sure?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Reis: "I've seen this Bill a number of times over my 10 years, and I use to drive a Chevy Venture and a Chevy Uplander, and I would always get comments from people saying, hey, Reis, union made vehicle you got there. Most of those vehicles are made in Canada. White Chevy Venture, white Chevy Uplander, about as American as you can get. Made in Canada. I bet half the vehicles in this chamber are made in a foreign country. GM, Ford, Dodge, Chrysler, American icon names, made in other

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

countries. On the flipside, a big chunk of my district works in Toyota in Princeton, Indiana. Sounds foreign, American made cars. What is the most popular vehicle used for police cars?"

Reis: "And probably Crown Victoria is pretty close to the top?" Smiddy: "Not anymore, no. It's the Ford Interceptor and it's made

right in Chicago."

Reis: "Okay. Well, over the years this Bill's been debated, Crown Victoria was #1, and Crown Victoria's are not made here. What about motorcycles?"

Smiddy: "They are actually made by Harley Davidson. And they are all made within the United States."

Reis: "All police motorcycles are made by Harley Davidson?"

Smiddy: "State... the State Police, yes."

Reis: "Okay. Any boats?"

Smiddy: "Not to my knowledge, no."

Reis: "DNR, would your Bill cover boats?"

Smiddy: "It would not cover boats, no."

Reis: "Okay. Ladies and Gentleman of the House, to the Bill. The other day we heard a comment from one of the speakers that we're just property tax panders. Well, this is another pandering Bill. You got to buy this vehicle because it was made in the United States. It reduces competition, it drives up costs. A lot of times you don't have a dealership, a local dealership that could work on these vehicles. I don't have a Toyota dealership anywhere near me. I'd like to buy one, but I don't have a place to get it worked on. You're… you're

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

reducing competition. You're reducing... increasing costs with this and your just pandering to something for legislative purchases... purposes. I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Kay: "Thank you. Mike, are you familiar with J.D. Powers?"

Smiddy: "Yes, I am."

Kay: "Did you happen to see where General Motors ranked, with respect to J.D. Powers?"

Smiddy: "No, but I'm sure probably towards the top."

Kay: "Yeah. In fact towards the top in all of their product lines. Is that not correct?"

Smiddy: "I haven't seen the actual study, Sir, but..."

Kay: "Did you consider that before you wrote your... your Bill?" Smiddy: "Yes. And I believe that General Motors has 12 different assembly plants in the United States as well that we could be purchasing these vehicles from."

Kay: "Okay. When did the Ford Interceptor that... that Chicago just purchased start being produced?"

Smiddy: "Not exactly sure when the ... when they started ... "

Kay: "Just... just recently, wasn't it? Yeah."

Smiddy: "It may have, yes."

Kay: "Have you seen <u>Consumer Reports</u> lately on automobiles and how they rank?"

Smiddy: "Not recently. No, Sir. how can I help?"

Kay: "Would you think that General Motors ranked pretty high?"
Smiddy: "I am sure that both... I'm sure the Ford Interceptor rate...
ranked fairly high too on these."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Kay: "Well, as a matter of fact, the Ford Interceptor isn't ranked yet because it's too new. But at the top of the list are the products that would be comparable to the Charger that's used and other GM products that now are used. And so, what I... I guess, I'm saying is that these are highly rated products that are not only purchased by the state, but also purchased and sold through at least 50 dealerships that I have a copy of, in the State of Illinois, who you're saying I'd like to take your business away. And I'm not sure that's really what you want you want to do. But I'd like to ask you a couple other questions. Are you familiar with free trade zones?"

Kay: "And is there a free trade zone in Marysville, Ohio?" Smiddy: "Well, not being from Ohio, I don't know, Sir."

Smiddy: "I'm very familiar with them. Yes, Sir."

Kay: "Well, how about... well, there is. How about Princeton, Indiana, is there one there?"

Smiddy: "Again, not being from Indiana, Sir, I'm not sure."

Kay: "And of course, there they build Nissans in Smyrna, Tennessee, and they build Hondas in... in Marysville. So, I'll... I'll just tell you likewise they have a free trade zone in San Antonio, which is a Toyota facility. And they have free trade zones in just about every manufacturing facility that I'm aware of in the United States that builds, what you would consider to be foreign made products, but yet, have they are manufactured, including engine parts, right here in the United States of America by United States workers. So, my question is, are we trying to pit one worker against another here, one American against another?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Smiddy: "Absolutely not. That's why we're saying that it doesn't have to be made by UAW members. It can be made by folks in Indiana, Texas, Tennessee, Kentucky, where those individuals are not union workers yet, those vehicles are assembled in the United States."
- Kay: "Well, let me ask you this, I... and I didn't get an answer in committee the other day 'cause I think someone cut you off, but isn't it important to you to understand where the wealth resides with respect to the sale of a product? And indeed, doesn't General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler enjoy recouping and keeping wealth in America?"
- Smiddy: "Well, I know a few years ago, because of the auto industries' issue, the Federal Government had to bail them out with several billion dollars. And I think the way that they should reward the government and the United States, is to build products here in the United States to help out American workers and American families."
- Kay: "So, you don't... you really wouldn't mind if Honda was purchased, or Toyota was purchased, or maybe Nissan was purchased over a General Motors product?"
- Smiddy: "If they are assembled by an American worker, as my Bill states, we are not precluding those manufacturers."
- Kay: "Okay. To... to the Bill. This is probably, in the Representative's mind, a good Bill because it says buy American, and I think that's been tried and tri... and run before in a number of different industries. I think Walmart ran with that idea for a number of years and found out that didn't work so well because they very quickly converted over to filling their racks of... their stores with things that were

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

purchased in Mexico and Australia and the Philippines, in Vietnam and so on and so forth. But I guess my... my issue here, folks, and I'm going... I'm going to suggest that you vote 'no' today, is that gives all appearances that we're pitting one American against another. We're saying one product that has an exceptionally high rate in J.D. Powers and <u>Consumer</u> <u>Reports</u>, because it comes from Australia with the profits staying right here in the United States of America is no good. And I think that's just simply wrong. It's bad thinking. And I'd re... I'd request... urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Harris, D.: "Representative, help me understand... I was not in committee, so help me understand in reading the synopsis and then als... and then reading the wording of the Amendment. The Amendment says that 'the vehicle has to have a VIN number that begins with the #1, the #4, or the #5. What does that mean?"
- Smiddy: "That would mean that they are... those vehicles are assembled within the United States."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. We keep using the word assembled, which I understand, but the summary that's in... on the LIS system, says that the agency must have a vehicle i... must have a vehicle identification number indicating that the vehicle was manufactured in the United States. Are we talking manufacture or we talking assemble?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Smiddy: "Final assembly. Coming off the line. Because we know that some of the parts are brought over from other places. As long as the final assembly is here, within the United States, and comes off of the line that would qualify and..."

Harris, D.: "So does the..."

Smiddy: "...that's where the VIN number would be."

Harris, D.: "...does your Amendment specifically... does that... do those VIN numbers specifically mean just assembly?"

Smiddy: "Yes, it does. It ... they are assembled here. Yes, Sir."

Harris, D.: "Has nothing to do with manufacturing. This could be... the parts could be manufactured in Mexico, Canada, Korea, Japan, anywhere, but they have to be assembled here?" Smiddy: "Yes. That is correct, Sir."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Well, thank you for the clarification. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill, if I may just very briefly. I understand that he... I assume that he's trying to help the labor forces here in the United States. I will tell you that ... the mat ... the auto company that I think is most impacted here is General Motors. And General Motors, at the time of the ... the sort of the collapse of the auto industry during our great recession, was of the big three, the one that I think was most supportive of making sure that the workers and their unions were part of the process of protecting them. The Bill itself, I think, sends a terrible message. Absolutely sends a terrible message as to what we want to do here, by way of attracting business in the State of Illinois. Specifically, this is just General Motors, I think aimed at them. This message comes across loudly and clearly, and I think hurts ... just not the large manufacturers, but hurts the local dealers

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

that bid on these contracts, and removes them from the ability to bid on the contracts of selling vehicles to... to the State of Illinois. Don't think this Bill is moving in the right direction by way of helping our business climate in the State

of Illinois. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will... the record reflect that we are excusing Representative Tryon for the day."

Speaker Lang: "Record will reflect that. Representative Nekritz." Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Nekritz: "Representative, it's my... you know, there's been a lot of discussion about Australia and some other... some other countries, Canada is in fact our largest trading partner. And my understanding is that when automobiles in Michigan are constructed, they go back and forth between Canada and the U.S. a couple dozen times while they're being... while they're being built. What would this Bill do to those kinds of automobiles?"

Smiddy: "Basically, if they're assembled here in the United States, in the Michigan plants, they are okay to purchase."

Nekritz: "Well, but they... but... that's what I don't understand. If they're... because, mine again, just from what I understand from meeting with Canadian Representatives and talking with them, is that the vehicle goes back and forth across the border, again, a couple dozen times while it's being assembled.

Smiddy: "Yes."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Nekritz: "So, I don't know what that... I don't know how this Bill accounts for that."

- Smiddy: "It's... it's final assembly. So, if... once the vehicle is completely built and comes off the line, that's... wherever it comes off the line at, at final assembly, that's where it... it's either made in the... assembled in Canada or in the United States, Michigan."
- Nekritz: "So parts are assembled or there's the... how, you know, I certainly don't know anything about cars. But if there's a big chunk of the undercarriage, for lack of a better word, that gets assembled in Canada and then comes back to the U.S. for final assembly, Canada can still do that, we can still put that in our car and it would still qualify under this?" Smiddy: "Absolutely."
- Nekritz: "Okay. So, I mean, I still have some concerns about the impact on our, again, out largest trading partner, Canada, 'cause they're very sensitive to these kinds of things. And you know, want to make sure that that trading partner of ours, who not only participates with us in building cars, but sends us a lot of energy and... and pollution free energy that we maintain that relation... that we maintain that relationship in a very steady and thoughtful way. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative, I do appreciate what you're trying to do. I'm from the Decatur, Illinois, area where we have... in January had 14 percent unemployment. So, I think if... for the last 30 years, since what I called a great recession of '82, you've seen my hometown's population decline. You've seen, and just

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

in the last five years, we've seen 3 thousand jobs just leave Macon County. I say that because I certainly understand what you are trying to do, but I will not support your Bill and I'll tell you why. See, I just got a call from my Chevy dealer, and he says in... in Decatur, Illinois, we sell 150 Chevys that are about, he says 75 percent domestic content to the State of Illinois. So, if your Bill is enacted, we're going to lose that contract in Macon County, and we're going to be out at least 12 jobs. So, it'd make my community's unemployment higher. So, again, I want to stress that I certainly appreciate what you're trying to do. I certainly think we'd all be much better if we buy American, but I don't think your Bill is on target. So, I will be voting 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I certainly appreciate what the Representative is trying to do, but I think the debate on the floor has shown a lot of the unintended consequences that could be because of the Bill. And if anything would endanger anything about jobs and the economy in the State of Illinois right now, I wouldn't want to endanger that because we already have one of the most unfriendliest business climates. You can ask anybody, anywhere. I've heard from five different groups about this Bill, and how negative it would be on the job climate in Illinois, no matter what it does to the cars. I mean, Representative Nekritz brought out points about going back and forth. So, does it just mean when the final part goes in and it gets imprinted 'Made in the U.S.A.', that it didn't go

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

back and forth five times in-between? But I understand what you're doing, I mean, I'm pro-American. I've bought an American car all my life, never owned a foreign car. But I just care about our economy and brining jobs back. And in that way, I couldn't support the Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

- Reboletti: "Representative, I drive a 2008, Chevy Impala. Which I purchased in Elmhurst, when Elmhurst still had a Chevy dealer that wasn't shut down by the Federal Government in their consolidation. Is that an American car? Because that car was, I believe, assembled in Canada. But like Representative Mitchell spoke about a few moments ago, has mostly American parts. Did I buy an American car or did I not buy an American car? Can you help me with that, Representative?"
- Smiddy: "Well, since 2008, they've actually brought the Impala back and it's actually assembled now in Detroit. So, it is an American car."
- Reboletti: "But mine wasn't, Representative. And I'm just tell... telling you that, whatever year it was assembled, it was assembled outside the United States. Assuming it was assembled here, if the majority of the parts are manufactured in the United States, but it's manufactured elsewhere, is that still an American car?"
- Smiddy: "It's... it's done by an American company, but it was assembled somewhere else. So, American workers did not as... fine... did not have a final assembly of that product."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Reboletti: "But... but numerous American workers, like the ones in the Village of Addison, which is a... the fifth largest manufacturing base in the state, an industrial park, there are numerous specialty manufacturers there that solely provide for car manufacturers. So, aren't those considered still American jobs because those manufacturers, those employees, are making products and parts that go in the vehicles? Doesn't that count, Representative?"
- Smiddy: "It... it will not affect those individuals because they would still be selling to the auto manufacturers to assemble their vehicles."
- Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I quess sometimes what's old becomes new again. And this isn't the first time that this Bill has been tried out and attempted and passed out of this chamber. And I would suspect that many of us, who think we drive American cars, I quess, by this legislation may not drive American cars. So, if your car has American products in it, mostly produced here, but it's assembled elsewhere, it's not an American car. Maybe we should amend the Bill to require that Legislators also have to buy American made, or I guess American assembled cars, or state employees. However, in this global economy, it's much more complicated than that. So I have grave reservations about what this actually does, and the law of unintended consequences. I don't want to put people out of work that work in those manufacturing plants in Addison for the benefit of somebody else in another community, or another state, because you're just shifting one American job for another. And I appreciate what the Sponsor's trying to accomplish, but this isn't as simple as, a vehicle is not

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

assembled and are the products... are not from this country, so therefore we want to make sure we buy only American products. That's where we're getting this... into this conundrum. So, respectfully, I would request a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "We still have spore… four speakers remaining on this Bill: Mr. Costello, Davidsmeyer, Brauer, and Representative Tracy. Mr. Costello."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I've heard many people in this chamber debating different issues about the Bill. You'll see I'm a chief cosponsor. I see this Bill as a jobs Bill. Many people, if not everyone in this Body, in a campaign, has talked about jobs. Creating jobs in the United Sates. Let's not forget a few short years ago the American taxpayers bailed out GM and Chrysler. I see this as creating jobs in the United States and those moneys going back to the American taxpayers that bailed out the companies that we're talking about. Lastly, we also talk about our economy. One of the issues we have as a country right now, we have about a 67 or 68 percent service economy. Manufacturing jobs have left this country, good-paying, manufacturing jobs. Let's work on bringing those manufacturing jobs back to our country. Again, I look at this as a jobs Bill. Putting Americans back to work. I request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Tracy."

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

Tracy: "Representative Smiddy, in committee we talked about several different things. And I... I don't know that we... we

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

addressed... have you made inquiry to General Motors as to why they would assemble motor vehicles in Canada or Australia?" Smiddy: "No, I did not."

- Tracy: "And certainly as... as many speakers previously have said, we understand how im... vital it is that we buy American-made products. However, as I mentioned in committee, I'm very concerned that we are overlooking that we have perhaps Illinois products that are generated here in Illinois. So, what I ask of you is... is are you aware if there are auto parts made by... in Illinois that are used in the assembly of some of those products that you want to... to ban from state procurement?"
- Smiddy: "Well, from a previous speaker, there are some products that are made in Illinois that eventually will be put on to these vehicles and products."
- Tracy: "So, do you think it's good precedent to ban Illinois products, Illinois job creators, from using their parts to be assembled in an overall product, regardless of where it's made?"
- Smiddy: "I... with due respect, Ma'am, I'm not banning these products. These products; will be still sold to the manufacturers to be put on those vehicles. What I'm a... simply asking is that the final assembly of the vehicle be made in America."
- Tracy: "But isn't it true that your legislation, in an effort to benefit all Americans, might actually hurt some Illinoisans?"
- Smiddy: "The way I guess I can respond to that is, a few short years ago we had plants of less than 100 workers in Belvidere

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

making Chrysler and Dodge products, today, we have 6600 workers there. So, we have helped the economy of Illinois." Tracy: "Well, what do you say to the guy that gets laid off from a parts assembly line in Illinois?"

- Smiddy: "What I'm saying is, is that there are more than just one automobile manufacturer that will be purchasing these products from that... from that company. We have no other opponents of the 'Big 3'. Chrysler or Ford are not opposed to this piece of legislation. And I am confident that they are probably purchasing those products for their vehicles as well."
- Tracy: "Well, we went over some of the vehicles that are assembled out of country, and Ford vans are not assembled in this country. Is that right?"

Smiddy: "I... I believe that they are not, no."

- Tracy: "And Chrysler minivans are not assembled in this country. Is that correct?"
- Smiddy: "I would have to look, but you… you could be correct, Ma'am."
- Tracy: "And what do we do whenever an agency has a particular concern and can't find... or feels that a vehicle assembled out of country better meets their specific safety or performance needs?"
- Smiddy: "From looking at the manufacturers, I believe that that... we would be able to accommodate them with some other type of a vehicle with everything that is being made here and assembled here in the United States."
- Tracy: "And also, in the legislation it says that state cannot rent or use vehicles that are made out of the county. So how

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

do you think that it will be implemented whenever we have to rent vehicles? Will... how will that be implemented?"

- Smiddy: "As you know in committee, Ma'am, we had a representative from Enterprise Rental Vehicles there. And we had made the commitment to amend the legislation once it gets over to the Senate, to say that if it's a lease it would be one year, anything less than that they would consider it a rental because rentals go from one, three, five and maybe into a month. So, it would not hinder that legisla… would not hinder those companies. And once we do that, the rental company would take their opposition off of the Bill."
- Tracy: "Do we know how many g... General Motor employees we have in the State of Illinois?"
- Smiddy: "General Motors? There's no assembly plants in gen... in Illinois..."
- Tracy: "So..."
- Smiddy: "...for General Motors."
- Tracy: "...and... and then what about General Motor car dealers in the State of Illinois?"
- Smiddy: "I'm not sure how many we have, Ma'am."
- Tracy: "And what about the employees of all the car dealers that are impacted within Illinois?"
- Smiddy: "Ma'am, as... as again, this is not going to impact them as much as what we think, because still every single one of us could go into those dealerships and purchase those vehicles. Not everyone is a fleet dealer. We feel that this helps out the economy of Illinois and it helps out the three manufacturers that we do have here that employ over 12 thousand of our Illinois workers."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Tracy: "And as we mentioned, there were... are about 300 vehicles in our present state fleet that don't comply with this under your Bill. Do we know how many overall b... vehicles we have in our fleet?"
- Smiddy: "I do not know how... what our total is, but again, it would not... the State of Illinois would not have to get rid of those vehicles. It's only on vehicles, that once this legislation would be signed, going forward that this would be implemented on. So, these vehicles are fine that are currently in our fleet."
- Tracy: "So, really, we're passing a... you're asking that a Bill be passed that we really don't know what benefit we'll have, what unintended consequences we'll have. It... it's just kind of ban of all out of country assembled vehicles that may contain Illinois manufactured parts, going to impact some Illinois employees that work for car dealerships and the like and... and this would be something that you think would be favorable for us to be dealing with right now?"
- Smiddy: "I think the benefit that we have, it's helping out American workers and in particular, the 12 thousand employees at the three manufacturers that we have here in Illinois. And I... I know that you had stated in the... in our committee that you would like to see... you had mentioned just limiting it to Illinois. I'd be more than willing to work with you on that Bill, but right now, we're trying to just not limit it just to Illinois, but just too all Ill... all American workers. And that's why I bring this Bill forward."
- Tracy: "Well, thank you. I... again, I appreciate the speaker's intent; however, to the Bill. I would just say we're setting

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

a horribly dangerous bad precedent that is going to put a... potentially impact Illinois workers and sets a very dangerous tone of what we're doing in Illinois when we so desperately need jobs, when our unemployment is so high. If we look at... at this type of legislation, it... it just makes no sense. With all due respect, to the person bringing it forward, I just... I would urge... that we take a look at what kind of precedent we would be setting and... and vote 'no' on this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Martwick: "Representative, there's 300 vehicles in Illinois that would be affected by this?"

Smiddy: "There are 300..."

Martwick: "That we own."

Smiddy: "...currently in the fleet ..."

Martwick" "Right."

Smiddy: "...that will not be affected by this because it would only be affected... the only affected vehicles will be going forward for new purchases."

Martwick: "Right. And so, that's... but currently, we have 300 that wouldn't comply, right?"

Smiddy: "That is correct."

Martwick: "Okay. And do we buy tho ... that those same 300 every year?"

Smiddy: "No."

Martwick: "Do you know? Okay. Do you know what the total amount of General Motors cars sold in... worldwide was last year?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Smiddy: "I don't, but I..."

Martwick: "I just read it was 9.71 million vehicles."

Smiddy: "Pretty good."

- Martwick: "And so, I understand the concern about affecting jobs. But this is potentially part of 300 vehicles, at most 300 vehicles, if we were to buy them all new next year, which I don't imagine we'd do, but I don't know. So this would affect... I might be doing my math wrong here, but is this three tenthousandths of one percent of their total car sales worldwide? I think that's the math I did. I'm... I might be wrong with my decimal points here."
- Smiddy: "You're probably a little bit smarter with the numbers than I am, so I'll take your word for it."
- Martwick: "Okay. To the Bill. I understand the concern with... with what we potentially might be doing. But in the practical reality of it, what we are doing is we're sending a message. We're sending a message that we need American jobs here, here in our country. And we've had this real outsourcing problem and we encourage our partners to provide jobs here in the United States and not outsource them. This will not affect General Motors bottom line, not even a little. We could affect General Motors bottom line more by simply deciding, when we purchase the vehicles, to just purchase from another company, which we have the freedom to do. We are not locked into buying vehicles from them. This is just a message to say, let's bring jobs back to America. Let's put our neighbors back to work. If we do that, we'll solve a lot more of the financial problems we have in our state than anything else. This is a good Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy to close."

- Smiddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is about helping Americans. It's about making sure that they are able to go to work every day, feed their families, and have a good job to support their families. This helps Illinois and it helps the workers of America. I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brauer. Please take the record. On this question,, there are 73 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5815, Representative Ives. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5815, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

- Ives: "Mr. Speaker. This allows an individual over the age of 18 confic... convicted of a Class C misdemeanor, other than a minor traffic offense, to expunge the records of his or her arrest two years after the completion of the sentence. There was no opposition in committee. And I ask for 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? Have all voted who wish? Cavaletto, Kosel. Please take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, an announcement from the Chair. We will begin to use the timer. Most of these Bills are on Short Debate and for those

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Bills that are on Short Debate, we will follow the rules. The next Bill in order is House Bill 5707, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5707, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In 2007, we passed a law creating a requirement that school districts adopt policies on bullying. 2010, we updated that, defining bullying, and creating a task force to study the issue and make recommendations for best practices. The School Bullying Prevention Task Force recommended that Illinois law be amended to provide clear guidance to schools for the evec ... effective prevention and intervention of bullying, including quiding ... quidance around what bullying policies need to include. I regularly hear from parents from all over the state, who are frustrated, frightened, and often heartbroken. Their kids represent a huge cross section of our community. They are targeted because of disability, because of race, because of gender, because of weight, because of religion, and yes, because of sexual orientation. What they have in common is a lack of support and response from their schools and their school districts, who often express surprise that there is a problem, and suggest that we just need to let ... remember that kids will be kids. And they... or they simply say they don't know how to help them. These schools, these communities, these parents and these kids need tools and information to help solve the problem. This Bill does not mandate programming, assemblies of any kind. This gives local

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

communities the tools they are asking for and will help us ensure that our schools are safe places of learning, not fear. Under the existing law, and this law, no student would be forced to act, or abandon their sincerely held religious beliefs, or lose their protected right to free speech, as guaranteed in the Constitution. I welcome your questions. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

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

- Morrison: "First of all, Mr. Speaker, could we take this off Short Debate, please?"
- Speaker Lang: "At your request, the Bill will be removed from Short Debate, but I will leave the timer on, Sir."
- Morrison: "Okay. Thank you. Representative Cassidy, there are, according to my analysis, there are a number of opponents that include the Illinois School Management Alliance, ED-RED, LEND, SCOPE, HSDO. Why... why are they opposed?"
- Cassidy: "We have been working with the School Management Alliance. They were under the impression that since this was based on the best practices model of New Jersey, that many of the funded portions of the New Jersey model were included. They are not. None of the man... the mandates that were... that have costs, that... that come out of the New Jersey model are included in this. We'll continue to work with... with the School Management Alliance as we have already. We made some... some changes in adva... up to this point. They continue to have some concerns about how the data will be collected and... and shared, and we'll continue to work with them on that."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Morrison: "And that's another question I was going to ask actually, is... is according to the Bill, there is going to be a lot of data collected by teachers, by staffers, counselors, other administrators. How... you know, schools are already under tremendous amount of burden just teaching the children the curriculum itself. And obviously, no one's... no one in this Body, no one in this state is going to support bullying, but isn't there an undue burden on those administrators and teachers in... in collecting all this data?"
- Cassidy: "I don't believe so. It's very simply following a set quideline for how they'll be reported. If we actually im... if we follow uniform steps when a ... when a bullying incident is reported, that collection of data is... is automatic. The... the problem comes, and one of the most heartbreaking stories I've heard, was from a family whose son had just made his second suicide attempt, and had been bullied out of two schools. When he... when he left the second school, he was told, and his family was told, that no other family had made a complaint like this. Within two days of word getting out about this child's attempt on his own life, they heard from four other families who had been bullied out of that same school, who had been told the exact same thing. This is nothing short of victim blaming. We need to know the size and scope of this problem so that we can do a better job of protecting our kids and our families."
- Morrison: "Thank you for that. I... on page 9... And by the way, Representative, I come... I come with this issue with an interesting perspective. Obviously, I'm a... I'm a father of two, I've been in school myself, I've been a teacher..."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison, your time has expired. Can you bring your comments to a close, Sir?"
- Morrison: "I'll have further questions if someone on my side will yield their time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Representative Morrison."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

- Morrison: "Thank you. And actually, Representative, I... I hope that we can talk about this further. But I've been on both sides of... of bullying. I've been bullied. And I'm ashamed to say it, I have been a bully, when I was considerably younger. And one thing that I thought was... that is very, very important is parental involvement. And in page 9 of your Bill, parents are... are taken out of, or there's... there's a provision that you strike out. Every school in this state, whether it's private, whether it's public, charter, has to communicate their antibullying policy with the parents. I'm just wondering why you would take that provision out of your Bill. Shouldn't parents have knowledge about what the antibullying program is in their school?"
- Cassidy: "It... it is moved to a separate area where the policy is shared and parents are automatically involved at the time of an incident, whether... whether we're talking about a bully or a victim. Additionally, this policy, this Bill, acknowledges the need to respond to bullies and the... and the issues that have brought them to that place in a way that is... that is restorative. Because it recognizes that... that children who

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

are bullying, frequently are coming from a place of hurt, and... and recognizes that they are not monsters."

Morrison: "Could you… could you explain that restorative process, or just give an example of… of the restorative process?"

- Cassidy: "Very simply, it... it encourages rather than exclusionary and harsh disciplinary measures that... that the bully be looked at as well. Not simply as the attacker, but as... as a whole human being in need of... of support as well. And that is the meaning of restorative justice. Restorative justice means to restore all parties to wholeness."
- Morrison: "Okay. And there's… there's definitely value in that. But I know… I see my time is winding down here. I do have some additional questions if someone else on my side would yield time."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. I spoke with the Representative yesterday. In the past, we have worked very hard together on some previous bullying Bills. The state does have a bullying policy in place. There is no question that the state needs to continue to work on that. The General Assembly, if you look at the opponents, you might not know the reason they oppose this Bill. It's not just because it's an unfunded mandate, but there are many Bills moving through the General Assembly on this particular issue because it is an important issue, and we recognize it. But they're all in conflict with each other. They require a variety of responses that are in conflict, some suspensions, some expulsion issues moving through the General Assembly. I also shared with the Representative that my youngest son was a victim of intense

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

bullying. This Bill, a collection of data, would not have made his life any better. So, while I think we have to work collectively for a response to this in the quickest way possible, I don't think at the end of the day that this Bill is going to improve the lives of the victims to the extent that we would like it to. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Tom Morrison." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison for two minutes."

- Morrison: "Okay. Thank you. And I'm... I'm going to bring to a close here. But Representative Cassidy, why... why is there not an opt out provision for those who would have a religious objection to school assemblies? I know that your Bill does not mandate content. But... but there are school assemblies that could be quite offensive to someone who's got a sincere religious belief. Why is there no opt out provision there?"
- Cassidy: "Well, first of all, as you said, this Bill does not in any way suggest an assembly of any kind to opt out of. Ultimately, schools decide what specific actions to take, what... how they want to implement their policies. And right now, as we speak, every day parents take their children out of programming that they find offensive, under the First Amendment. We restate First Amendment language that was put there at the request of the folks that are now asking for this opt out. The First Amendment language covers that need in a way that... that does the job. Opt out language of this sort... they are asking is simply unnecessary."
- Morrison: "Okay. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. As I said earlier, obviously, bullying is a serious issue in this state.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

The question is, how do we best address this problem? And I don't think this Bill accomplishes what... what we need to accomplish. But in addition to that, I think there... it has the potential of serious harm for students who have a sincere religious belief on why they would not... in terms of programming at schools. Obviously, this Bill doesn't mandate it. But I would just encourage the Body to go to the Illinois Family Institute website, illinoisfamily.org. There are videos there of a man named Dan Savage, well known speaker and author. He's the creator of the 'It Gets Better' program. And some of his programs, at some of our high schools, around the country, have just been incredibly offensive and in a sense, as the speaker, bullying those who disagree with the content. And for that reason I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conroy for two minutes."

Conroy: "To the Bill. When I was in high school, I was beat up twice. It wasn't the physical blows that I was left with, those were not as painful as the culture of fear that is created when you're bullied. It is something that traumatizes a person and it stays with you for life. And for that reason, having understood what that culture of fear is like, I would to thank this Representative for this legislation. And I'd like to encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis for two minutes."

Willis: "Thank you. To the Bill. Before I was a Legislator, I was... sat on a school board for 12 years. Part of my responsibility was to come up with a bullying policy for our school board when I was on the policy board. This is a great

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Bill. It goes and it brings together all of the components that are necessary to have a comprehensive bullying policy in place. Adding into that, evaluating and recording, and making sure that we have record of how that policy is implemented and what the outcomes are is truly important for evaluation purposes. It does no good to have something down on paper if it's not followed appropriately, if we don't make sure that those follow-ups are done. It is tragic and we hear this very often in the news that someone is beaten up or killed, part of a bullying policy and a parent comes on and says, I told the school there was a problem and nobody listened. This will help us to make sure we don't hear those things anymore. We'll have documentation. We'll have data that we can prevent that from happening. We can make sure that the policies are followed and that they are implemented where they need to be. Because of that and because of my past history of making part of this policy in my own local district, I would urge everyone to vote 'aye' on this. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams for two minutes." Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Williams: "Representative, I'm reviewing the list of proponents. In terms of people that have expertise on children and mental health regarding children, who is in support of this Bill?"

Cassidy: "Turning to the list. I have worked with the National Association of Social Workers, the Association of School Social Workers, the psychologists, the psychiatrists, every mental health profession is in support of this. This is... this is based on model law that was actually supported by... by a

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

very, very conservative majority in New Jersey. This model works and it is what our state needs."

- Williams: "Well, thank you. I think that's important to point out that the overwhelming... I think all the organizations committed to and with the expertise on mental health are in support. And the opponent, who's... is there just... I'm reading only one opponent? The Illinois Family Institute is opposed?" Cassidy: "They seem to be the most vocal opponent, yes."
- Williams: "Okay. Well, I only see one opponent listed. Just FYI, Family Institute's the only opponent. We've got all the science on the side of moving forward with a comprehensive

policy. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris. Leader Turner in the Chair."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. You know, I rise in support of this legislation Simply because th... no child should ever have to go to school in fear. No child should ever have to go to school and be diminished because of who he or she is, or what they believe. That this is a good, commonsense Bill that will protect all our children. And it will do it affirmatively. It will do it in advance. You know, we are all heartsick when we read on the newspaper, or turn on the TV almost every day now and see some child who has been bullied because of who they are, because of what they look like. Whether they're too big, whether they're too small. No one should have to live like that. We need to do better for our families. I urge everyone to vote 'yes' because this will protect all of our children. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kosel."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We each have analysis that are written by our staff and they don't always line up. I just want to let the Body know that the Republican analysis shows not only the Illinois Family Institute as opposed to this Bill, but the School Management Alliance, ED-RED, LEND, SCOPE and the Illinois High School Districts Association. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "Thank you to all of my colleagues for your questions, for your words of support. You know, when we were in committee, we were... we had parents share their heartfelt stories of... of fear and anguish and heartbreak. Students who... who were targeted because they were... they had disabilities and were tortured every day in school. Students who were... who were tormented because they were bi-racial. I too was bullied, not for the reason that probably 90 percent of this Body would suspect I was bullied. Nobody knew I was gay. But they knew that I loved going to church. They knew that I believed in God. They knew that I believed that I should have behave in a certain way for my God. And I got picked on mercilessly for that, and this Bill protects those very children. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie."

- Currie: "Thank you. Please let the record reflect that Representative Soto is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5707 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 DeLuca, Sullivan. Mr.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 64 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5707, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4304, Representative Will Davis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4304, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."

- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4304 is an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office. What it's attempting to do is to clean up the monitoring device driving permit, or affectionately called MDDP law, to allow offenders who only injure themselves to qualify for what is called a BAIID. And BAIID stands for Breath Alcohol Ignition Interlock Device. Currently, if you get a DUI, and are in an incident where someone is injured, you cannot qualify for one of the BAIID devices. This clarifies that if it is a first offense and you, meaning the driver, is the only one injured, you can qualify for the BAIID. Be more than happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4304 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 Harms. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 71 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 30... 4304, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Harms, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Harms: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "State your point."

- Harms: "Paging for me today, behinds me is Cassidy Stucki, Kayla Kusman, T.J. Eades, and they're accompanied by their teacher, up in the gallery, Amy Moreno. If we could welcome them to their Capital."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, and welcome to your Capitol. House Bill 5862, Representative Ives. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5862, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

- Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You heard the Floor Amendment on this yesterday. It amends the Freedom of Information Act to provide that the law enforcement and court records of juveniles chi... charged with county or municipal ordinance violations will not be subject to FOIA. It comes as an initiative of a police officer in my community who works with the youth in the high schools and had said youth... being actually solicited for services by lawyers getting that information through the city. So, I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5862 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 74 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5862, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Bill 4495, Representative Flowers. Out... Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4495, a Bill for an Act concerning minors. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4495 permits the court to place a 15 yearold youth in DCFS custody on the basis of delinquency adjudication, or the court find that in... incarceration of this youth would not be appropriate, and the youth cannot return home. So, as a result of the youth not being able to return home, and incarceration is not a place for him to be, DCFS would be able to place this youth in their custody. And I would urge an 'aye' vote. And would be more than happy to answer any questions. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4495 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 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4495, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hammond, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "Please state your point."

Hammond: "I would like the Body to join me in wishing a happy birthday to one of our very able staff members, Lori Hendren.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Lori's having a birthday today, but not a baby. Happy birthday."

Speaker Turner: "Happy birthday, Lori. Representative Osmond, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will you have the record reflect that Representative Brady is excused for the rest of the day." Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. House Bill 4207,

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4207, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 4207 addresses the issue of cyberbullying. Cyberbullying is an issue that's impacting our students with bullying, no longer on school property, but actually in the privacy of their own home, on social media, through text messages. And we're finding that this is having devastating effects on children. As we know that right now in the State of Illinois, every school has to have a bullying policy and procedure in place, but they can only enact that procedure if the incident happens on school property or with school property. What this Bill says is although a school cannot monitor outside activities, if an incident of bullying is brought to the school's attention and the school says that it ... it is within their purview, then they can enact the curry ... current bullying policy that they already have in place. If they find it's not in their purview, they can direct that person or that family where to go so they can find the help that is needed. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Sandack: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

- Sandack: "Laura, we had a nice chance to talk about this and I... I am impressed by your efforts on what you want to do. I have a couple questions. First, has law enforcement weighed in on this, and if not, have you sought the opinion of law enforcement, with respect to the confines and parameters of your Bill?"
- Fine: "I have not discussed this with law enforcement. Right now, all a family can do if their child is being bullied on social media, is go to law enforcement for help. This gives the family another avenue. It's not saying that they can't seek the help of law enforcement, it's saying they can try to go to the school first to see if they can get the tools that they need there."
- Sandack: "Well, I certainly appreciate that. And I understand you want to be a little expansive. My concerns, and I think the concerns of others, is that maybe fine line between what happens outside school and then all of a sudden bringing school into the equation, where, frankly, law enforcement is better suited to address the matter. So, please explain to me, if you can, how it is a school board or a school principal is supposed to differentiate from something that's totally unrelated to school activity and then them becoming involved in the process?"
- Fine: "And that's already in the bullying policy that's in place for the school. They have a series of questions to ask to find out if this is affecting the student's performance in school. If the child is no longer coming to school, if they're

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

afraid to come to school, it has to affect what's happening to that child on school property. Because even though the bullying might be taking place outside of school property, they're still facing their bully at school and how are... how is that impacting their performance and their ability to learn."

- Sandack: "Moving on a little bit. I... I see some of the opponents and the ACLU is one of them, and I suspect they're objection has to do with free speech in some potential unintended consequences that may be involved with your legislation. Have you had a chance to talk with them, and what is the crux of their continuing opposition?"
- Fine: "From the conversations I've had, their main concern is that the freedom of speech of the person who is doing the bullying."
- Sandack: "Well, can you elaborate a little more on that? Because obviously that doesn't necessarily suit... sit well. But at the same time, they're obviously concerned that there is overreach involved in your legislation, I assume."
- Fine: "That's not the conversation I had with them. It was only the reason of freedom of speech of the person who was saying the information on the social media that... that we had discussed."
- Sandack: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I... I'm impressed with the Sponsor's efforts and intentions. I just caution that we... we're seeking to expand something that may be beyond the parameters of school. Bullying at school, we've heard another measure, is something within the confines and parameters of the school, within their jurisdiction, and frankly, it's

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

their responsibility. Extending that beyond, I think pinches local law enforcement, potentially harms free speech and expands the universe of this situation where it may be only in the confine of local police authority. So, I urge some caution on this vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine to close."

- Fine: "Again, this is something that's happening to our children. We've seen the devastating effects of cyberbullying because once a message gets out there on social media, we don't know how many people it's going to reach. And unfortunately, we've seen victims of cyberbullying have to change schools. We've seen the very devastating effects of suicide as a reside... result of cyberbullying. This is an issue that's going on in other states. We've seen about a dozen other states pass similar policies and this is really victims' rights because if a child cannot learn in school because of something that is taking place, we need the school to be able to have the ability to either help a student in the school or guide them where to go outside of the school. And I ask for your support for this, for the victims who are the victims of bullying. Please, an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4207 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 the count of 85 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no', 0 voting
 'present'. House Bill 4207, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Bill 5894, Representative Durkin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5894, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is... comes... emanates from an issue which came to my attention from an incident that occurred in my legislative district last fall. In this particular situation, a young man was engaged in the sport of crossbow hunting and was cited by the Conservation Police for having a loaded crossbow on his ATV. This individual brought this to my attention and raised concerns about the Fourth Amendment issues related to this particular incident, which caused me to take a look at the Wildlife Code. And as I reviewed it, I was surprised that in that Code, the language it seemingly grants Conservation Police Officers plenary authority to conduct search and seizures on private land to enforce the Act. What I'm doing here, right now, if we would not have addressed that individual, the problem that individual had last fall with the crossbow, it was within plain view, but what this does is that this... this Bill in its amended form reflects the appropriate case law under the Open Fields Doctrine about issues regarding search and seizure for police officers, but mainly Conservation Police Officers in the course of the enforcement of the Wildlife Code. I'm willing to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Reboletti for two minutes."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd like to thank Leader Durkin for bringing this measure. And having had the opportunity to prosecute some of these cases that the Conservation Police worked on in Will County, I believe it's an appropriate and important measure to make sure that all of our law enforcement are under the same rules and laws and follow the same case law in the state and the United States. And that, there's no doubt that under the Fourth Amendment that we should be protected in our homes and in our curtilage. And I think that this measure speaks directly to that, that if an officer happens to be a Conservation Police Officer, they shouldn't be able to enter your home, when the Illinois State Police or the DuPage County Sheriff's office could not. And so this makes a great deal of common sense. These law enforcement officials shouldn't have any additional ability above and beyond this. And I have dealt with issues where some of those officers took great latitude, many years ago, with this ability and said that the Illinois statutes allowed them to do those things that other departments could not. I think this is finally time that we make sure that our law enforcement are on the same playing field and I would urge your support. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Phelps for two minutes."

Phelps: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Durkin: "Yes."

Phelps: "Leader Durkin, with all your hard work, now the Conservation Police and their lodge, they're okay with this Bill now, correct?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Durkin: "That's correct. They did slip it in favor. We met. It's a very healthy discussions. Last month..."

Phelps: "An... and I appreciate that."

- Durkin: "...about the whole issue of the parameters under the Fourth Amendment for CPOs. So, and I think that this Bill addresses their concerns. They are now in agreement."
- Phelps: "Great. And the Department of Natural Resources are now neutral, correct? I think they are?"

Durkin: "Yes."

Phelps: "I was just told by them. So, to the Bill. Leader Durkin, thank you for your hard work. I know this was a lot of controversy, but it really isn't. It's the right thing to do. You made it work. Congratulations. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams for two minutes." Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

- Williams: "First and foremost, can you define, it's been a while since I've been to law school, can you define the term 'curtilage'?"
- Durkin: "All right. Here we go. Well, you know what, I'm going to cite our United States Supreme Court that has decided what 'curtilage' means. And I'm going to quote a passage from the United States Supreme Court as it relates to the Open Fields Doctrine. Open fields does not provide the setting for those intimate activities that the Amendment is intended to shelter from government interference or surveillance. There is no specific special interest in protecting the privacy of those such as the cultivation of crops that occur in the open

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

fields. So, that is how the Supreme Court is defined 'curtilage'..."

Williams: "Okay. Thank you."

- Durkin: "...but the 'curtilage' is also defined in the statute, which is the area which bounds the private home, that area which we believe that the matters, as the Supreme Court stated, matters of intimate activities which you would seek to have those protected from the watchful eye."
- Williams: "Okay. Thank you. That's helpful, it's a fun word to say, I just wasn't sure what it meant. The prior speaker, as well as yourself in your introduction, mentioned or referenced this as an extreme example of Constitutional overreach. If that's the case, why has there never been a challenge to this provision before?"
- Durkin: "Well, interesting enough, there has been a challenge of the issue of the extent, and the… as I said earlier, the parameters that CPOs, which are Con… Conservation Police Officers and their ability to enforce the Wildlife Code. It's called <u>People v. Layton</u>, L-a-y-t-o-n it came out of the Central Illinois District. And basically, also took language from that opinion and incorporated it in this Bill, which did lay out the parameters that Conservation Police Officers must abide by to enforce the Code, pursuant to Open Fields Doctrine."
- Williams: "Okay. Well, I don't recall that being discussed, specifically, in committee, but fine. Final question..."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams, for one additional minute, we are on a timer."
- Williams: "Okay. Just one quick thing."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Turner: "Thank you."

Williams: "This came to your attention you said, through a constituent or..."

- Durkin: "A young man brought it to my attention, who was cited by the Conservation Police Officers in Lamont, Illinois, which happens to be part of my legislative district. And I thought it was a responsible thing to talk to this young man, and decided how we got to that point."
- Williams: "Okay. My concern... To the Bill. My concern on this Bill is we just got through passing a very comprehensive, at the courts direction, Concealed Carry Bill. And within that Bill there are numerous restrictions designed to protect the public's safety. And I would hope that we don't end up with Bills here in Springfield to address wha... when certain people might get a violation of those provisions. So, if we have the things in our statutes and laws to protect public safety, I don't think the best genesis for changing those laws is t... someone that's... something that stems out of a violation. So, I think we need to be wary moving forward. And I'll be voting 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks for two minutes." Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Franks: "Representative, I was just reading the analysis, and I'm... and I understand that you're trying to have the Conservation Police Officers held to the same standard as other law enforcement. That's my understanding of what you're trying to do with this. So, my question would be, what is the

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

standard for a search warrant for law enforcement? Is it reasonable suspicion or is it probable cause?"

Durkin: "Probable cause."

- Franks: "And... but with this wouldn't the standard only be reasonable suspicion and not probable cause. This would be a lesser standard?"
- Durkin: "No. At the end we state if you are… if you're in open fields, you don't need the search warrant. That is… Fourth Amendment doesn't protect but…"

Franks: "Sure, I get the open fields."

- Durkin: "...when we get into the... under the Code right now, if you read it, it will give... it gives CPOs, as I said earlier, plenary authority to enter buildings to be able to enforce the Wildlife Code. We're saying that, you need to have PC, probable cause, if you're going to enter on one's home or the exceptions that we... the common exceptions that occur, which we don't need the... the warrant."
- Franks: "That's what I wanted to make sure..."

Durkin: "It's a probable cause standard."

- Franks: "...that's what I wanted to make sure we kept the same standard. 'Cause I don't want somebody coming into my house who doesn't have warrant based on probable cause."
- Durkin: "No. Warrants, or if it's one of the enumerated exceptions, exigencies this... there's about seven or eight different exceptions to the warrant rule, under the Fourth Amendment, but we have not changed that. You are still the king of your castle, so to speak."
- Franks: "Yes. That's what I wanted to make sure, 'cause when I was reading this, I wasn't sure whether the reasonable sus...

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

suspicion standard was being substituted, but you cleared that up."

Durkin: "Correct..."

Franks: "Thank you."

Durkin: "You're welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Durkin, to close."

- Durkin: "Well, thank you. This has been a very healthy and lively debate. But again, you know, I think we often have situations where constituents or people in your district have had a certain matter that they disagree with. But that's what we do down here. And the... this case, this particular young man, I think will be very happy if we pass this Bill. And I appreciate his willingness to come forward and be brave enough to tell us about that unfortunate situation, which he did in Judiciary Committee a few weeks back. So, with that, I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5894 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', 5 voting 'no', 0 voting
 'present'. House Bill 5894, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House
 Bill 4360, Representative Jones, being carried by
 Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4360, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the re… House. This Bill is ba… an initiative of the Secretary of State, and is basically cleanup language. There is no… all the references to the insurance has been removed. There's no opposition currently on the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing..."

Mayfield: "Ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "...no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4360 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 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4360, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4956, Representative Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4956, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a initiative for the Village of Mundelein, in mine and Representative Sente's district. What this will allow is the village to acquire properties through quick-take powers. Ultimately, what we're doing is expanding a roadway. And embedded in the roadway expansion is going to be a waterline that's going to service the fire stations to increase capacity. And also, we are going to be improving signal traffics at the corner where the two... the high school and the

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

grade school meet to increase safety for our kids. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4956 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 Davidsmeyer, Will Davis, Jackson, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On the count of 74 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 4956, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4124, Representative Kelly Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4124, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4124 is based on another recommendation of the Illinois Family Law Study Committee. It amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act, and several related Acts, and states that in that Act that one of the underlying purposes is... of the Act is to recognize that in order to maximize the opportunity for every child to maintain and stren... strengthen the child's relationship with parents, the child's best interest may be served with a minimum amount of parenting time for each parent. That amount is 35 percent of available residential parenting time. The Bill further provides that a parent's bein... a parent being awarded the minimum percentage of parenting time shall not, in and of itself, constitute a

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

reason for deviation from child support guidelines. I urge passage of this Bill and welcome any guestions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jackson for two minutes."

Jackson: "Mr. Chairman, I'd like for my vote to reflect 'yes' on 4956."

Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request. Representative Sandack for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Kelly, this is a trailer of the larger Bill that we just passed earlier this morning?"

Burke, K.: "Yes."

- Sandack: "I've been getting calls from judges in DuPage County that are concerned about the 35 percent. Could you just elaborate a little bit? Is it a presumption? Is it a starting point? Is it a suggestion? What is it in your Bill?"
- Burke, K.: "It... Ron, I would characterize it as a suggestion. It's not in the... in the Section of the statute that deals with custody. It's in the policy statement. And I don't believe that it's intended to be a guideline. It's intended to state that the public policy of... of Illinois, of this state is to encourage parents to spend as much time as possible with their children and foster a healthy relationship, even if the parents are no longer together and that that is best achieved through a 35 percent minimum parenting time. It was the result of a lot of testimony that the committee heard from various advocacy groups that... that they feel based on social science and... and other research that's been done, that children do better the more time that they have with each

09800119.docx

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

parent. Of course, there are circumstances when that will not be true. And it... and that's why this is in the policy part of the Bill and... of the statute and not in the actual custody Section."

Burke, K.: "Aspirational is a great word for it."

Sandack: "To the Bill. This is a tough port... portion of the overall Bill which is why I... I commend the Sponsor for taking it out. I've heard from people on both sides of the spectrum on this, many thinking that this ought to be stronger language others telling me, including judges in DuPage, that they think even the suggestion of that language in there, kind of rises to more than aspirational, but perhaps a presumption. I'm going to listen to the debate. I'm in-between on this, but I... again, I'm going to commend the Sponsor on a very well done job moving this proposition forward. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, K.: "I... I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4124 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourself. Have all voted who wish? Representative Harris, Nekritz, Thapedi, Tracy. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 69 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 4124, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3664, Representative Kosel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3664, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to thank the Judicial Committee and Representative Nekritz for working with me to make this Bill a better Bill. This could be called the Metra/Alex Clifford Bill. This Bill will prohibit severance agreements, funded in part or totally by public dollars, from imposing confidential... confidentiality clauses with the exception of trade secrets, propriety information, or others exemptions used in the Freedom of Information Act. And I will gladly answer any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I want to commend the Sponsor on being responsive and listening to everyone that's opined. I think it's a very good Bill now. I think it addresses a discrete problem, a well-known problem. And I think it has the potential of avoiding future problems. So again, I want to commend the Sponsor and recommend a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "I rise in support of this legislation. I wish I would've thought of it. Great idea. I am just so sick of governments trying to hide their dirty laundry and just put the dirt under the rug. I mean, it happens all the time. This is awesome. I mean, why don't we fire people and just say get the heck outta here? Why are we paying them? We've done this with the state recently. We... we pay college presidents \$400 thousand to leave, after they've acted badly. We pay hundreds of thousands

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

of dollars to other folks. Enough is enough. This is crazy. They should not be doing it. This is a great piece of legislation. Thank you for bringing it forward." Speaker Turner: "Representative Kosel to close." Kosel: "Thank you. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3664 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 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3664, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5330, Representative Chapa LaVia. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5330, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

- Chapa LaVia: "Hi, there. This Bill was an agreement between ISBE and the school… high school district organizations, quite a few. They're putting toget… together a task force, or a committee that would revue assessments. So, things like the park and other things like that. And I ask for a 'yes' vote, and I'll take any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5330 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 97 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5330, having received the

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4910, Representative McSweeney. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: House Bill 4910, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4910 simply encourages partnerships for job training between manufacturing companies and community colleges. The Illinois Manufacturers Association has been very supportive of this legislation. So many of us find that there are companies looking for skilled workers, and what this Bill tries to do is encourage partnerships for job training. Again, this is permissive, there's no state spending, there are no mandates in this Bill, but we need to train our workers. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti for two minutes." Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

- Reboletti: "Representative, I couldn't agree with you more. I was just wondering if you could elaborate a little bit on how this would work or how... how would this urge these individuals to come together. I know that the College of DuPage has been trying to partner with a number of manufacturers in my district, as well as the Elgin Community College. How would this work?"
- McSweeney: "Specifically, it would set up a public/private partnership. It would set guidelines for training. You would use best practices for industry certification. Again, this is permissive. There are actually great programs in many parts

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

of the state and Representative Hays and Jakobsson district, Harper College. So this is a permissive Bill that will allow them to work very closely. Community colleges are not opposed to this Bill. This is not a mandate, but would specifically with set guidelines, Representative."

Reboletti: "No. And I appreciate that. I think this the wave of the future for those individuals who aren't looking to go and get a bachelor's degree or... or any type of other training that they're looking to work for an associates to go into a trade or into manufacturing is a good... private/public partnership. So I would urge its support."

McSweeney: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick for two minutes."

Martwick: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Martwick: "Representative McSweeney, I noticed that there is a provision for grants. Can you explain the grants provision?" McSweeney: "That actually was taken out in the Amendment. It was..." Martwick: "Oh, that was taken out with the Amendment? Okay."

- McSweeney: "Yes. Yes. In fact, what the original idea was, not to have any public money at all, but to set up for private money. But we did Amendment #2, that's out of the Bill altogether, Representative."
- Martwick: "Okay. To the Bill. I want to commend you for this legislation. I brought a similar piece of legislation last year that wa... did not advance, and I'm glad to see that yours is advancing. I think that this is a wonderful program. I have a couple of community colleges in my district that are pursuing this type of manufacturing training. I even have a

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

high school that is... has advanced computerized manufacturing training and it... it's really doing a great job preparing people for the workforce in an area where there is a demand for these employees. So, I would strongly urge an 'aye' vote from everyone in the chamber."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon-Booth for two minutes." Gordon-Booth: "Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is... thank you Representative McSweeney for bringing this piece of legislation forward. I live in a community in central Illinois that has also grappled with the issue of fi... of connecting the skills necessary with the work that is available. Encouraging these sort of public/private partnerships is exactly what we need to be doing here in the State of Illinois to close the skills gap that we have. So again, Representative McSweeney, thank you for bringing this wonderful piece of legislation. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McSweeney to close." McSweeney: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4910 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 Lilly. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no, and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4910, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4075, Representative Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4075, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4075, you… we sho… we have to adopt the Amendment Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Floor Amendment #2 and adopt Floor Amendment #3."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please table Amendment #2."

Zalewski: "This is it."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk."

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

Zalewski: "Thank you..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 3 is a gut and replace that adopts the changes that we negotiated with the opponents of the Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 4075. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Floor Amendment #4."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please table Floor Amendment #4. Mr. Clerk."

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

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4075, Representative Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4075, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4075 is a Bill that would install a provision in State Law that would regulate commercial ridesharing applications. At the outset, let me say that we have done enormous, painstaking negotiation over the course of the last 72 to 96 ... even the last week, in an effort to bring everybody together on this Bill and work out an agreement. The opponents of this Bill have gotten 85 percent of what they have asked for. They would have gotten 100 percent, but we couldn't come to an agreement on the final piece of the Bill. We are simply looking to install commonsense regulations on these applications, so that our constituents can ... can be safe while using these apps. We want to ensure licensure, we want to insure insurance coverage, and we want to insure safety of our constituents. The Bill sep... bifurcates the drive time between below 18 hours and above 18 hours per week. If a part-time driver wishes to use this as a secondary sources of income and falls below that threshold, they'll be subject to some basic commonsense regulations. If they go above that time, they're going to be subject to the Home Rule unit ... Home Rule unit's ordinance and be brought on a parity with other similar modes of transportation. Again, I would just say this is а comprehensive, thought-out approach that has been worked

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

substantively and long with the opponents of the Bill. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Mike, this is obviously kind of an important piece of legislation. So, I have some questions for you. Isn't Chicago working on something, an ordinance, to address this issue, in Chicago, right now?"

Zalewski: "Yes."

Sandack: "And hasn't Chicago come out in opposition to your Bill?" Zalewski: "It's... I would say at this stage, Representative, they... they probably would... without speaking for them, they've indicated to me they think some of what we are doing needs more work. However, I would say given the comparisons between the ordinance that's been proposed and the statute as... and the Bill before the Body, there are substantial similarities and I think that the city can support a lot of what's in this Bill."

Sandack: "Perhaps. But if this is worthy, that your Bill is worthy of state statute, being addressed statewide, shouldn't cabs and taxis be looked..."

Zalewski: "They..."

Sandack: "...at state wide as well?"

Zalewski: "...they are. We regulate taxis. Now, cities can go above and beyond..."

Sandack: "Correct. And they do."

Zalewski: "...what we do."

Sandack: "And the City of Chicago has."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Zalewski: "Correct."

Sandack: "Which is one of the reasons they... whether they're neutral or impartial opposition to your Bill, they're doing their own thing right now."

Zalewski: "The apps are?"

Sandack: "The City of Chicago."

- Zalewski: "Or the taxis? Well, they... they're... I... they haven't done their own thing, Ron. They... they've considered a ordinance, but they haven't moved on an ordinance. They haven't even put an ordinance before the City Council."
- Sandack: "And we're talking about a Home Rule unit of government, the City of Chicago. And typically, transportation is a local issue. Wouldn't you agree?"

Zalewski: "No. I would not. We..."

Sandack: "You would not agree to that?"

- Zalewski: "...we made it abundantly clear back in the early '80s that on commercial rideshare... in fact, on ridesharing issues, the state would have preemptory authority on this. And that was because these alternative forms of taxis were... were appearing. So, I would say state statute is controlling here." Sandack: "Okay. To the Bill. And I know the timer's on. I... I
 - appreciate what the Sponsor's trying to do and I understand much has been agreed to. Here's the dilemma, folks. This is a new technology, a new industry, a new venture that's actually providing efficacy, good results, and we in Illinois have a tendency to squelch entrepreneurship and innovation. We have an unmistakable history of trying to overregulate when something new is on the market that offers consumers value. So, I caution some... I... I think we should use some

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

caution here. I' m glad much has been agreed to, and I was hoping before the vote would be taken, if there's even an agreed Bill or not. I suspect the Sponsor would offer that this would be worked on in the… in the Senate. I'm… I'm going to invoke my friend on the other side of aisle, I'm going to listen to this debate. I'm leaning against opposing this Bill because of… for the purpose of simply, it does too much while other opportunities at regulation locally should be moving forward. And I'm getting yelled at by a gentleman on the other side. Here's what I suggest, folks. When in doubt on something new and innovative we ought not to choke it. So, again, I'll listen as we move forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond for two minutes." Osmond: "Before you start the timer, could we please excuse

Representative Cross for the rest of the day?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes. Thank you."

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

Osmond: "Representative, I have a concern about the liability insurance in this. And what type of policy will this come under?"

Zalewski: "A commercial insurance policy, JoAnn."

Osmond: "And so, that would cover... in other words, the companies would be buying the policy for... for this vehicle?"

Zalewski: "It... companies would be responsible for commercial policy insurance coverage. Correct."

Osmond: "And does... is there any opposition from the insurance industry at this time?"

Zalewski: "No. The..."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Osmond: "Were they part of the negotiations?" Zalewski: "...the... absolutely. They... the language in the Bill is...

is their language."

Osmond: "Okay. Thank you very much.

Speaker Turner: "Representative Morrison for two minutes." Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Morrison: "Representative Zalewski, I... you have worked very hard on this. And we had pretty good discussion debate in committee on a couple of the different occasions. So, first of all, I just want to thank you for all the work you have done. I think there are some things that... you know, changes that you have made that make sense, like the insurance provisions, make a lot of sense. And I appreciate that those are in there. Why... what... what was the reasoning behind the 18 hour provision? How did you come up with..."

Zalewski: "Sure. That..."

Morrison: "...that threshold?"

Zalewski: "...that's actually a good question, Tom. We… we have… throughout the course of the negotiations with the apps, they've always said they were comfortable with bifurcating what a part-time driver is and what a full-time driver is. That there were certain drivers in these systems that wanted to do this as a full-ti... as a part-time job. The way tha... the way it works is you… you turn on the app and if you can take a ride, you take the ride. But there are a certain number of drivers who consider this a full-time job. And they… they basically act as a taxicab driver. So by bifurcating that system, we… we regulate that in a way that makes sense."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Morrison: "And what's the consequence if a driver, just in one particular week, goes over that 18-hour threshold? So, let's say, most... most weeks they're at like 5 to 10 hours, but you know, some week they just happen to exceed that. What's the consequence?"
- Zalewski: "So, in an effort to give local control to the local municipalities, the statute would be silent on that and the… the sanctions would be allowed at the le… at the de… locals discretion."
- Morrison: "I don't understand how that would work if we're making a statewide standard."
- Zalewski: "Well, we're not. We're making a statewide standard for part-time drivers. For full-time drivers over that 18 hours, a local unit of government would be entitled..."
- Morrison: "No."
- Zalewski: "...to enact their own ordinance..."
- Morrison: "I..."
- Zalewski: "...to control it."
- Morrison: "Right. I understand for full-time. But what about a part-time driver, who just, in one particular week, happens to exceed that 18 hours?"
- Zalewski: "If they exceed that 18 hours, I think they would subject... be subject to sanction under the state statute. But we're not trying to do... we're not trying, we... we want these drivers to abide by the state statute."

Morrison: "Okay. My time's..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Morrison, can you please bring your remarks to a close."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Morrison: "All right. I... Again, I'm going to be voting 'no'. I do appreciate the work you've done on it. Again, I don't want... as Representative Sandack said, we tend to be protectionists in this state. We're doing great things with technology in the City of Chicago, the 1871 Operation. We're becoming a techhub. We want to encourage technology in benefiting consumers. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris for two minutes." Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor." Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

- Harris, D.: "Rep... Representative, which Amendments... which Amendments are on this Bill right now?"
- Zalewski: "Number... Number 1. Committee Amendment #1 was adopted, and I adopted Committee... Floor Amendment #3."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you very much. And just a couple of questions, perhaps from the consumers point of view. The ridesharing operations... there's... there's an issue as to whether or not they provide satisfactory facilities for disabled individuals. Is that addressed at all in this Bill?"
- Zalewski: "So, again in an effort to offer local control, Representative, if they find themselves in this 18 hours or more posture, or the local ordinance is going to govern that, we want local ordinances to control accessibility. We want accessibility, but the local control is going to remain with the city."
- Harris, D.: "So it's only for those indi... only for those drivers that exceed the 18 hours with that accessibility."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Zalewski: "No. No they're… So, for wheelchair accessibility, they'll… wheelchair accessibility, David, it would be the full… the statute would control."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. And what about the issue, I know that the… there's an issue of what they call 'surge pricing'. How is that… is that addressed at all in this Bill? That sometimes the fees that they charge can be excessive at certain times when other cabs aren't available, or bad weather, that sort of thing?"
- Zalewski: "So, under our current Bill, as is before the Body, we say in the statute, in the Bill, that the dispatcher, which is the app or the taxi dispatcher, controls the pricing mechanism. So we'll assure... one of the acts of these apps was that they don't want government controlling their way of dealing in a marketplace. And we said fine, but we're going to ensure that everybody has a discretion from a dispatch perspective to control their own marketplace."
- Harris, D.: "So, there's..."
- Zalewski: "That was an agreed ... "
- Harris, D.: "...so..."
- Zalewski: "...that was an agreement. That was a concession to the apps."
- Harris, D.: "...so... and I... I have to close. But so, is there no protection against surge pricing?"
- Zalewski: "They at... they simply have to provide notice on the app that they're going to do it."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you very much for the information. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis for two minutes."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Davis, M.: "Mr... I'm sorry. Representative Zalewski, could you give us an idea as what some of the regulations are? You might have missed... I might have missed you saying it already."

- Zalewski: "Yes, Monique. So, what we basically say is we want to create a new type of... of statute dealing with these ridesharing applications. We want them, if they find themselves driving a lot, to have licensure, to have insurance coverage, proof of responsibility. We want them to serve underserved communities. We want them to get their vehicles checked."
- Davis, M.: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. He shut you off."
- Zalewski: "The whole list or just the last part?"
- Davis, M.: "Well, you say you want them to do the things that all taxis or delivery services should do. They should serve all communities."
- Zalewski: "Correct."
- Davis, M.: "And they should do what else that's new?"

Zalewski: "We want them to check their vehicles to make sure their vehicles are safe."

- Davis, M.: "How... who does that? Who... who..."
- Zalewski: "The dispat..."
- Davis, M.: "...how much... do they pay for that?"
- Zalewski: "...the dis ... The company pays for that."
- Davis, M.: "Okay."
- Zalewski: "We want them to make sure their drivers are safe through background checks. We want them to make sure their vehicles are up to code. We want them to have insurance coverage."
- Davis, M.: "Why are they still opposed?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Zalewski: "I... I haven't been given a reason why the apps are opposed to this Bill. I've been told they fundamentally think that we don't bel... that they shouldn't be regulated. However, when dealing in the specific issues of the Bill, I haven't been given a current reason."
- Davis, M.: "You know ... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. With great respect and regard for Mr. Mike Zalewski, who is a great Legislator, who is certainly a great Representative for many of these issues, my concern is that we don't have enough knowledge about this new industry. Chicago is a large, growing city. People need to get places quickly, and they couldn't count on cabs or taxi service. So, this new industry emerged. You call in and give your credit card number, you give your name, and then they pick you up. It's their own private vehicle, or one that belongs to the company they work for. Now to deny them in any way the opportunity to serve these new communities that have developed all along State street, all along Indiana, brand new houses, condominiums, people going from there to downtown can't get there. We need to keep this industry and we need to keep it free of restraints. It's almost like charter schools, people need a choice. I urge a 'no' vote with all due respect because, Mike, I want you to work on it a little more with the people involved. I'm a person from the city. I can't get a cab at 107th Street, you know. And everybody..."

Speaker Turner: "Rep..."

Davis, M.: "...doesn't have access to public transportation. And I know you mean well. Give it a little... a few meetings... a few meetings over the next two weeks and come back. We'll support

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

you Mike but right now I cannot. We don't want you to tie the hands of these people, charge them \$25 thousand a year that they're not going to make. You know, we just want to keep this industry growing. It used to be like that in Chicago. There was a time..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative..."

Davis, M.: "...they called them jitneys."

Speaker Turner: "...Representative..."

Davis, M.: "Yes."

Speaker Turner: "...Representative, time. We're done."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you."

Davis, M.: "And thank you, Representative Zalewski. Vote 'no'." Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin for two minutes."

Durkin: "Thank you. I'll be very brief. I've been listening to this debate, and this is good. But there's absolutely nothing in this Bill that is going to stop the innovation and technology from advancing forward with this type of service. But what my concern is, always, is that we ... we look at common carriers such as... as cabbies and basically, these groups or these commercial transportation providers, they are always and have been traditionally held to a higher standard of care, and that's a good reason for it. And to me, it came down very simple. I think the person who's going to be behind that wheel needs to be insured. I think they need to be subject to the same type of background checks that cabs do right now. It's important for me as a... as a father knowing that my nieces, my daughters that they're going to be somewhere in the City of Chicago, that they're going to be safe with the individual

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

driving that car, whether it's a cab or if it's somebody with Uber. I believe you've made some reasonable accommodations and I will support this measure."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

- Demmer: "Representative, this 18-hour ceiling is pretty important in this because it makes... tries to make a distinction between a part-time, casual driver and somebody who makes more of a career out of this. But as a previous speaker brought up, I think there's an interesting question about how that 18-hour ceiling is calculated. Is it triggered by one week of driving more than 18 hours? Is it triggered by an average? What's the determination?"
- Zalewski: "So, what... what we wanted, Tom, is for there to be local control. So, we remain silent on the mechanism to measure the 18 hours per week 'cause we want locals to determine what's best for them."
- Demmer: "And I think that's an important distinction because this could easily be triggered by one week of... there's a convention in town, you'd want to drive during a... during a athletic season more, you live in an area where there's going to be a sudden influx of people, and somebody who is a part-time driver, who's a seasonal driver, may trigger this 18-hour provision in one week or in a couple of weeks, but through the rest of the year, may be well below that... that threshold. So, I'd say that to assume that a part-time driver will be part time throughout the whole course of the year is kind of a worry... worrisome provision to put into... put into place. And

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

you know, license plates too, having that triggered at the 18 hour threshold is... is a real challenge. That's a permanent thing, you know, affix that to your car. It's a... it's a difficult thing to have that fluctuation with. So, for... for that reason, I think there's some concern built into this Bill. And again, I'll continue to listen to the debate but I appreciate your work so far on it."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kosel for two minutes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Kosel: "Many of you that have been here for a several years know that I worked very hard after a young lady from my district was killed on... in a hit-and-run accident in the City of Chicago by a taxicab to try and get..."

Zalewski: "No. No."

Kosel: "...statewide regulations..."

Zalewski: "You're going to get Victor on..."

Kosel: "...for taxicabs as a floor, rather than a ceiling. So, I want to commend the Sponsor on doing this statewide. I think it's a step. But I think it's also something that we need to look at for taxicabs statewide because where many places like Chicago go a great job other places don't. And I think there's a real need for it. So, congratulations and good luck."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "Very briefly. It's important to note at the request of Representatives like, La Shawn Ford and others there's an obligation to serve in this Bill. We want underserved communities to be served by these apps. It's an important part of the Bill. It was included in the Bill. Nothing in

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

this Bill is going to shut down these apps. We want them to thrive. We want them to do well. However, it's our duty to protect our constituents. And in this building, if you negotiate in good faith and you put in things in the Bill that the other side has asked for, it's... it's incumbent upon us, the General Assembly, to honor those agreements. And we've done that with this Bill. This is a good piece of legislation that protects your constituents. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote." Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4075 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 Brown, Mitchell, Bost, Zalewski. Zalewski. Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 80 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4075, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5926, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5926, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5926 is a initiative of the Illinois Restaurant Association. Also, supported by the Spirit Distributors. There are no opponents to the Bill. It actually establishes an alcohol server training requirement in Cook County. I'm more than glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis. Two minutes."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

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

Reis: "Representative Feigenholtz, this is just for Cook County?" Feigenholtz: "Correct."

- Reis: "Okay. Let me ask you a question, and I'm no way, shape or form speaking in opposition to your Bill. But sometimes schools and philanthropic organizations will volunteer to work at Bears games, Rams games, work in the concession stands. How will this affect them?"
- Feigenholtz: "We have addressed that issue in an Amendment and exempted them."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5926 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 103 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 0 voting
 'present'. House Bill 5926, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
 Representative Will Davis, for what reason do you seek
 recognition? Representative Will Davis. Representative
 Davis."
- Davis, W.: "I apologize, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, sorry to interrupt this great flow of Bills and debates that we're... that we're having, but I wanted to take an opportunity to acknowledge someone from my district. As you know, the Illinois Black Chamber of Commerce is having their lobby day.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

You probably have seen many of their members running around, they all have green arm bands on. But a gentleman, and I would ask him to stand up, is also an alderman from the City of Harvey and Harvey's Second Ward Alderman, Joseph Whittington. Please welcome him to Springfield. Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "And you're welcome to your Capitol. Representative Reboletti, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would briefly move to suspend the House Rules. I see that Leader Hays is off the floor. But there's somebody else that's joined us on the House Floor that I think could fill in, probably for a few votes. He promises to fly under the radar, like he taught me. If everybody would welcome Leader Bill Black back to the House Floor."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome back, Representative."

Reboletti: "Welcome back, Leader."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Thanks for the love. Thank you very much. House Bill... House Bill 5354, Mr. Meier. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5354, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Meier."

Meier: "Yes. This Bill addresses home kitchen operations. We've been in agreement... been working with the Northern Illinois Public Health Association to come into agreement with it. And it simply will put home kitchens under the rules of municipalities, townships, or counties. And it will allow

111

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

them to be closer in line with the farmers' markets. And I'd appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will say... will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cassidy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5926, Leader Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill. My apologies. House Bill 8, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 8, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I may take a moment, please, to give you a little history. Three years ago we unanimously passed Senate Bill 1122, which made it a violation of the Human Rights Act for an employer to treat a pregnant woman differently than a nonpregnant worker who are, and I'll quote, similar in their ability or their inability to work, end of quote. Yet, Illinois are still losing... Illinois women are still losing their jobs because of their pregnancy. They are being forced to quit or continue to work in conditions that threaten their pregnancy or their life. They're being fired because employers refuse to make temporary work modification like putting a stool out just so they can sit or either permission to have a water bottle or taking a break or having some assistance to lift heavy boxes. When women need them to

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

continue to perform their jobs, these are things that women need, in order for them to continue their job safely. Also Senate Bill 1122 was intended to ensure that employers would no longer treat pregnant workers as second-class citizens. The workers who couldn't do this particular task because of conditions related to pregnancy or child birth would not be treated any worse than any other worker who couldn't do that particular job because of a disability or because of an injury or illness. Ladies and Gentlemen, the courts have made the distinction about women injured in the workplace or injured on the job. The courts has made that decision. And also, the Seventh Circuit Court of U.S., Court of Appeals have limited this protection for pregnant workers contrary to the intent of Senate Bill 1122. The courts have ruled that even though employers admit that they treat pregnant workers differently than others, a pregnant women cannot win her case unless she can prove that the refusal to provide accommodation was motivated by a specific intent to cause her harm. As a result, employers are refusing to extend the same reasonable accommodation to pregnant women that they are ... that they give to other workers. This is unfair and this is contrary to the intent of Senate Bill 1122. So, therefore, I bring you House Bill 8. House Bill 8 will restore our original intent when we unanimously passed House ... Senate Bill 1122 three years ago. This Bill clarifies the law so that pregnant women receive the same reasonable accommodation employers are already acquired ... required to provide under the Americans with a Disabilities Act and the Human Rights Act to employees with disability and will ensure that women will receive the same

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

treatment that their employers give to similar nonpregnant employees, which will allow them to stay on the job and continue to support their families, but not requiring accommodation if it imposed an undue hardship on the employer, similar to the Americans with Disabilities Act. Hospital 8 ... I'm sorry. House Bill 8 does not require employers to create new positions, transfer an employee with more seniority, or promote an unqualified employee. For example, if light-duty is not available for a temporarily disabled correctional officer, then such an accommodation would likely be not available for a pregnant correctional officer. And also, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the purpose of intent, House Bill 8 amended by Amendment #3 does not apply to religious employers as defined in Section 2-101 b(2) of the Illinois Human Right Act. In any event, the term 'reasonable accommodation' only applies to a pregnant woman ability to perform the work or job function for her position. House Bill 8 is good for business because it will increase workers' productivity, retention, and morale while also decreasing the retraining of workers, health care, and litigation costs. Accommodation like water and a stool to sit on can mean the difference between a healthy pregnancy and a high-risk pregnancy. I would appreciate support for House Bill 8. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Harms for the rest of the day."

Speaker Lang: "That will be done. Representative McAsey." McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

114

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- McAsey: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative, for sponsoring this Bill. I do have a couple of questions for you. First, isn't it true that the intent of House Bill 8 is to allow women to work and to maintain a healthy pregnancy?"
- Flowers: "That is the intention of House Bill 8. Pregnant women should be allowed to work and provide for their family just like anyone else."
- McAsey: "Thank you. Representative, do you have any idea how much, if anything, this will cost employers?"
- Flowers: "Representative, thanks for asking that question because it would not cost employers no more than it would cost employers now to comply with the law of people that's disabled and or that has been injured on the job. It's the same principal. They make reasonable accommodations."
- McAsey: "Thank you. And Representative, isn't it true that this legislation will not increase litigation costs for employers?"
- Flowers: "No, it will not increase litigation costs for employers because women are not interested in suing, all they want to be is respected and protected and given the rights of... just like other employers. If... if an employee has been injured in an accident and they need to sit down a little extra or be able to sit down and do their work, we're not asking the employers or the employees to put anything new or go out of their way other than make reasonable accommodations, once again, what the law... the existing law already call for."
- McAsey: "Thank you. And in fact, the State of California had passed similar legislation more than a decade ago. And I

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

believe that in that state the amount of litigation actually decreased after such a law was on the books. Representative, to the Bill. As a new mom, I am in strong support of this legislation. This time last year I was expecting my first child. And I know that I was very fortunate because serving and working in this position I had the ability to sit down in one of these chairs, to have a bottle of water if I needed it, and I know that so many working women do not have those same opportunities or simple accommodations. Allowing women access to a stool, allowing them to remain hydrated to keep ... without undue hardships to employers. Each of those things goes such a very long way to contributing to a healthy preqnancy. This important measure will support preqnant women and most importantly allow them to enjoy welcoming a healthy baby at the end of that pregnancy. I urge the support of the Members of this Body. Thank you, Representative. Thank you Members of the House."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we take this off Short Debate?"

Speaker Lang: "Certainly we can."

Sandack: "And I'm going to ask for a verification of the Roll Call, please."

Speaker Lang: "That will be acknowledged."

Sandack: "Thank you, Sir. Representative, just some que… Thank you. Couple questions, please. You're… you're well aware of the Family Medical Leave Act, I assume, yes?"

Flowers: "Yes."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Sandack: "And that's present law by the federal... it's present Federal Law applicable to all employers of certain criterion, correct?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Sandack: "For instance, you need to have 50 or more employees to be applicable for that law to be applicable."

Flowers: "That's under the Federal... yes, you're right."

- Sandack: "Under your Bill, there is no maintenance, right? All
 employers, correct?"
- Flowers: "Pardon me?"
- Sandack: "There's no 50 or less. It could be one employer... two employees, three employees."
- Flowers: "The Bill says that if it causes a hardship on the employer he does not have to comply."
- Sandack: "But it's your intent that it be applicable to all employers?"
- Flowers: "The Bill says if it causes a hardship for the employer, if he has one of if he has 50, he need not apply."
- Sandack: "What's a hardship to you, Representative, so that the ... "

Flowers: "I have... I have."

- Sandack: "...the legislative intent."
- Flowers: "For legislative intent, if that means that the employer has to go out and buy a bigger chair for the woman to sit in, he doesn't have to do that because he would not do that for you if you had a back injury. So, whatever the employer do for you because of your injury, if he allow you to sit down at your desk and put your feet up and someone bring you water or you're able to have your water right by you or just give you extra break or just tell you to walk away, get up and

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

move around a little bit for circulations. You know, no charge, no cost, no inconvenience. Whatever he does or she does for anyone else do for me as a pregnant woman."

- Sandack: "Representative, the Family Medical Leave Act is up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave. Your Bill, HB8 has no term limit. Isn't that correct?"
- Flowers: "Yeah, there's a term limit, Sir. There's only 9 months to a pregnancy."
- Sandack: "So, it's the entire length of the pregnancy?"
- Flowers: "No, that's not what the Bill says."
- Sandack: "Well, I'm just repeating what you said."
- Flowers: "No, the Bill… No, no. See you're confusing two Acts. But…"
- Sandack: "I'm ask... I'm comparing them, Ma'am. That's what I'm doing."
- Flowers: "Pardon me?"
- Sandack: "I'm comparing one to the other."
- Flowers: "Okay. Well... then there's no comparison because we all know that a pregnancy is nine months or less. That's number one. And number two, the good part about this legislation, that you must have a doctor's authorization so the person have to bring a medical note to their employer. So, it may be for the duration of the pregnancy. It depends on the health of the female, the health of the baby, or it may be the last few weeks or the last trimester."
- Sandack: "Going to some of the con... you were speaking of your discussions with the business community and I know they have some concerns about the words in the statute still. They're worried that it's over expansive. They're worried that it...

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

that it's unclear in some instances and overreaches. For instance, they... they wanted related medical out. Any pregnancy irrespective of whether it's a high-risk pregnancy or if there's a doctors problem, but any pregnancy at all, immediately this Act is implicated. Isn't that correct?"

- Flowers: "I... I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, can you lower the volume of the House, please?"
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers makes an excellent point. Could we lower the volume in the room? We still have a lot of work to do, Ladies and Gentlemen and the noise will just slow us down. Please proceed, Representative."
- Flowers: "I'm sorry, Representative. Can you please repeat what you just said?"
- Sandack: "Right. One of the concerns I'm told the business community had is because this applies to all pregnancies, not just too high-risk pregnancies or pregnancies doctors are concerned about. If you're pregnant, this Act... this Act applies."
- Flowers: "You know what... I... Let me just say this to you, with all due respect if..."
- Sandack: "That's always a good start."
- Flowers: "Right. Right. Keeping it nice here."
- Sandack: "Yeah."
- Flowers: "So, you know, all peop... all woman that's pregnant, some women go through their entire pregnancy without any problems. None whatsoever, and then there's others who may have complications. There's others because of the nature of their job. Can you imagine a woman that's seven months pregnant trying to lift a heavy box like she was able to do when she

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

was six months? And she's merely asking you, for the sake of her unborn child, for the sake of her health, can you just, you know... she went to the doctor and she asking... she's asking her employer, can you just give me a break? Can you give me some other light-duty to do? Is there some paperwork that I could do? Can I answer the phone? Or can you just give me some assistance? The same thing that that employer would do for you if you injured yourself on the job. Or if you..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "So that the..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack, your time has expired, Sir. Could you bring your remarks to a close?"

"I will. Thank you. This is one of those propositions Sandack: where's there's almost a no-win situation. No one's against pregnant women. No one wants to be against pregnant women. We want all women to deliver healthy babies and have good atmospheres in the workplace and beyond, in which to do so. however, this Bill is problematic because it expands rights beyond what's already provided in Federal Law. It has many undefined terms that are potentially abused and ... and could result in unintended consequences. An earlier speaker said that this would not raise costs. Come on. It, of course, will raise costs. An earlier speaker said it wouldn't increase litigation. That's folly. Of course, this is a bevy for... for lawyers to expand a new cause of action that's undefined and offers plaintiff's lawyers a new cause of action. We are doing something beyond the ken of what we should be doing. And I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

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

Ford: "Representative Flowers, could you tell me how long you've been in the General Assembly?"

Flowers: "Pardon me?"

Ford: "How long have you been in the General Assembly?"

Flowers: "Sir, I've been here 29, 30 years, something like that." Ford: "Well, what took you so long to get this Bill to the floor?" Flowers: "Well..."

Ford: "Did Jehan Gordon-Booth force you to do this?"

Flowers: "Pardon me?"

Ford: "Did Jehan Gordon-Booth force you to do this?"

Flowers: "Well, you know, I'm glad you brought her name up, but she didn't have to force me."

Ford: "Okay."

Flowers: "I was willing and able to do it."

- Ford: "And the next question I have for you, Representative Flowers, I think this is a protection for the employers because if an employer forces an employee to do work that is strenuous to the body that could be a lawsuit. So, I thank you for this Bill."
- Flowers: "Well, thank you, Representative. And I'm glad you brought that up because, to the previous Speaker, you can't have it both ways. Either the employers are for doing the right thing or they're not. And if you're for doing the right thing and if you're doing it already, you know that there's no cost involved. And you know that it's in the best interest to cut litigation as opposed to add. And I... I just want to say to you that this Bill, quite frankly, is already in law,

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

as far as... there's two groups of women right now, today, as we speak that is protected. If you are a peace officer... on page 17 of the Bill, Section H, if you are a peace officer or firefighter you are entitled to reasonable accommodation. So, if it's okay for a peace officer, if it's okay for a firefighter, we should not be discriminating against other women who become pregnant. They, too, should have the same reasonable accommodation. We should not be discriminating against pregnant women here in the State of Illinois and/or, the United States of America, period."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford, your time has expired. Is that all right with you, Sir?"

Ford: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Representative Sente for two minutes." Sente: "To the Bill. I was a small business employer, so I looked at this language very seriously. I employed 20 architects and various employees, over half of them were female employees. So, over the years, I would argue that this language in this Bill is reasonable. To be able to allow reasonable accommodation so that my female employees could serve our clients is good for an employer. It allows me to keep on deadline, to keep serving our clients, and to allow women to be able to contribute to the workforce and work through their pregnancy. I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. I've heard people on this House Floor say how much we value health in pregnant women, how concerned we are to make sure that the babies born to those pregnant women are healthy. I'd say it's

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

time to put our money where our mouth is. It seems to me that those of us who care about healthy pregnancies and healthy babies have a responsibility to vote 'yes' on House Bill 8. This is a reasonable Bill following language already in place and for many years in place, in the State of California. The sky did not fall; litigation didn't go through the roof. What happens under this Bill has happened in California, is that make reasonable accommodation, employers reasonable accommodation to make sure that pregnant women are, in fact, living that pregnancy healthy, living that pregnancy with an opportunity to make sure the children at the end of the pregnancy are born healthy and well. I don't think this is an undue burden on employers. There is legislation being considered at the federal level that would look very much like this. And not only California, but New York City also has adopted language that guarantees this minimum level of support and respect for women who are pregnant. It isn't asking much to say, give me a chair to sit down. Let's make sure I'm not dehydrated. Let's make sure that I have an opportunity to bring this baby to term, a happy healthy and well-baby. I encourage your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie, you had an absentee to report." Currie: "That too. Representative Acevedo is excused for the rest

of the day. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you very much. I'd like to acknowledge the presence of the Governor of Illinois, Governor Pat Quinn. Representative Tracy for two minutes."

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

123

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Tracy: "Representative Flowers, or... can you give me a scenario of what would... would classify or be undue hardship under your Bill? What would... what would an employer have to prove or what scenario do you contemplate as being an undue hardship?"
- Flowers: "I'm sorry, Representative. Can you ask that question again?"
- Tracy: "Undue hardship. How do you think that would be defined?" Flowers: "Well, it depends on the employer. Different employers have different situations. So, I don't know how it will be defined. So, but... but in the Bill, in the Bill, it's very plain, very clear that they can only make reasonable accommodation. And if this a hardship on the employer that they cannot do it, they just can't do it."
- Tracy: "And your intent is not to classify pregnancy as a disability, correct?"

Flowers: "No. Pregnancy is not a disability."

- Tracy: "And also, but then the... a pregnancy with restrictions, they're already accommodated under the Family Medical Leave Act, right? If you're medically given restrictions, those are covered, correct?"
- Flowers: "Well, see, the Family Medical Leave Act means that you are on leave from your job. And so therefore, that's a different situation."
- Tracy: "Okay, correct. But what I'm saying is, is that, if you have medical restrictions given by your supervising doctor, you can have an accommodation, correct? This goes beyond that. Is that correct, also?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Flowers: "No, no, no, no. It doesn't go beyond anything. If your doctor says that you should be restricted to being on your feet for four hours a day..."

Tracy: "Right and that's..."

Flowers: "...and... and you."

- Tracy: "...the situation that we already have covered by law, correct?"
- Flowers: "No, because if it was covered... If this was covered by... for every... all pregnant women across this state, we would not be having this discussion."
- Tracy: "No, that's what I'm saying. Some women do have medical restrictions. Others..."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative, your time has expired. Can you complete your remarks, please?"
- Flowers: "Well, yes, some women do have medical restrictions because the women in the Army, they have medical restrictions. The U.S. Government recognizes pregnant women and also, firefighters and police officers. Yes, there are medical restrictions. There are things that must be accommodated for these women. Reasonable accommodations I wanted applicable to all the women."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Tracy, please bring your remarks to a close."
- Tracy: "And I think that sums up this, that it's going to be a very subjective test based on a woman's own preference and the like. And I think that previous speakers have acknowledged this, of course, is going to drive up the cost of doing business. We all want healthy babies to be born, but I think there was a reasonable offer to compromise and make all

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

parties that are opponents nonopponents to this Bill, but that the... that was not accommodated. And I think we could have had a compromised and agreed to Bill, if that were the case, that would give the safeguards that we're trying to bring to the business community and likewise, the safeguards to all pregnant women that work. So, with that, I don't think we got quite there. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker. I sit to the left of Representative McAsey. I sit to the right of Representative Gordon-Booth. I will be voting for this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth for two minutes."

Gordon-Booth: "Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Sorry for rising so slowly, but luckily, I serve here in the General Assembly where I can prop my feet up underneath my desk with a ... on a garbage can that's been flipped over. Those accommodations have been provided to me by the General Assembly, so thank you so very much. And I must say that although the doctor has not diagnosed me with a condition, I would say that swollen ankles makes it very difficult to walk around here and work your Bills. But I want to thank Representative Flowers so much for carrying this piece of legislation for all of the women that live and work in the State of Illinois and decide that they want to bring life into this world and still have an opportunity to work and to provide for their family. All women in this state don't have the same privileges that myself, Representative McAsey, yourself, and other women who have had children, while they also worked and helped to take care and provide for their families. In my opinion, this

09800119.docx

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

legislation does not put undue burden on businesses because, you know what, there are many businesses, not just in the State of Illinois, but throughout this country that decide that they want to be a progressive employer and they want to have some of the breast... the best and brightest women working in those entities and they provide these opportunities because they know that young women, who are in the family planning stages of their lives, still want to have the opportunity to work and to bring children into this world. So, Representative Flowers, thank you so very much from all the pregnant women across this land."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for two minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. While serving in the Army, I was not pregnant just once but I was pregnant twice and so I am very familiar with the profiling restrictions of a pregnant woman in the Army. And the Army makes numerous accommodations for pregnant women in the Army. You can't be around fumes, you don't have to stand at parade rest for longer than 15 minutes, you know, all light-duty, no heavylifting, you don't have to go to the weapons range, you don't even have to be transported overseas for any reason. Obviously, you don't deploy in a combat situation. So, they ... they have a number... a number of regulations that actually restrict what a pregnant woman can do in the Army. And you know, I still ran at six months pregnant. It didn't matter. A lot of people run until they deliver. That wasn't me, but I did make it pretty far. I still did a number of my duties, whatever I could do. I've been fortunate that I have not had to work in a typical 8 to 5 position where you're standing on

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

your feet all day or do any of that. And I appreciate that some people do have to go through that. However, I... as much as I want to vote for this Bill, Mary, I have a little problem with the idea of what is reasonable in the subjectivity of it and when you're dealing with businesses on very, very fine margins. I would hope that employers would make those reasonable accommodations for their employees, but I worry, I seriously worry about the lawsuits that may ensue from a Bill like this when there's been disagreement between an employer and an employee. And... and I just... I think that if we could work on this a little bit longer and get more specific about the regulation, I would certainly appreciate that. So, I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate and decide later on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There was an article in today's <u>Sun-Times</u> about Mrs. Villanueva and she stated that after repeatedly unloading trucks, lifting, and carrying heavy boxes and packages, she really couldn't afford to quit her job. She couldn't. She had to continue to work and as a result of her not being able to afford to quit her job, and reasonable accommodations was not made for her, she lost her child. Why did she have to lose her unborn child? Because no one respected her as a woman. No one respected her as a pregnant woman. All she wanted to do was to have reasonable accommodations. As the previous speaker spoke and said when she was in the Army, reasonable accommodations was made for her. She didn't have to go overseas. There was... she didn't have to work 180 days past

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

pregnancies. She didn't have to do the training and the fitness. There was reasonable accommodations made. And once again, what's already in existing law. I am telling you now, in existing law reasonable accommodations are made for firefighters and peace officers. So, all of you who are concerned about the employer and how they may have suits, tell them they don't have to worry about that if this Bill becomes law. Because all they have to do is make reasonable accommodations. And if those accommodations are not reasonable for them, all they have to do is say, I'm sorry I can't do that, period. You don't have to worry about being sued. We, right now, are discriminating against other women, other women who are not having reasonable accommodations made for them because they are pregnant. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is about life, this is about liberty, and this is about the pursuit of happiness. Women who are pregnant deserve to be respected. Please vote 'aye' on House Bill 8. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "The Lady has moved for the passage of her Bill. Mr. Sandack has asked for a verification. So, staff will retire to the rear of the chamber. Members will be in their seats and vote their own switches. 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 yourself. Harris, Ives, Jakobsson. Mr. Harris. Representative Ives. Please take the record. On the question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And Mr. Sandack do you persist on your verification request? The Gentleman withdraws his verification request. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

declared passed. Mr. Clerk on the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 5622, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5622, a Bill for Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Turner, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner on the Amendment."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. I'd like to move it to Third and have a discussion about it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5622, a Bill for Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner on the Bill."

Turner: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 20... 5622 sets forth rules for employers that choose to offer a payroll card program. Many employers in Illinois currently use payroll cards to pay employees. However, this is new technology which State Law does not address. House Bill 5622 addresses four main points as a result of these payroll cards. The Bill ensures that workers voluntarily choose to be paid by payroll card. It provides workers with at least one way to get their wages off their card without paying a fee. Limits are set on allowable fees in making sure that they are in

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

line with the kinds of fees on other cards like debit cards. Workers also must be provided with a way to check their balance and access account statements. Many groups have been involved in the discussions and include best practices by employers who currently use these payrolls. These groups include: the retail merchants, the credit unions, the credit card companies, banks, consumer advocacy groups, as well as working groups. Following these discussions, the Bill has become more flexible for employers, standardized language in terms that make them clear and more workable for financial institutions while preserving the central protections of the Bill. House Bill 5622 will codify the best practices of employers currently using payroll card programs into law and prohibit the unreasonable fees that the Attorney General's Office has uncovered during this investigation of such programs. The Bill simply protects employees, establishes guidelines for employers choosing to utilize this new option for wage payment. Payroll cards can be a benefit to both employers and employees, but regulation is necessary to increase transparency and to control these fees and put in some effective consumer protections. I'd appreciate your support on this Bill."

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

Sandack: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Art, this came to committee this morning. We didn't really have good process. It was out on a partisan Roll Call. In fact, I don't know that you did any more than introduce it. And I know there's still some opposition despite your

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

efforts of trying to get... making it an agreed Bill. The bankers and the Chamber still oppose it. Can you tell the, you know, the chamber why there's opposition from those groups still?"

Turner: "Great question, Representative. The bankers are still opposed to the Bill and it surrounds around the… What is it? …the overdraft fees for the decline… the overdraft fees that… that are assessed when a person makes a transaction and doesn't have the requisite amount of money in the account. Working with the AG's Office on this, currently banks don't charge an overdraft fee for their members who overdraft and don't have the amount of money in their account. We just wanted to set that same standard for the payroll cards. The banks suggested that there's still a fee involved on their end or a cost involved on their end and that they'd like to work that out. We even said we've make the commitment, the Attorney General's Office and myself, to continue to work on this in the Senate as it pertains to the banks concerns. And…"

Sandack: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Let's hold the noise down in the chamber. Mr. Reboletti's getting nervous. Let's hold the noise down. Please proceed."
- Turner: "So, we've… we've continued discussions with the Banker's Association to… and made a commitment to the team to have a discussion in the city… in the Senate concerning those fees that they may incur, those small fees that they may incur on that."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Sandack: "All right. Well, they're concerned about a fee and an unintended consequence because the Bill's not quite prime time. What's the Chamber's objections? Do you know, Art?" Turner: "I don't know the Chamber's objections."

- Sandack: "Have there been discussions with the Chamber's representatives, with respect to this Bill as well?"
- Turner: "I haven't had a chance to talk directly with the chamber, but again, the Attorney General's Office has had a chance to speak with..."
- Sandack: "All right."

Turner: "Okay. You get it? All right."

Sandack: "To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Sponsor is one of the best Members of the General Assembly, but this process has not been a good one, with respect to this Bill. This Bill came before the Labor Committee this morning at 8:30 and at about 8:32 it came out on a partisan Roll Call, although there was no debate, no discussion, no vetting of the guts of the Bill. These are the... this is the first time I've had a chance to ask any questions on this Bill. That's not good process. In fact, it's poor process. So, forget the merit to the Bill for a minute and look solely to why we have a bicameral system and why this is not how we should get Bills out of this House, notwithstanding deadlines. So, for that purpose and that reason only, I respectfully urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Tracy for two minutes."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think we've pretty much described that we didn't have an opportunity to talk about this Bill, but I do think afterwards we did have...

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

pinpoint two areas where this Bill could be improved. And I'm asking that the Sponsor continue to work on this with the Attorney General's Office. I mean, certainly we've identified a new niche of payroll cards that has not been regulated and perhaps does need some definitions and the like, but there are two areas. One is... is the Sponsor mentioned to is the decline payment fees, which certainly, if a person is trying to use a payroll card and there's a decline because of fees, obviously, somebody bears the brunt of the cost to this. I think it's only fair that we attribute costs where the actual fair assessment should be. And then the other part was one part that I wanted to ask the Sponsor about was the access or the location of access that... that wasn't clear to me. What fee was that attributable to, if I could, Leader Turner"

Turner: "The fee, Representative?"

Tracy: "Right. A fee associated with the location or something. There was two parts that were the main opposition to this Bill. And that's..."

Turner: "So..."

Tracy: "...what I didn't have a handle on."

- Turner: "There's no fee involved with that right now. We worked with IRMA specifically around this portion and came up with the language that... that the bank or financial institution just had to be readily available to the employee and this is language that they suggested."
- Tracy: "But as I recall, there was a definite statement made. And that's the problem, I think that speaker Sandack mentioned to this was, we're not even clear what... you know, all the different portions of this Bill. But there was one other area

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

and it had to do with, user of the payroll cards physical location to a bank or the like, and how to attribute that cost. So, I'm just asking that we be given more time to work this out. The… certainly it could be an agree… the consensus of our committee was… is there's a problem here, needs a solution, but it needs to be a fair and accruable solution. And again, I think we could have an agreed Bill if those concerns are met. So, thank you. At this time, I'm not sure how I'll vote because, again, I don't like this process where we can't present the best Bill possible to go forward because, as we know, a bad Bill only gets worse. It doesn't usually get better if we don't try to correct it before it becomes law."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Turner to close."

Turner: "To the previous Representative's point. We... we did the ... In current law, checks... there's language... there's language in current law that says that checks have to be ... an employee can cash a check at a readily available location or bank location. We've made many concessions over the months of negotiating this Bill. We've changed the definition of 'payroll cards', changed the definition of a 'payroll card account', changed the disclosure requirement from in plain language to clear and conspicuous, changed voluntary written consent to voluntary consent. A whole host of things to make this service available. There are many individuals who don't have a bank account, don't have access to a bank account, so this is a service that is important. We'd just like to put the consumer protections in. We will continue to discuss this going forward and any concerns that people may have, should this Bill head

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

over to the Senate. And I'd really appreciate your support on this very important service. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harris, Willis. Willis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5666, Mr. DeLuca, on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. DeLuca. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5666, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative DeLuca, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Floor Amendment #1."
- Speaker Lang: "Floor Amendment #1 is already on the Bill, I
 believe."

DeLuca: "Okay."

- Speaker Lang: "Or Committee Amendment 1 is already on the Bill. We have Floor Amendment 2, Sir."
- DeLuca: "Okay. Move to adopt Floor Amendment #2. I can explain it on Third Reading, if that's okay."
- Speaker Lang: "Any 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."

136

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 5666 is an initiative of the National Waste and Recycling Association, and it creates the Illinois Solid Waste Hauling and Recycling Program Act. The fundamental purpose of this legislation is to implement a comprehensive approach to ensure accessibility to commercial recycling services in the Chicago metropolitan area. It only applies to the counties of Cook, not in Chicago, Lake, DuPage, Kane, Will, and McHenry. It does not impact any existing municipal or county commercial franchise agreements. It mandates that waste haulers offer commercial recycling services, a mandate that the industry supports. It mandates that waste haulers shall provide a written offer to provide recycling services to commercial businesses, and this must be done at least once during the term of the contract or at least once every two years. A mandate that the industry supports. It establishes a process for a municipality to follow if they choose to enter into a franchise for the collection of waste at nonresidential, nonindustrial locations. It mandates waste haulers guarantee a 50 percent... a 50 percent recycling rate for nonresidential locations when the 36-month reporting period has expired. It mandates waste haulers guarantee a 50 percent recycling rate for nonresidential locations and must submit a report every six months to the municipality and the municipality must post the reports on the website. This legislation will increase

137

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

recycling volumes, reducing waste entering our landfills. The legislation will increase employment opportunities due to the 50 percent recycling mandate and the processing of recycling material. This will ensure a free and open market system increasing competition and improving pricing, and it allows private business owners to choose for themselves who they will... who will service their waste removal needs. Now, the Amendment that we adopted in committee yesterday removed all opposition. And if you look at the analysis, there was quite a bit of opposition to the way the Bill was originally introduced. So, we've made some real good progress. I ask for your 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Reboletti: "Representative, as I review my analysis, I know there were a lot of opponents to Amendment #1 and I know you were trying to withdraw that, but I believe that Amendment #2 became the Bill. Did Amendment #2 alleviate the concerns, most of them of municipalities? I know that the DuPage Mayors and Managers were opposed. The Village of Addison, which I represent, was also opposed. If you could, maybe, let me know what... how this changes that."

DeLuca: "Yes, it did."

- Reboletti: "So, now are they new... are they neutral or do we know if they're proponents?"
- DeLuca: "No, actually, their representative in committee yesterday actually said they support the Bill the way it is amended."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Reboletti: "And how does this fundamentally change how we deal with recycling in the collar counties... with commercial recycling?"
- DeLuca: "Well, the biggest part of it is that the mandate that I referred to in my opening will be 50 percent. Which means that the haulers must meet that level, must meet a 50 percent partition... participation rate. And also included in the amended, also deals with diversion, which means the waste that is no longer being picked up in the trash truck that's no longer be going into the landfills. So, the haulers will be reporting both, the number of non-residential locations that are participating with the recycling, but also, that... the amount of tons of waste that is no longer going into a landfill."
- Reboletti: "And how would this impact the bottom line for the... for the communities as they negotiate? Is this something that would be a cost savings? Is it something that would be, maybe, neutral for the bottom line? How does that impact them?"
- DeLuca: "Because of the way this is written and opening up competition, creating more competition, there should be a savings."

Reboletti: "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 take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Moeller."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

- Moeller: "I have a two residents from the beautiful City of Elgin here this afternoon in the gallery, Faith Haskin and her daughter, Grace Haskin. So, if you'd give her a Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Glad you're here. House Bill 3958, Representative Kifowit. Out of the record. House Bill 5864, Mr. Moffitt. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5864, a Bill for an act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5864 is an initiative of the Illinois Sheriffs Association and IPSAN, which is Illinois Public Safety Agency Network. This makes some ... just some updates there, the guidelines. This was originally established back in July of 2006. With this legislation, it clarifies that IPSAN is an entity with a statewide jurisdiction and involvement while simultaneously confirming that IPSAN is expressly comply with state not-for-profit reporting requirements and it is not a state agency. A streamlining that needs to be done is the fact that they u... they get information from the FBI and from the Department of Justice, and that information is only to be available to sworn-in law enforcement officers. Their current board... their current description includes people from the fire service. And so now, this would take it back to where it's only sworn in officers and the fire service is in agreement with this. This

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

will allow them to receive funds that will be used for the network to help law enforcement. Be happy to entertain any questions."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, 81 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 738, Representative Cloonen, on the Order of Second Reading. Out of the record. House Bill 5660, Representative Conroy. Out of the record? Out of the record. House Bill 3820, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3820, A Bill for an Act concerning State Government."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo, you have Amendments on this Bill?" Crespo: "I do."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3820, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration.

Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Crespo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "And this is House Floor Amendment #4, correct?"

Speaker Lang: "The Clerk says you have 3 and 4, Sir."

Crespo: "Yeah. Okay, 3 and 4. And basically, it's a technical Amendment that pretty much, as to the extent of current law

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

is repealed, the Single Audit Commission from April 1, 2014 to April... December 31 of 2019. And it also addresses some concerns about the exemption process."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Chair recognizes Representative Bellock on the Amendment."

Bellock: "I'm in favor of the Amendment. I'm sorry. I was thinking the regular Bill was up. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed
 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr.
 Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Crespo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3820 establishes the Grant Accountability and Transparency Act. Just to give you some background, over 70 percent ... of the state budget is distributed by grants and of that 70 percent, approximately, 70 percent of those grants are currently subject to federal rules. On December 2013, the feds issued the uniform rules for federally funded grants, failure to comply with those grants regarding the risk of losing those federal funds. That same year, House Bill 2 was introduced and passed by our esteem colleague, Representative Patti Bellock, which created the Illinois Single Audit Commission to research federal best practices with respect to grant administration leading to the Grant Accountability and Transparency. The recommendations of that commission are adopted in this House Bill. Some of the salient points are the following ... "

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Mr. Crespo. Are you explaining Amendment 4 or the Bill?"

- Crespo: "That... Amendment #4 actually addresses... I apologize. Amendment #4 addresses some of the extensive concerns that were brought up in committee."
- 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. Please read the Bill on Third Reading."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3820, a Bill for an act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo, you can continue where you left off, Sir."
- Crespo: "So some of the salient points... Thank you very much... help state agencies and grantees comply with the federal rules and reforms. The grant making process will ensure that guidance and training for state agencies and grantees, so they can understand those federal rules for grants, so they can comply with the rules, would require grantees to submit a proposed budget. There's a required also to note any deviation from the budget through the award of the grant. It will prevent a grantee from using grant funds to overcome fund deficiencies from another grant and would prevent a grantee from earning a profit from a grant. It creates a public catalog of all grant programs administered by the state. And the sunsets in five years. And as I mentioned before, I also want to thank Representative Patti Bellock for her work with the Illinois

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Single Audit Commission, which is pretty much the genesis of this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. I Bellock: want to thank Representative Crespo for doing this. This Bill originated last year when we formed the Illinois Single Audit Commission of which we worked on for a full year. So just to explain how important this Bill is, is that the budget of the State of Illinois is made up of \$46.9 billion in grants. Again, that's \$46.9 billion of grants. Seventy percent of those grants that come to Illinois are federal grants and they go by the federal guidelines, but 30 percent of those grants do not go by the federal guidelines and that was what we see in a lot of articles about abuse of state grants. So what this is, is to form the single criteria like in the federal quidelines to apply to those 30 percent of grants in the ways that Representative Crespo just discussed. There's been a lot of discussion about this Bill over the last couple of weeks, I just want to address two of those issues because this Bill does not just apply to social services or universities. This Bill applies to ever major state agency in Illinois. It's a major undertaking, it is a major transparency and accountability Bill to apply to \$46.9 billion. And so, the universities have raised questions about this. I just want to address this because we've gone back over this with them a couple of times and our response is that, if the universities... If a university is already in compliance with the federal rules HB3820 will have no effect on it. The intent of HB3820 is to streamline the rules for state grants that

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

are not currently subject to the federal rules. I think universities, the majority of all their grants pretty much are federal except for 3 percent, so that's in answer to that. A lot of the private, smaller, social service agencies have asked questions about taking private money in grants, this Bill does not abli... to private money. It applies to federal and state money, so I encourage all of you to support this Bill. I think it's one of the most major Bills in the last couple of years to address apparent... transparency and accountability in our fiscal office of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

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

Riley: "Representative Crespo, and I appreciate the previous Speaker's concerns, but in many ways, at least in terms of people who have talked to me, there are some issues with both universities and with community-based organizations. You know, often, you know, there are unintended consequences that come with any piece of legislation now. Many community-based organizations think that it will limit their ability to do business and get grants, you know, with the state. Matter of fact, you know, during debate in committee, rather than congruence with the Federal Government's guidelines, rather, you know, than, you know, meeting up with single audit responsibilities, a program that... that we all know had some issue, but it was brought up in debate as a reason for this Bill. So... so, what is it? Because there's a lot of communitybased organizations that do a great job and are meaningful

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

adjuncts to what we do here in this state. So, how would you address all of these organizations still having opposition to this Bill? Now, I'd also let you... like to hear whether or not the opposition by many of our universities has been taken off."

Crespo: "Thank you, Leader Riley. In terms of the non-for-profits, it was one of the concerns that I had originally. We do have some non-for-profit that that do a phenomenal job in delivering the services, but they have some challenges when it comes to reporting and some of those requirements. The Bill is drafted in such a way that it does state that they will be held by OMB in terms of walking through that process, so they can meet whatever the demands are in terms of reporting requirements. There's also ... there's some new things here, obviously, they're concerned about human nature. Where there's something you folks tend to react a certain way. There's a pre-award process that they have to present some type of plan for the grant. There's some requirements in terms of when we post these to get some ... some folks and agencies to put in for these grants. There's a postgrant receipt process as well, but we're going to walk them through that. That's not ... when I spoke to them, they understand that, and they're fine. Some of those agencies today receive federal grants, so they have to abide by these rules, regardless. The ones that ... the only differences are those state grants and we are changing some of the requirements, in light of some of the issues that we've read in the paper, that we're concerned about. But I don't think they're going to have a problem. In regards to the universities and colleges, and they came to my

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

committee like the night before the Bill was presented, I don't think they have the same concerns and problems as the non-for-profits. I think they have the skill set or they should, to meet all the requirements. But let me point something out. And I'm just going to read a couple of audit reports. One of the largest universities that's complained a lot about the... about this, in some of the findings that we have here, they had issues with the return of Title IV funds that were not made timely. They had issues with inadequate control over federal reporting. And I can go on and on and on. I mean, when I look at these audit reports, they almost became like the poster child, why we should have this. And some of these were federal grants that they were not complying the way they should have."

- Riley: "But you... but you also would admit that some of those, I mean, you know, let's face it, a CPA firm, you know, doing an audit. There are things that might be mentioned in an audit that still aren't material weaknesses."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley, your time has come to a close. Can you bring your remarks to a close?"
- Riley: "I will bring my remarks to a close. To the Bill. The Bill has a great title. And matter of fact, what the Bill is endeavoring to do makes a lot of sense. But this is a case where I think that there's unintended consequences. Frankly speaking, a lot of the problems that happened with grants were the responsibility of the department that issued those grants. They should have done a better job with their own due diligence. And so, unfortunately, because of those issues and

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

I think we could do a much better job tweaking this Bill, I'm going to be a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The University of Illinois and other universities have contacted me with some of the concerns that the former ... the previous speaker outlined. You know, we created a situation through our Procurement Code that has been nothing short of a nightmare for our public universities, for our research universities. Currently, when a grant comes that is shared between the University of Illinois and the ... and Purdue University, for example, Purdue has do to all the purchasing because we have, in an unintentional way, made the process of purchasing those items for high-end research almost an impossibility for our universities. The universities have expressed some very, very serious concerns in relation to this Bill. I know the Bill is very well intended. I think the underlying rationale is very, very good. But I certainly intend to listen to the rest of the debate. The universities contacted me as late as yesterday with a stringent opposition. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, just to get your intent on the record since a lot if this Bill is rather broad and not well-defined. Is it your intent that if an organization is meeting all the federal requirements for these grants, that that federal verification will serve as the state verification?"

Crespo: "Yes."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Pritchard: "Is it your intent that this does not, as we heard earlier, involve private contributions?"

Crespo: "Correct."

- Pritchard: "As we look at some of the concerns that we've seen from the procurement law, that some of the suppliers are not willing to sign the forms and the requirements of the Secretary of State's Office, what do we do in the case that we have a supplier or a grantee that isn't willing to sign that document?"
- Crespo: "Representative, yes, it... be very clear, this does not impact the procurement process at all."
- Pritchard: "But that is my point. In the current procurement process, we have some vendors that don't want to sign our paperwork. And therefore, we're limiting the number of vendors that might be appealing and therefore, lowering the cost of the things that we're purchasing."
- Crespo: "Okay. My understanding, Representative, is they have to register with the Secretary of State's Office, regardless, if they want to do business with the State of Illinois, independent of this Act."
- Pritchard: "Well, I'm just concerned about that component because it has been demonstrated to us in the procurement law that some vendors don't want to participate with our forms. And therefore, we're limiting the number of competitors. And therefore, perhaps paying a higher price for some of the things that we procure. So, I would ask that as the regulatory body of the Legislature looks at the rules, that they take into consideration this fact that we want to increase the grants, and the grantors and the competitors that want to do

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

business with the State of Illinois. Does this open... does this Bill open the door for additional restraints, burdens and administrative costs to our universities?"

Crespo: "No, it does not."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard, your time has expired. Can you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"
- Pritchard: "I would just suggest that there are lots of concerns about this Bill. It is a good-intention Bill that we do need to get control of our grants and look that we're getting the results that we want when we make these grants. But that as we develop the rules, that we not become overzealous, that we honor the commitments that donors and federal grantees have made and that we don't make this more onerous on our universities. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jakobsson for two minutes." Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

- Jakobsson: "Section 5 says that the Act is intended to increase the accountability and transparency in the use of grant funds from whatever source. Does that imply that the Act has scope over all of the universities activities, even those funded from private foundations and corporations?"
- Crespo: "No. We've made this very clear to the universities over and over again. It does not apply to private grants. The U of I was mostly concerned with the Melinda Gates Award that they get. It does not apply to that."
- Jakobsson: "Well, I really wanted to make sure I heard that on the record today because it isn't... I don't think it's written that clearly. Section 35 creates a set of rules that appear

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

to apply to all state and federally funded subawards from the university. This sort of goes along with what the previous speaker was saying. The rules would require, among other things, all recipients and subrecipients to register with the Secretary of State. And the university, as well as others, have experienced the same requirement in the procurement context and that has led to confusion among vendors, delays in procurements, extended delays in procurements for the some of the major research that would be bringing in more dollars to the university and lost opportunity to increase costs on campuses. So, would that apply to these subrecipients?"

Crespo: "Number one, as I mentioned before, they have to register with the Secretary of State regardless and they have to abide by the federal rules anyway. Now, let me point out that in committee they mentioned that approximately 3 percent of the grants are state grants, 3 percent. A majority of 67 plus are federal grants and then some are private grants. So, this has been explained to the universities over and over again. As I mentioned earlier, when you look at their audit reports ... there are so much real findings on these audit reports, by the way folks and many of them have to do with the federal grants. They're even, at times, not even abiding by federal rules. I cannot even imagine what they're doing with state grants. I'm not accusing them of anything, but I think this process will definitely give us some control that we can make sure that the money's being used the way it's supposed to be used and stop reading the papers. And I'm not saying the we universities, but if we read in the papers the last year or so, we keep reading about these abuses with federal and state

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

grants. That, if anything, that really should be the genesis of this Bill. That really should be the motivator of why we need to pass this Bill."

- Speaker Lang: "Representative Jakobsson, your time has expired. Can you complete your remarks?"
- Jakobsson: "Thank you. Section 55 creates a new office to regulate sponsor program activities without clear limits on its authority. I think there's a lot of work to be done yet on this Bill. And I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just in response to the last question by Representative Jakobsson, HB 8 does not contain any provision related to the Illinois Procurement Code. The Procurement Code is entirely separate from the grant making authority. And I want to make sure people understand that, that this regarding grant-making authority. Moreover, grants are expressly exempt from the provisions of the Procurement Code. So, I'm saying that and especially like what Representative Crespo just said, with the universities concerns we are saying that if they are compliance right now with the federal guidelines, 97 percent of their grants are under the federal quidelines. So, if they're in compliance there should be no problem whatsoever. And regarding the private groups, what I said, I know that they have had the concerns. This will not impact any private money they get. They will not have to give out any information more than what

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

is already requested of them now in the grant process. So, I just want to encourage everybody there will be more work on this in JCAR. This is an extremely important Bill regarding 49... or \$46.9 billion in grants. That is almost 70 percent of the entire budget of the State of Illinois. So, all we do here day-in and day-out about fiscal accountability, this Bill will have more of a major impact in the State of Illinois regarding grant-making process, by all the work that has been done on this in the last year. I really encourage all of your support on this. It will go over to the Senate. It will have more discussion in JCAR. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo to close."

"Speaker, Members of the House, a couple points. I want Crespo: to thank, again, Representative Patti Bellock. And she pointed something that, I need to make sure everyone understands. They still have to go through the whole administrative rule process. So, the universities, anyone who's concerned, can go through that process as well. This ... actually what it does, it streamlines the process which will make it a lot easier for the agencies. And again, whether it's federal grants or state grants we're talking about tax dollars. People that we represent. What they pay into government. And I'm hoping that once this Act does pass and become law, that we don't have to keep reading all these articles in the newspaper about all the ways and actually, the criminal behavior that somehow comes out of these grants. So, again, thank you for your time. And I will ask for an 'aye' vote."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- 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? Chapa LaVia, Flowers, Hoffman, Thapedi. Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Martwick."
- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

- Martwick: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, standing with us today in the gallery above the Republican side of the chamber is an 8th grade class of students from my district. And I would like to ask you to all join me in welcome… welcoming the 8th grade class of Portage Park school and their teacher, Mr. Kwan to the State Capitol."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Have a great day in Springfield. House Bill 802, Mr. Drury. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 802, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Drury has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury on the Amendment."

- Drury: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment 2 and then discuss it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Without objection. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 802, a Bill for an Act concerning

criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

- Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 802 implements uniform for conducting eye witness identification standards procedures, which are better known as criminal lineups. These uniform procedures will allow for more consistent and accurate results. The procedures benefit law enforcement by reducing the number of false accusations against those who serve and protect us every day, our brave police officers. Additionally, the procedures will help prevent scenarios that lead to incorrect identifications and lead to the horrific situation of wrongful convictions. This Bill is the result of over a year of negotiations with all of the stakeholders. I know of no opposition to the Bill. And I ask for 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? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Davis, Leitch, Sommer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3831, Representative Gordon-Booth. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3831, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

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

- Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth. Please present the Amendment."
- Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill... I'd like to move to have the House Amendment 1 adopted to House Bill 3831. This Amendment is an initiative of the Comptroller's Office. What it would do is, it would allow the master contractors to be exempted from paying the Minority Contractor Opportunity Initiative Fee. This particular fee is a fee that fund ... partially funds the POWER Program that is run by the Comptroller's Office. This was a program that was initiated by Judy Baar Topinka upon her... the beginning of her administration. She saw that there was a great need to increase the pool of minority applicants that have an opportunity to successfully fulfill applications for the State of Illinois. What has been happening, unfortunately, there was an unintended consequence. Many of the master contractors that do business with the State of Illinois are paying a repetitive fee that they should not be paying. So, by exempting the master contractors from paying this fee would allow the staff that is paid to do this work, it would give them the opportunity to actually be able to do more of the work that we would like them to be doing. I'm open to any questions. And I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3831, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

- Gordon-Booth: "The House Amendment that I just spoke to you about is the Bill. So, I'm open for any questions. I ask for your '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? Have all voted who wish? Davidsmeyer, Davis. Please take the record. On this question, 102 voting 'yes', sorry, 101 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4094, Mr. Davis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4094, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #1 was adopted previously. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative William Davis."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

- Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Lang: "Amendment 2 is withdrawn, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, please proceed."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative William Davis and has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last... earlier this week, I brought this up and we adopted an Amendment, but we didn't move it because we were working on a different Amendment. And I'm taking this liberty because I know that this can be kind of a very sensitive issue for Members here in the General Assembly for a variety of reasons. But what we have in front of you is our best attempt, and I want to thank, initially, Representative Elaine Nekritz, Chair of the Judiciary Committee and Members of the Judiciary Committee that allowed us to be able to move at least one of our Amendments out of committee. But Ι also want to thank, Representative Reboletti, who worked to try to come up with some language that hopefully got to what we were trying to do. Essentially, as it relates to this issue with sex offenders, there are ... one statute was passed some time ago and then there was a subsequent statute that was passed, that allowed for some opportunities for a registered sex offender to be able to be in a... in the presence of their own child, under certain circumstances. That second statute that was passed, it did not repeal the previous statute. And so, what it did is it created confusion in some respects where jurisdictions didn't know which one, if they came across a case like that, I guess they had a choice or wasn't sure which one that they could pursue an individual underneath. So, all of our efforts up to this point have been to try to clarify and to tighten exactly how a situation, if it arose under these circumstances, could be addressed. So, Amendment #3, and I do move for the adoption of Amendment #3, tries to provide some basic language. And I want to be real clear, everyone, this does not repeal

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

anything, this does not weaken anything, this does not make it more difficult for law enforcement to do its job. So, for those of you and to be very sensitive to you because of the districts you represent, generally, those things that are perceived as being soft on crime, you don't vote for and I can respect that. This does nothing like that. What it simply says, and I'll read the language that we inserted. Simply says, except as otherwise provided by law. Those of you who are attorneys understand exactly what that phrase means. And what it's attempting to do is to make sure that the most recent provision that was passed into law is the one that's used to address situations like we're describing or have attempted to describe, both in committee as well as on the House Floor previously. So, that is what the language does. It has. It's been put in two areas of the existing statutes. Again, Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of the Amendment." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, can we hold your comments for Third

Reading? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor 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." Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4094, a Bill for an Act concerning

criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis, did you already explain the Bill?"
Davis, W.: "Well, if I may add just a little bit more to it.
Again, we know what language we're adopting and the situation
arose because you had a registered sex offender and because

of the conflicting provisions currently in law that gentleman

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

basically took the more conservative route in terms of attempting to watch his child participate in organized activities in a public place. The idea of this is to provide a mechanism so that certain individuals and again, if the courts deem otherwise that that contact should not happen in any way, of course, what the courts say does prevail. But again, in a situation where the courts are already making provisions for a father to have interactions with their child we're suggesting that if the child participates in an organized activity which may be in a park that that father is allowed to participate, meaning... no, I shouldn't say participate, is allowed to go and attend the event in the park to watch their child. Again, if the provisions, if there are orders of protection and all those other things that could be invoked by a court, if those are in place then, of course, this negates anything, that takes precedent. But in a situation where a court does allow for interaction between a father and a child that that father now be allowed to watch an activity of their child in an organized way in areas such as a public park. I'm done, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Reboletti: "Representative, as you know, you and I have had a number of conversations regarding this. And obviously, we have two conflicting statutes. One recognizing some exceptions; one passed later that was silent as to what those exceptions are and I know that that causes a lot of consternation with law enforcement. Can they arrest somebody?

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Can they prosecute? What would happen at the conviction level? Can you explain to me... I know that where the provisions are already carved out as to who can or cannot be in the public park. I know that that statute already says that there is a carveout for certain offenses. Could you enumerate those 'cause I don't believe every sex offender is allowed to come into a park with a child? I don't believe, no matter what the crime is, that everyone is allowed to do that?"

- Davis, W.: "I believe the answer to your question, Sir, is that the carveout is for child sex offenders who are a parent or a guardian."
- Reboletti: "Right. But I don't believe that every offense is covered. So, there might be some more aggravated offenses. I don't believe there's always a carveout for those and maybe you could ask your staffer on that."

Davis, W.: "Give me one moment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, have you completed your remarks?"
Davis, W.: "No, no, he has. I'm trying to answer his question,
Mr. Speaker. Again, trying to make sure we understand your
question, are you suggesting, with regard to what may be
classified as dangerous sexual predators?"

Reboletti: "Right. There... that there are certain convictions that this does not already apply for, even with... within the conflict of laws that you may have one convicted person... obviously, the person that you and I... the mother testified about, it was a situation where it was a teacher with his student."

Davis, W.: "Correct."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Reboletti: "And I know that that's a different level of sex offense compared to that of somebody who's in their 30s with a person that same age, mates with a 14-year-old. So, I know that's a different level. Is there a carve-out for aggravated criminal sexual assault and some of the more violent offenses as compared to some of the other sex offenses?"
- Davis, W.: "You mean... you mean as in certain violent offenses?" Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, your time has expired, but I'll
- give you a few... another minute."
- Davis, W.: "Would not apply to criminal sexual assault, aggravated criminal sexual assault, predatory criminal sexual assault. Is that, essentially... Okay."
- Reboletti: "Right, and that's what I wanted to bring to the attention of the Body, is that those extreme, violent offenses are already excluded by the other provision and that while obviously, no sex offense is condoned ever and that a victim is still a victim at any level, that there are different grades and we classify those by the different levels of the offenses and that the more egregious offenses, the Class Xs that we talked about, this predatory criminal sexual assault, some of the Class 1s, younger victims with older offenders are already excluded and this would not change that. Is that fair to say?"

Davis, W.: "That is correct. Does not change that."

Reboletti: "And I think that that's the important part, Representative, is that the portion says except as otherwise provided by law is that we've already... this Body already voted on about that, I believe, three and a half or four years ago that there was a, with some exceptions, that some of the other

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

child sex... some of the other sex offenses gave the permission to a parent to participate in a child's event at a park as long as they were there with the child and did not have any communication..."

Davis, W.: "With any other..."

Reboletti: "with any other children and that would not disturb this."

- Davis, W.: "Yes."
- Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I have immense respect for the Sponsor of this Bill, but after investigating these types of horrible crimes for five long years, I don't believe that this is something that we want to open other children, possible victims, up to. So, I would requestfully ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the… with regard to the last speaker, again, this is already in statute. We're not changing anything that currently is in statute, but we're simply trying to eliminate any conflict in the two statutes and hopefully direct, if there happens to be that situation, to direct to the most recently passed statute which does allow for this to happen. Again, I just want to be clear that we're not trying to… Mr. Speaker, can we just take this out very briefly, briefly?"

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk." Davis, W.: "Thank you."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 5526, Mr. Reboletti. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5526, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Body. House Bill 5526 deals with a plant which is known as kratom or kratom. It is ... it has the same impact or affect of an opiate, similar to heroin. And that there has been some discussion and I have received e-mails on both sides of the issue of banning it. I have received e-mails from those who have said that it is like heroin and it's very addictive and I've also received e-mails from individuals who are veterans that say they use it to deal with PTSD. And the FDA just placed it on its watch list and other countries have banned it. I think one of the important things here and what I've tried to do, instead a full, all-out ban and be respectful of the wishes of the Judiciary Committee, is to begin with the fact that we not allow the sale of it to minors and that we criminalize that activity. One, that if a person sells this substance to a minor it's a Class B misdemeanor and if a minor possesses it it's a Class B misdemeanor. So, with that, I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Zalewski: "Representative, did you ask the previous Sponsor to take his Bill out of the record just so you could do your Bill?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Reboletti: "I wish it was that simple, Representative, but the answer's no."

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

- Speaker Lang: "That's it, Sir? Really? Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Turner. Please take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4123, Mr. Moylan. Mr. Moylan. Out of the record. The Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the record please excuse Representative Kosel?"
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel is excused. Mr. Moylan. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, please put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4123, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment 1 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Moylan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

- Moylan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker... thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have an Amendment. I'd like to adopt the Amendment first and then go to the Bill. Is that okay?"
- Speaker Lang: "Do you want to tell us briefly what's in the Amendment, Sir?"
- Moylan: "Yes. The Amendment is a gut and replace and it deals with... because I have many mobile home parks in my district and the residents of these parks have asked for increased

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

rights as tenants. This Amendment includes many agreed upon changes by both opponents and proponents of the legislation. There's more work to be done, but we've agreed to continue working on this Bill in the Senate."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4123, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

- Moylan: "Yes. This legislation provides mobile home owners various rights including increased disclosure of park owner information in the lease, post in the custodian's building outstanding public health violations at the park, ensure security deposits are not to be included in a claim against the park owner or by a creditor. And I ask, respectfully, for 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? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Brauer, Franks, Reboletti. Please take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4591, Mr. Martwick. On the Order of Second Reading, please read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4591, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Martwick, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is an Amendment to this Bill, Amendment #1. This is an Amendment that removed opposition. It allows funding to follow the child no matter which way they go between charter or public schools. It removes all opposition from the Bill. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed
 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr.
 Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4591, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a school funding Bill. This was originally brought to me by a local school principal who is concerned that children who attended charter schools and who left the charter school for any reason to come back to the public school, that the funding which was distributed on a quarterly basis would not follow the child for the days in which the receiving school was charged with educating him. I filed a Bill that would require that money then to follow the child.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

I was then approached by representatives for Stand for Children in the Illinois Network of Charter Schools who said that they would be in full support of the Bill if we allowed the door to swing both ways, meaning that if the charter school had a vacancy and they filled that with a child from a public school then the funding would then again follow the child. I have heard from many people on this Bill that they believe that this Bill accomplishes the intent of the law which is to allow the school charged with educating the child, allows them to have the resources that they need. I know of no opposition. This Bill is supported by the Chicago Teachers Union and Illinois Network for Charter Schools as well as many of my fellow Representatives. I ask for your support and 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? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3944, Representative Jakobsson. Representative Jakobsson. Out of the rec... There's Representative Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. No running, Representative." Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3944, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Jakobsson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Jakobsson."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move Floor Amendment #2 to the Third Reading and then discuss the Bill then."
- Speaker Lang: "Without 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."

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3944, with this Floor Amendment, makes discretionary a 10 percent set-aside of any capital appropriation for our state universities for new construction only after July 1 of this year. Requires that a set-aside be to utilize for capital renewal or deferred maintenance. And so, the boards of trustees would authorize this 10 percent set-aside, the request for it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, is there any assurance in this Bill that the set-aside won't be swept by the Governor's Office?" Jakobsson: "Yes. This appropriation would be in a fund that the university would keep... the universities would keep."

Pritchard: "I think that's a critical component of this Bill because I've had a university in my district who set aside some of their own money for maintenance, unfunded

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

maintenance, and the funds were swept by the Governor's office. So, I think it's important that we have this provision. Is it also discretionary that the university set aside that 10 percent?"

- Jakobsson: "It is discretionary. It would be up to the boards of trustees."
- Pritchard: "I know it's very possible, in construction, that costs may be lower than what is anticipated when the original request for capital funding is approved. And therefore, there might be excess funds, but so often there isn't excess funds. In fact, the cost increase may have gone up from the time that the proposal was developed. So, I think it's important that this be discretionary. Thank you, Representative."
- 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. Cavaletto, Drury, Flowers, Harris, Reboletti, Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 92 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5838, Mr. Mitchell. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5838, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5838 is really, I guess, you could call it a second chance Bill. I've met a ton of people in my district and also kind of seen in practice folks who, for whatever reason, someone gets pregnant or

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

someone has to leave to work for the family don't get a chance to complete their high school education and want to go back and have a chance to do so. Currently, they can do that up to the age of 21. This Bill would say that they could do so up to the age of 23. When I presented the Bill in committee, there was concern because the language made it seem as if this could be forced upon school districts to do it in a classroom setting that did not want to do so. The Amendments, as I understand it, pushed all opposition to neutral and clarifies that the intent of this Bill is to be permissive and to really allow folks who want to to have a second chance. Welcome questions and I would ask for 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? Have all voted who wish? Golar, Jakobsson, Tracy, Unes. Please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1322, Mr. Hoffman, on the Order of Second Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1322, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. This... Amendment #2 or Amendment #3, what it would do is it would remove safety net hospitals as well as critical care hospitals from the licensure yearly fee."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1322, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1322 is an initiative and an agreement between the Illinois Hospital Association and the Illinois Department of Public Health. Back in 2005, we passed here in the General Assembly, the Adverse Health Care Event Reporting Law. Unfortunately, the Adverse Health Care Event Reporting Law has not been able to be implemented because of lack of funding. This would provide that funding. What would that law do? It would indicate that hospitals would be required to report what they call never events, very serious events such as operating on the wrong site for surgery, operating on the left arm when it should have the right arm and those types of never events would have to be reported, then the department would come into the hospital, they would study, they would develop a policy and make recommendations on how to stop them from happening in the future. In addition, what this would do is it would provide an agreed to ... this is an agreed to ... a \$55 licensing fee that will be paid for by the hospitals, will go into a fund and would be used in order to make sure that we are investigating these never events as well as events that are brought by patients or others and they make complaints

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

against hospitals. Let me just give you an example. Last year alone, there were 617 total complaints made against hospitals to the department and only 438... and 438 of them have never been investigated. This is something that we need to do for patient safety. Safety net hospitals have been removed from the fee. Critical care hospitals have been removed from the licensure fee. And I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield, please?" Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

- Osmond: "Representative, just to renew so everybody understands exactly what we're doing, all hospitals are in agreement to pay this fee."
- Hoffman: "Yes and this is an initiative of the Illinois Hospital Association along with the Illinois Department of Public Health. We did remove the poorer hospitals, the safety net hospitals from the annual assessment and we removed the critical care hospitals which are all hospitals that have under 25 beds."
- Osmond: "So, the smallest hospital, in your estimation, what would be the most that they would pay, the smallest hospitals?"
- Hoffman: "Well the smallest hospitals would pay zero because if you have... yeah, if you have under 25 beds we remove them from the yearly assessment."

Osmond: "Okay. But what would be... All right. Let's go this way. What would be the maximum that a large hospital would pay?"

Hoffman: "I believe that... and this is what I was told by the department. I believe that the largest hospital, if you calculate the beds, that would be about \$50 thousand."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Osmond: "And that is agreed to by them?"

- Hoffman: "And it is agreed to by the Hospital Association. They want to make sure that this law is enforced. They want to make sure that these never events don't occur and they want to give the department the financial resources in order for that to happen."
- Osmond: "And did you not say before that there was approximately over 600 occurrences that happened, but only somewhere in the area of 400 was investigated due to the fact that they did not have enough funds?"
- Hoffman: "It's actually the opposite. There were 617 total complaints just last year alone and 438 of them have not been investigated."

Osmond: "I'm sorry, not been investigated."

Hoffman: "Yeah, have not been investigated."

- Osmond: "So, they only have the opportunity of investigating a little over 200. And with this bed fee then they would be able to accommodate these types of incidences?"
- Hoffman: "Yes, it'll go into a fund that'll be used for this purpose."
- Osmond: "Okay. And I stand in strong support of this issue. Thank you."
- Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "So, I just wanted to clarify, it's \$55 a bed no matter what the size of the hospital is except for those ones that

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

are exempt, those smaller that you said were 25 beds or under."

- Hoffman: "Yes. The critical care hospitals, those are 25 beds or under and the safety net hospitals which are the highest Medicaid hos... the ones that have the highest Medicaid patient mix..."
- Bellock: "Right."
- Hoffman: "...and so we take... they're removed and they don't have to pay under this... the Amendment that we adopted."
- Bellock: "Right, because a safety net hospital is not necessarily just 25 beds. So, I just wanted to clarify that that there were smaller hospitals that did not have to pay and then the safety nets don't have to pay or the critical care does not have to pay."

Hoffman: "That's exactly right."

- Bellock: "Correct? And so, this goes into the fund and the Department of Public Health then will do the investigations of the hospitals and these events, correct?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. the provision was sought by the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services to ensure that the license fee does not run afoul of federal regulations. I digress, the Illinois Department of Public Health will do the investigations, but we also put in here that by rule we could reduce it if we have to, so that it doesn't run afoul of federal regulation. So, the maximum is \$55 and it will only be paid... or will not be paid by safety net hospitals or critical care hospitals and then the money goes into that fund that the Department of Health Care and Family Services

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

will use in order to make sure these 438 complaints that were not investigated last year get investigated."

Bellock: "Right. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the Bill. I think that this is a good Bill to support because I think a lot of people think that hospitals are investigated a lot more than they are on these type of events. And I think that even though some people are a little bit shy of that \$55 fee, I think that this is something for the safety of the patients in the hospital. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos for two minutes."

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

Pihos: "What reassurance do we have that these funds won't be swept?"

- Hoffman: "That's not the intent. I don't know if there's… if you can put anti-sweeping language because that language can always be changed, as you know, but I don't believe that… I know that the Hospital Association wouldn't support that, I wouldn't support it and I know that the department wouldn't support it and this is an initiative of the department. So, I don't… and of the Governor's Office, so I don't believe in that… it certainly is not my intent and I don't believe that it's the Governor's intent either. So, I would fight that tooth and nail."
- Pihos: "Thank you. One other question. I think I know why the safety net hospitals are protected, but could you just articulate that?"
- Hoffman: "Well, they are the ones with the highest Medicaid mix, and as you know, the Medicaid reimbursements, many times, is

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

not as much as insurance reimbursement. The safety net hospitals are just that. There are safety nets in many of the poorest communities that have the highest Medicaid mix and they have a very difficult time making ends meet now so, we exempted them out of this."

Pihos: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: " Sponsor yields."

- Feigenholtz: "Representative Hoffman, just a couple of quick questions. Very often, when people who discuss Medicaid these days worry about the upper payment limit in the discussion of assessments. Can you tell me if this is matchable? If there's going to be an effort to match these funds if this has any effect on the upper payment limit?"
- Hoffman: "In my discussions with the department and the Hospital Association during this Bill, we never brought up it being matched. I can tell you that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services asked that the \$55 be the maximum and if we are running afoul of any federal rule, we could reduce that by rule. So, that was the only discussion we really had about the federal and matchable money. If it is matchable, I think we probably should try and do it."

Hoffman: "It's totally different."

Feigenholtz: "And there's no intention on amending this Bill with another assessment? It's just... it is what it is. There's no boogeyman in this Bill?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Hoffman: "Yeah. This is just an initiative by the Department of Public Health."

Feigenholtz: "Terrific. 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 take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3885, Representative Manley. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3885, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Manley."

- Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. This is... House Bill 3885 is a collaboration between the Will County Governmental League which is a coalition of several communities that I represent, the Illinois Department of Revenue and the Retail Merchants Association. The point of this Bill is to help all municipalities, not only those with levy authority, by allowing them to view certain retailer tax records that are reported to the Department of Revenue. I'm glad to take 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? Kay. Please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4612, Mr. Sandack. Please read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4612, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

- Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This was a gut and replace. The Amendment was put on yesterday. This is essentially a study to look at shared services for student transportation in the state that will be undertaken by ISBE. Yes, it's a task force, but it's undertaken by the State Board of Education. I know of no opposition. I'll take any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "I thought you didn't like task forces, Sir? Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 102 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4157, Representative Berrios. The Bill is on Second Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4157, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Berrios."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Berrios on the Amendment."

- Berrios: "Floor Amendment 1 is adding unpaid interns to the Illinois Human Rights Act."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Berrios."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Berrios."

- Berrios: "Amendment #2 expands the definition of an 'unpaid intern'."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4157, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Berrios."

- Berrios: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today I bring you House Bill 4157. As it currently stands, an unpaid intern is not legally an employee which means according to many State Laws they're ineligible for basic employee human rights protections. When someone is hired into an office to fulfill an obligation, that person should be protected at the workplace like any other worker even if they're unpaid. Many interns work long hours for zero money, but complete the same tasks as paid employees. As it currently stands, unpaid interns can legally be sexually harassed in the workplace by their employers because they're not categorized as employees. Today, we are adding unpaid interns to the Illinois Human Rights Act and I'd 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

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Reboletti. Please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3833, Mr. Costello. It's on the Order of Second Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3833. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Costello."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. House Bill 3833 clarifies that the Adjutant General is the Director of Military Affairs and also the Commander of the Illinois National Guard. This needs to be done for audit findings. It also deals with the Illinois Military Family Relief Fund. It addresses the \$2000 needs base grant which is for soldiers who have a particularly difficult financial hardship. Also, the \$500 status grant which is given for the hardship of deployment. Currently, these grants are only given out under statute if they are related to the war on terror or 9/11. I think everyone's aware of the fact that we've drawn down in Iraq and we are drawing down further in Afghanistan, so this language needs to be changed. In order for these soldiers to access these grants, the language would be changed for a deployment of more than 30 days active duty. We are not seeking any new revenue, just to access the current fund which is the Illinois Military Family Relief Fund. I thank you and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3833, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello, did the Amendment become the Bill?" Costello: "The Amendment became the Bill. I believe I explained

it and I will take any questions. I ask for your 'aye' vote." Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3948, Representative Golar. Please read the Bill. The Bill is on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3948, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Golar."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar on the Amendment."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2... I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3948. This is a change in statute. House Amendment #2 restores current law language requiring that Grow Your Own Teacher program to consider whether a candidate has a high school diploma, is a parent, community leader, para educator and has experienced an interruption in his or her college education."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed
 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr.
 Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3948, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this Assembly. GYO ... As a change agent for the diverse educator pipeline, Illinois today ... I would say in 2011 was ranked among the lowest 48 in state teacher diversity index according to teacher diversity matters published by the Center for American Progress. Despite concerted efforts to promote teacher diversity, Illinois teachers workforce has not kept the pace with the rapid demographic transformation among the state's students and as a result, Illinois has one of the highest teacher diversity gaps in the country. The goal of the GYO initiative is to recruit and prepare parents and community leaders to become effective teachers in hard-to-staff schools. This Bill has been in effect since 2005. It was started with the local Logan Square Assembly. Serving as a substantial percentage of low-income students this program helped to promote the public agenda goals by developing a pipeline of teachers of color. We've had some challenges with this particular Bill over the past, I say, since 2006, but this statute and the benchmarks that we have put in should bring about a great change for this program. I'll be happy to take any questions."

183

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- 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 take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this issue, there are 101 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Gordon-Booth will be excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick. Mr. Martwick has changed his mind. House Bill 4505, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4505, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. 4505 is an initiative of the Department of Ag and it actually just allows them to regulate vegetable oil. Now, as to the name Dead Animal Disposal Act, I'm probably not the guy to explain that part. I'd like to yield the balance of my time to Representative Reboletti."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti regarding dead animals."

- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not the expert I think Representative Mautino thinks I am on dead animals. I would like to add that the Italian Caucus is a proponent of the Bill. And I'd like to yield the balance of my time to Representative DeLuca."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca regarding dead animals."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

yield to Representative Rita."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Rita does know about dead animals."
Rita: "I can see why my colleague from southern Illinois would
say that, but you know and, I'm not an expert in this area.
I'm going to yield my time to Representative D'Amico."

- Speaker Lang: "This is really well-orchestrated. Representative D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I'm no expert on dead animals, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to move the previous question. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Mr. Mautino, do you wish to close? 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 81 voting 'yes', 20 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Martwick."
- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Martwick: "Mr. Speaker, in the gallery today, over the Republican side of the chamber is a class from Mary, Seat of Wisdom School which actually is in my good friend, Representative

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Moylan's district however, I would point out that two of my nieces are in the class. So, if you'd please help me in welcoming my nieces Gabrielle Figliuolo, Gretchen Cox and all of their classmates from Mary, Seat of Wisdom."

- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Apparently, every school child in your district is in Springfield today, Sir. Representative Tracy."
- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, I do have to make an announcement that I sit next to the real critter queen of the House Floor. She knows her dead animals, she knows her live animals, so in deference to the Bill, you should've asked Representative Hammond what a dead animal is."
- Speaker Lang: "Unfortunately, no one yielded to her. House Bill 4407, Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4407, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the Early Intervention Services System. It clarifies that children can continue with services while their parents attempt to resolve a dispute through either due process hearing or through mediation. It's agreed upon by the Department of Human Services and early intervention services. And I'd 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? Chapa LaVia. Please take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5709, Mr. DeLuca. Please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5709, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative DeLuca." Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca." DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to adopt House Floor Amendment #2. Can I adopt the Amendment and discuss it on Third?"

Speaker Lang: "Does the Amendment becomes the Bill?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5709, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the waiver valuation Bill which allows municipal employees to conduct valuations under \$10 thousand. And with the Amendment we've included the language that has the training requirements in it and it removes the opposition. So, I ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'aye'; opposed
 will vote '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 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5766, Mr. Reboletti. We have to keep him busy. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5766, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Reboletti."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 5766 is an attempt to create a pilot program which would..."
- Speaker Lang: "On the Amendment, Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "...I'm sorry. The Amendment which will become the Bill, it will create a pilot program..."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it..."
- Reboletti: "I want to explain it."
- Speaker Lang: "Explain it on Third... and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5766, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Now, Mr. Reboletti, you can explain it to your heart's content."
- Reboletti: "This is a very good Bill and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. Is that what you were saying?"
- Speaker Lang: "Perhaps you could explain it to us now."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Reboletti: "I was trying to do that on the Order of Second Reading, but Ladies and Gentlemen, seriously, this is a Bill that is trying to deal with the issue of addiction throughout the state. And it is an opportunity for people who are low-level offenders, that would be convicted of possession of a controlled substance, retail theft, burglary that are involved with mental health issues or substance abuse issues. And it would seek to be a pilot program where facilities would be located in DuPage County, would be located in Cook County and ones to be named in one of the redeploy counties, preferably a downstate county. And it would mirror some of the boot camp provisions, but wouldn't have an age limitation or the physical limitations that are included. But the idea would be that they'd have to be a first offender, have one of those types of convictions and then go to a facility where they could get the treatment that they need and then hopefully be rehabilitated and could enter a productive life. And I would yield to any questions, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "No need. 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. Andrade, Hernandez. Please take the record. On this question, there are 81 voting 'yes', 20 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5940, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5940, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

189

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill simply changes the definition of a 'dangerous animal' for the purposes of maintaining control over these species in Illinois. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those... Mr. Sullivan is recognized."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I spoke with some of the people that are in favor of your Bill in my office and there is a concern, not necessarily about your Bill, but about the underlying language that would make it a problem if I had, say, a hunting dog and we had DCCA... You know how they have shock collars and you walk around with the hunting and then I bring my child along with me to go hunting birds and potentially someone could consider that a... I might be on the wrong Bill. Is this the Bill that would make it punishable to have one of your children next to you?"

Zalewski: "No, no."

Sullivan: "Forget everything I just said."

Speaker Lang: "It sure was interesting though. Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Reis: "Representative, what is a 'dangerous animal' as defined in your Bill?"
- Zalewski: "Under current law, individuals are prohibited from keeping a lion, tiger, leopard, ocelot, margay, jaguar, cheetah, mountain lion, bobcat. I don't… Current law provides…"

Reis: "I'm going to help you out. Does it include coyote?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Zalewski: "This Bill amends the exceptions to the Act and does not prohibit properly maintained zoo parks. We made a lot of accommodations to the Bill. We just changed the definition."

Reis: "Okay. Let me help you out. There were some hard words to pronounce there. I understand that. Does it include coyote?" Zalewski: "Yes."

- Reis: "And what is a refuge area? And I'm being serious here. Everybody else can joke when I'm done."
- Zalewski: "A refuge is a place where a not-for-profit entity operates a place of sanctuary where abused, neglected, unwanted, impounded, abandoned, orphaned or displaced animals are provided care for the lifetime of the animal. It does not include any commercial activity."
- Reis: "Okay. We passed a Bill here eight years ago, I believe, that DNR has yet to implement that allows coyotes to be penned up. We changed statute with over a hundred votes in this chamber and I just want to make sure your Bill isn't taking away what we did for several of my constituents back several years ago where we allowed coyotes which was a dangerous animal to be penned up and for sporting events."
- Zalewski: "I don't believe that's going to be affected in our Bill."
- Reis: "But you don't know for sure and that's okay. I'll work with whoever picks this up in the Senate to make sure we don't undo what we passed here."

Zalewski: "Sounds good, David."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Davidsmeyer: "In my district I have a gentleman who raises fox. What... how would this affect him?"

Zalewski: "What kind of facility is it, C.D.?"

Davidsmeyer: "It's raised for fur."

Zalewski: "So, that's a commercial activity?"

Davidsmeyer: "I would say yes."

Zalewski: "We would argue it doesn't apply because there's lawful possession for the purposes of selling the fur."

- Davidsmeyer: "What if a... somebody owns a lion for the purpose of education? Not for consumption."
- Zalewski: "It's prospective. It's prospective, C.D., so it wouldn't apply. They currently own the lion."

Davidsmeyer: "Did you say it would apply?"

Zalewski: "It would not 'cause it's going to be prospective in nature. If they own the lion as we speak, it wouldn't apply." Davidsmeyer: "But as his lion gets older and he goes to replace

that lion..."

Zalewski: "We don't want... I think, prospectively, he would not be able to get a new lion."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. And this is a gentleman... the gentleman I'm referring to actually travels throughout the U.S. with these animals."

Zalewski: "Is he a licensed zoo?"

Davidsmeyer: "I haven't had a chance to speak with him. I didn't realize this was coming up this quickly."

Zalewski: "Okay. That would be helpful to find out, C.D."

Davidsmeyer: "I agree. Would you pull this from the record so I have... have a little more time to..."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Zalewski: "Well, I think we could probably discuss it in the Senate."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Zalewski: "My sense is that he would... if he's licensed, currently licensed, and it's prospective he would not have to necessarily have to give up the lions."

Davidsmeyer: "But we'll work with you in the Senate on that." Zalewski: "Yeah."

Davidsmeyer: "And my concern is, you know, there's... I'm sure there's always bad apples in the bunch that don't treat animals fairly, but there are good people out there that do things well and take care of their animals properly and I'm just making sure that those people aren't receiving the wrong end of this Bill. So I..."

Zalewski: "I understand, C.D."

Davidsmeyer: "...understand your efforts. 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? Cavaletto, Sullivan. Please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5710, Representative McAsey and her friend. Please read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5710, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey. Of that... you should not do that. Representative McAsey."

193

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 5710 is an initiative of the Probation and Court Services Association to allow for probation officers to have contact with victims in cases of domestic battery to make sure that the court has all of the information that it ought to when it's making determinations about how to best protect these victims with regard to electronic monitoring and other conditions of bail. This Bill represents an agreement between probation as well as the Illinois Coalition against Domestic Violence and the Illinois Coalition against Sexual Assault. I will take any questions and appreciate the support of the Body. 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? Mr. Franks. Please take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5633, Representative Kelly Burke. Kelly Burke. No need to run. We'll all wait. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5633, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Kelly Burke." Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "House Amendment 2 is a gut and replace Amendment that becomes the Bill. It requires the Office of Retail Market Development in the Illinois Commerce Commission to prepare a report regarding natural gas competition for residential and small retail market."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed
 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr.
 Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5633, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill does what I just said it did on... the Motion is..."
- 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? Reboletti, Sullivan. Reboletti. Please take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5395, Representative Monique Davis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5395, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Beiser."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Beiser on the Amendment. Out of the record. Representative Davis, do you wish to move the Bill to Third Reading without the Amendment?"

Davis, M.: "With the Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Well, the Amendment was taken out of the record." Davis, M.: "But it's my Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser, maybe you can clear up this interesting dilemma."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Beiser: "Apparently, I'm not good at hand signals other than that I wanted to let the Chair know that that Amendment was offered by Representative Davis in committee. I apologize to the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "We don't have a signal for that, Sir. Representative Davis on the Amendment."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #2 replaces the previous information in House Amendment 1. It applies only to Cook County and provides that ... the following when a landlord is seeking to evict a tenant. If a landlord is granted an order of possession of the property, a tenant may only file two motions. Currently, the tenant can file motion after motion after motion to stay its enforcement. A judge can also allow a stay for good cause. If a stay of enforcement is filed, but denied by the judge, the sheriff must evict the tenant within 45 days of denial. If a motion for the stay of enforcement is granted, the sheriff must evict the tenant within 45 days from the stay and the stay ceases to be effective. If the sheriff does not evict within that time, a peace officer is authorized or allowed to execute that eviction. Currently, Mr. Speaker, if a landlord files for the eviction of a tenant, he pays over \$200 in a fee. He also pays \$60 for the sheriff to serve notice to the tenant. Most times the sheriff doesn't get to serve the notice and the landlord, has to pay an additional fee to a process server or to post. Once the posting has occurred and the tenant is finally brought into court and the judge orders possession to the landlord as soon as the ... as soon as it's allowed the possession is given to the landlord the tenant has the right

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

to go and file a motion to delay or stay that. That's another two weeks. When they do return and the judge says your motion to stay is denied, the tenant can file another motion and they're... at this point, current law does not allow for any stopping of these motions. Currently, some people in Cook County are remaining in the landlord's property without paying rent for up to a year or more. I will answer questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack on the Amendment. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5395, a Bill for an Act concerning civil

law. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Lang: "Representative, did the Amendment become the Bill?" Davis, M.: "The Amendment becomes the Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack on the Bill." Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, we had a nice discussion in Judiciary yesterday about this and it's kind of a unique situation. Some people that you would think would be proponents are actually against it and it's just an interesting dilemma. I think I know exactly what you're trying to do, but there's some interesting challenges. Has law enforcement, the Chicago PD, or any local unit of police enforcement endorsed your Bill?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Davis, M.: "Chicago police, in my knowledge, they have not... they're neutral on the Bill. Is that right? The sheriff's office is opposed because we're saying that a police officer can enforce that eviction. You know, currently, when they go in to evict they only unlock the door, ask all people inside to leave the building and the other things are left up to the landlord."
- Sandack: "Right. And the process of eviction isn't really changed. It's how it's enforced is how your Bill addresses it. If the sheriff doesn't get it done in a certain time, then local peace officers, local police, would be authorized to engage in the process which they don't do now, correct?"
- Davis, M.: "That is correct, but that's only bec... you know, it was only given to them. There is no constitutional authority that gives the sheriff the right to evict. There's no constitutional authority. It's just a process that was given to him to do."
- Sandack: "I understand that, but they're equipped to do that. They've been doing it for years. Local law enforcement doesn't and hasn't, correct?"

Davis, M.: "That is correct."

- Sandack: "And with respect to the timing of your Bill, you're accelerating the process of eviction quite dramatically in fact."
- Davis, M.: "Not really. Not at all. Not at all"
- Sandack: "You're not."
- Davis, M.: "No. The first time you file and it's two weeks before the person may be served..."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Sandack: "Not the service process. After an order is undertaken. So, the order itself of eviction, now you're saying if it isn't done in 45 days it goes to local police."

Davis, M.: "That is correct."

Sandack: "All right. And..."

Davis, M.: "That's 30 days and two weeks. Now, don't forget, the landlord has been without rent..."

Sandack: "Yes, Ma'am."

Davis, M.: "...perhaps for four months or more up 'til now."

Sandack: "No doubt about it, but in Cook County, Judge Evans, the chief judge of the..."

Davis, M.: "Circuit Court."

- Sandack: "...of the whole court, yeah. Many times they don't even do evictions because of inclement weather and how would your Bill address that?"
- Davis, M.: "This Bill has nothing to do with the weather. It still allows the chief court... the chief justice of the court to use inclement weather to halt evictions. It does nothing with taking that out of the judge's hands."
- Sandack: "So, there's an exception in your Bill that says the 45 day period of time does not toll if there's a weather..."
- Davis, M.: "It says for good cause the judge can order a stay for good cause."
- Sandack: "For good cause. Well, that's in every… almost every civil law procedure, for good cause. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I commend the Sponsor in her attempt to accelerate and make more efficient the eviction process. I empathize with landlords who go without payment; however, her Bill is not supported by the people who undertake the system as it

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

currently exists. The sheriffs are against it. The courts are against it. Local police is not with it. This is a dramatic change to the status quo. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Willis: "I have a couple of quick questions to help clarify this for me a little better. We're not getting rid of the renter's bill of rights. The renters still have that protection that's afforded to them, correctly?"
- Davis, M.: "Yes, Representative, they still do and there is no court opposed to this legislation. There is no court that has said they're opposed to this legislation."
- Willis: "So, what we're really looking at is to streamline the eviction maybe possibly clear up some time in the courts right now with nuisance cases by just delaying that, right?"
- Davis, M.: "It's really... thank you, Representative and it really is to stop a group of people who have learned this system and are using this system to scam landlords. No other jurisdiction allows what Cook County is allowing. No other jurisdiction does that. Our sheriff is so busy today. Our sheriff is doing a wonderful job. He's taking over the south suburban officials duties for some of them that are said to be correct... corrupt. He's taking over those duties. He's dealing with the puppy mill. He's dealing with the strip clubs and he also has to take care of the court. He's getting ready to have inmate's rehab houses and put those houses under homeless shelters or mental illness places. Our sheriff is tremendously busy and to expect him to do... you see, when this job was given to him,

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Cook County was much smaller. There weren't that many people living there. There were not that many, what would you call it, rental units. Cook County has grown substantially and his jobs have grown substantially. According to the law, he... there's nothing in the law that says the sheriff has to do the eviction. That's just a process that was given to him. One of my colleagues asked if the police wanted to do evictions. Well, I asked do they want to do burglaries, do they want to do murders? You know, do they want to do robberies, do they want to do traffic stops? So, I think it is unfair to landlords who continue to have to have to pay taxes, garbage disposal which has almost doubled and to allow a person who really has no excuse, they just have the ability to keep filing motions to stay the judge's order."

Willis: "Thank you for that clarification."

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

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Yes."

- Davidsmeyer: "The question that we have on this Bill is basically who is going to do the eviction? I don't think that anybody's against what you're trying to do as far as the continuous stay after stay after stay. You know, the eviction process has to move forward and I understand and that's a good Bill. I think the disagreement is on the enforcement side."
- Davis, M.: "Well, a landlord, according to the Bill, the landlord can hire a police... a peace officer. They don't have to hire. They can bring a peace officer and all that peace officer

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

does is unlock the door, remove people inside. They don't... you know, long ago they used to have to remove the furniture and they don't do that anymore. They merely ask the people to leave and secure the building so the landlord can enter."

Davidsmeyer: "So, I want to clarify my statement earlier. There are people opposed to the stays. I'm saying, for the purpose of our discussion, I'm not opposed to that part of the Bill. I'm opposed to who's doing the eviction."

Davis, M.: "The evictions, okay."

- Davidsmeyer: "And so, if we were to just change this Bill to go back to just the sheriff's department providing this."
- Davis, M.: "Well, let me ask you this, Representative. How can the sheriff do all of these things? Now, seriously, how can the sheriff have inmates being trained to rehab houses, go and rehab houses, deal with puppy mills, going to the south suburbs and take over some of their corrupt government and do evictions. He doesn't have time to do evictions. He doesn't really have time to do any serving. You pay \$60 for the sheriff to serve. The sheriff doesn't serve. Then you have to go back and pay some more money to have a process server. All I'm saying is this... the way this currently sits and it's been that way before Chicago or Cook County became the size that it is, the sheriff was supposed to do all of these things. He really just doesn't have time."
- Davidsmeyer: "And I would not argue with the fact that the sheriff's office is very busy, but I would also say that the City of Chicago... their police department has plenty to do as well."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Davis, M.: "So then they should say to the landlord we can't come. We don't have time."

Davidsmeyer: "It's kind of a moot..."

Davis, M.: "So, then you have to wait for the sheriff. In this…" Davidsmeyer: "It's kind of a moot argument."

Davis, M.: "Representative, in this Bill, the sheriff has 45 days; he can still do that. If they have a slow day and they want to do some evictions, they can do it, but if he doesn't have time to do it that landlord has some relief. Do you know there are some people who are staying in these landlord places for over a year without paying."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah and I think that is crazy."

Davis, M.: "It's not fair."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer, your time has come to a close, Sir. Can you complete your remarks?"
- Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. Why does this only apply to Chicago? Just a quick question."
- Davis, M.: "It's for Cook County."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay."
- Davis, M.: "For Cook County."
- Davidsmeyer: "Cook County only?"
- Davis, M.: "Other counties usually have a much more, I would say, fair and deliberative process. Only Cook County does this exist in."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Thank you."

Davis, M.: "You're welcome."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Reboletti: "Representative, I would and I've asked you as you and I have conversed, would you consider taking this out of the record and getting an extension on this so that there might be some compromise, because I truly appreciate the position of a landlord, but I also appreciate the position of the sheriff's office and the concerns of other law enforcement agents that might be pushed into service to do this without a lot of guidance because I'm not sure if it would be Chicago Police Department. Could the Elmhurst Police Department serve process? So, would you consider doing that so that we would have the break to work on it?"
- Davis, M.: "Well, I'd like to know what you think would make this a better Bill. I mean, the sheriff will always be opposed for some reason. It is not in stone. It is not in the Constitution that only the sheriff can evict. That is just a job that was given to him before he started to do the many wonderful things that he now continues to do and adds to his repertoire."
- Reboletti: "And I can appreciate that and I know that the sheriff has involved himself in other endeavors that are outside the scope of the generic requirements of what the sheriff's supposed to do which is the sheriff's supposed to provide court security, run the jail and serve civil process and also provide law enforcement for unincorporated areas. So, I know that he does a number of other things, but I'm seeing that there are many other people that are opposed to this and I was hoping that if you took this out of the record that maybe some of those... that opposition might be removed if there were some Amendments here that would strike a balance between people that are truly gaming the system as a tenant and

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

allowing law enforcement to... the sheriff to execute their job and to timely evict people based on valid court orders."

- Davis, M.: "The only way, Representative, the only way the sheriff will be able to do evictions as charged is to hire a lot more sheriffs. Currently, he does not have enough people to monitor the jail, do rehab of housings, monitor the puppy mills, going to the strip clubs, go... in the south suburban districts and those corrupt governments, remove them and run those governments. He does not have time for evictions anymore. And as you state, there were three things given to him. He is to do those three things that you mentioned. He is to provide service and security at all the court facilities which have grown. Don't forget we have many more court facilities now. We got drug court, divorce court, domestic violence court. These things were not in place when he was given the job for evictions. There's also ... he administers the Cook County jail. That is exponentially large. And then the third thing he's charged with is policing the unincorporated areas of Cook County. Now, along with those three things that he's absolutely charged with, he has added or someone has put a lot of extra things on his plate and by having all of these extra things on his plate for which he's doing a great job it leaves ... excuse me, it leaves landlords vulnerable to people remaining in their property, destroying it, not paying rent and growing up thinking the world owes them a living and they don't have to pay. It is not fair to the landlord and it is not fair to the tenant."
- Reboletti: "And I appreciate that, Representative, but you say, that a peace officer can do this."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Davis, M.: "A peace officer can do this."

- Reboletti: "Representative, you're saying a peace officer. You haven't said what departments would participate. Are they only Cook County law enforcement? Could they be from other counties downstate? Are they people that are retired peace officers?"
- Davis, M.: "The way it's written, Representative, all of those could be of service in serving for eviction officers. Absolutely correct."

Reboletti: "And what hap..."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, can you bring your remarks to a close?"
- Reboletti: "I have one final question, Mr. Speaker. If there wa… something were to occur and the tenant sued the peace officer, is the lawsuit then against the department for which that person works or does that lawsuit go against the sheriff of Cook County?"
- Davis, M.: "Well, I know that, to my knowledge, none have ever charged or sued the sheriff."
- Reboletti: "What I'm saying, Representative, is that many times these can be confrontational situations. They could involve some type of physical contact between the officer and the tenant and if there's an allegation that the officer has used excessive force and that tenant sued the police officer would they sued be sued in their capacity as a Chicago Police officer, an Elmhurst police officer or would they somehow be deputized by the sheriff's office?"
- Davis, M.: "It would be under which authority they were under. Are you under the Chicago Police Department? Who's... are you

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

operating on your own? Are you operating part time? Are you getting paid part time and you're no longer under the auspices of the department that you actually work for? There are many avenues here and the..."

Reboletti: "And I appreciate that, Representative..."

Davis, M.: "...JCAR... JCAR would make the rules for this particular behavior."

Reboletti: "But I sincerely doubt, Representative, that another department's going to want to take on that responsibility." Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick question. Our analysis
 says that the Illinois..."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Oh, I'm sorry. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "Yes."

- Ives: "Our analysis says the Illinois Rental Property Owners Association is opposed and Chicagoland Apartment Association is a proponent. I was just wondering why one would be opposed and the other a proponent. They seem to have similar interests. Did they come to you or tell you what their opposition is?"
- Davis, M.: "Well, I think... we have been working with the Illinois Rentals Association... the Association of Realtors. We have been working with them and also the Illinois Rental Property Owners Association. We have been working with them to develop this legislation. We are not trying to hurt anyone or any industry. We are trying to assist and help landlords collect the rent that helps them pay their bills."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Ives: "Well, that's why there just seemed to me a little bit of confusion then, that's all, but if you don't have a really... If they didn't give you a really good solid reason why they're opposed, that's all I was trying to get at."

Davis, M.: "The people you named are not opposed."

Ives: "No, the Illinois Rental Property Owners Association."

Davis, M.: "They are proponents. The Illinois Rental Property Owners Association are proponents of this Bill."

Ives: "Okay. Our analysis..."

Davis, M.: "The Illinois Association of Realtors."

Ives: "Our analysis just says something different, that's all. Thank you."

Davis, M.: "Well, your analysis is incorrect."

Ives: "Okay. That's what I was... that's why I was asking..." It did not make sense."

Davis, M.: "And I thank you."

- Ives: "And we know that does ...
- Davis, M.: "I appreciate that. Yes, they are proponents."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis to close."

- Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'd like to take this Bill out of the record."
- Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be taken out of the record. House Bill 5623, Mr. Sandack. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5623, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Bear with me one second, please."

Speaker Lang: "We're bearing, Sir."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Sandack: "Thank you. You remember we did a gut and replace yesterday by an Amendment. This Bill simply requires local units of government that already have a website, not social media, their own website have an e-mail for constituents to notify them. It can be one, it can be a board member, it can be several, but at least one e-mail address must be on that website. It's a good government initiative. I know of no opponents."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Golar, Jackson, Moeller. Please take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5598, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5598, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Feigenholtz."

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Chairman Lang. Floor Amendment #2 is a gut and replace to the Bill. This is a Bill regarding children who have serious mental illness. This 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. Please read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5598, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Feigenholtz."

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you. This Bill is a gut and replace. It creates an Act about children who have serious mental illness. We are trying to avoid forcing their parents to relinquish them to be wards of the state and instead bring them into care at the Department of Human Services for treatment so that they can stay children in their families. I'd be glad 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? Crespo, Golar, Crespo. Please take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3834, Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3834, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Gabel, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

- Gabel: "Yes, I move that the Amendment be adopted. The Amendment becomes 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."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3834, a Bill for an Act concerning

State Government. Third reading of this House Bill." Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

- Gabel: "This Amendment puts into statute the Executive Order which transferred the Senior Health Insurance Program to the Department on Aging from the Department of Insurance. It's just meant to make sure that that department stays there. 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? Cavaletto, Harris. Please take the record. On this question, 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5742, Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5742, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill allows the Department of Public Health to designate hospitals as comprehensive stroke centers. Previously, this highest level of stroke center designation did not exist when the previous Public Act was passed in, I don't know, Public Act 96-0514."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Harris, Hoffman, Jakobsson, Phelps, Verschoore.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Phelps, Verschoore. Please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4033, Representative Golar. Representative Golar. Out of the record. House Bill 4169, Representative Hernandez. Out of the record. House Bill 3939, Mr. Jackson. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3939, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jackson."

Jackson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Amendment's goal is to better conform Illinois' current law, the Military Children Act, to the model language of the interstate compact on Education Opportunity for Military Children. These changes give more latitude to children of active duty military personnel for purposes of meeting the different requirements for schooling in every state by, 1) Adding an enrollment and entry age section for children of active military personnel to Military Changing ... Children Act. Excuse me. 2) Adding a school student records section for children of active duty military personnel to the Military Children Act. 3) Expanding on a section to include course placement, program placement, placement flexibility, extracurricular activities and absence related to deployment activities for children of active military personnel in the Military Children Act. 4) Adding a member to the State Council and 5) Replacing the term 'military families' and 'active duty military personnel'. This Amendment is an attempt to update the Education Opportunity for Military Children Act

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

and was initiated by the Lieutenant Governor's office. This Act was originally House Bill 4674 of the 96th General Assembly and passed the House with a vote of 115-0. This language is agreed to by the Illinois Association of School Boards and Illinois Association of School Administration. We know of no opposition to the Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote and will entertain 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, 100 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5816, Representative Senger. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5816, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 5816 is basically amending the Illinois Pension Code. It's doing two things. It's basically changing the Code to say that if an individual is incarcerated with a Class X or Class 1 Felony, as a result of the incarceration his pension benefits will be suspended until he is no longer in prison and then they can be reinstated in front of the pension... respective pension board. It is also, basically, reinstating what is already in place for work related felonies. That if it's a work-related felony which includes intimidation of a public official, bribery, kickbacks, smuggling public monies and theft of governments which can have a pension suspension

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

today, that benefit would be forfeited. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote and I'm open for questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

- Martwick: "Representative Senger, I have a couple of questions about this Bill. So, this Bill is designed to punish public officials or... is it any government official or is it just public officials?"
- Senger: "It's basically officials that are in... public officials that are in a benefit system, a pension benefit system. So, it's police, fire, you know, all the state systems."

Martwick: "Okay. So, any government worker who commits a Class X or a Class 1 would have their retirement benefits suspended?"

- Senger: "Correct."
- Martwick: "Would there... is there any provision that they're taken from them?"
- Senger: "They're suspended if they're, you know, incarc... if they're... through their time in prison the pension board determines whether they reinstate the benefits or what happens after that."
- Martwick: "Okay. So, if... what about the situation where the person who has committed this crime, as bad as they may be and we want to punish them, which I imagine a long period of incarceration is pretty good punishment, but what happens if they are the sole source of income for a family? IS there any provision to provide for that family while this person is incarcerated?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Senger: "You know, what is happening today and this is a situation where there was a firefighter in Chicago that killed his wife and he was, you know, charged for murder, life prison ... basically imprisonment. What he did right before he killed his wife is he basically applied for his pension and then gave the power of attorney to his first daughter, so there was a situation there where, you know, he was collecting a pension. He collected up to 840 thousand and the person who should have had the benefit, the son, did not receive anything. So, I understand that there is those situations. You know, the way our ... the way we were today if you're ... if you're in prison you're denied Social Security entirely. If you're, you know, if you're also in prison and you're not under one of these Felony Codes that we're seeing right now and you're collecting a pension, you can still collect the pension. It doesn't mean that that goes to the children. There is a situation where one could pass away when incarcerated and then they're, you know, it's up to the discretion of the pension boards to give to the child or not. So, that's something I'm willing to work on in the Senate, but again, today, you know, there's nothing to say that those children ... if one's receiving retirement gets that benefit. It's up to the parent to do that if they choose to do such as that firefighter, you know, gave the power of attorney to his first daughter."
- Martwick: "Is there anything in here that allows the court to take in into consideration any hardship, I mean, let's be honest, again, we know that we're talking about really severe crimes, but if there are children who are dependent upon this

215

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

income, minor children perhaps a disabled child or a disabled spouse, if they are not complicit in this action and this action has nothing to with their service as a government employee, are we not then punishing the disabled or minor child or dependent that, I mean, can the court consider that hardship?"

- Senger: "What it is right now today for everyone it's a benefit of the annuitant not a hardship. So, again, anyone who's an annuitant is a benefit of the annuitant. Now, there are... if that annuitant passes away, there's survivor benefits that can be transferred to then the spouse or children, but even today, if there's... let me put another example. If there's someone who is an annuitant and they're collecting, for an example, \$160 thousand a year and they have a child that is disabled or you know, and they don't mind taking care of that child, it's their right not to do it. So, again, it's the benefit of the annuitant not a hardship."
- Martwick: "Right, but let's just take a short example. Let's imagine that there is a firefighter who is retired at the age of 52 which would be eligible. Let's say he got married at the age of 45 like I did and had a child and that child was born with some sort of developmental disability that required constant care. He is retired. He has earned his benefits. He's paid into the system. He's receiving retirement which, presumably, is caring... providing a benefit and care for that disabled child and now he's convicted of a crime, do we just take that entire source of income away and then punish this disabled child? I mean, I get what you're getting at, but I think that there is... I guess the point I'm trying to make is

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

that there's some holes here where we could really be punishing people that didn't commit the crime and in our criminal justice system shouldn't we be focused on them?" Senger: "You know, I'm not, again, that's whether or not one's no matter what if ... what crime they're in prison, you know, even if they aren't part of the system, that is in place there today if they're collecting a retirement. This Bill is really the first step of saying if you are incarcerated, there was an example, again, of the firefighter that killed his wife and then actually he killed his wife and then his annuity actually was bumped up because he no longer had a survivor on his plan to take care of, that that individual who does not care about his immediate family at all doesn't have the right to collect that pension... is suspended of that pension. There are ... we've had, luckily, through the conversation of this we've had a lot of consideration on how that could be thought through possibly as a separate Bill on how those hardship cases come into place, but that's another... that's going to be a huge discussion because, again, we don't have any special consideration for anyone with hardship. It's only the, you know, it doesn't matter who you are, but their annuitant is to the annuitant and not to anyone else unless that person designates the child as a survivor and when they turn 18, they're out of that classification too. So, that's something that needs to be talked about in a much broader scope than what this is doing right now."

Martwick: "Thank you. To the Bill. I see my time is up. I commend the Sponsor for her attempts at bringing about a greater form of punishment to those who would commit the most egregious

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

crimes. I support those types of measures, but in this is instance Ι think there some severe, unintended consequences. This measure takes away earned benefits from someone who's committed a crime, but those benefits are not necessarily going to be used just so the person who committed to the crime and we could very well be punishing people who are not at fault and that is not what our criminal justice system is about. I know we're talking probably about a small number of cases here, but where these cases could be in the demonstration ... in the example that I used, they could be quite severe and what happens then to the disabled minor child or spouse that has no other form of support, does not have Social Security. What do we do to them? We turn them out in the street? That's not justice. That's not justice."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick, your time has expired, Sir." Martwick: "Thank you. I urge a 'no'..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Franks: "Representative, is there any correlation to the member having to be in office at the time when a crime is committed for them to forfeit the pension?"
- Senger: "Okay. Just an explanation. There is Code already in place
 for a work-related..."
- Franks: "I understand that."
- Senger: "...claim."
- Franks: "I'm asking about this Bill."
- Senger: "No, if one is active, retired or inactive that's... it's all... it pertains."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Franks: "All right. So, if someone has retired and is already collecting, and it says theft of governmental property, is there any cutoff on the value or is it just theft of any governmental property?"
- Senger: "That's a work-related felony."

Franks: "Okay. But let's..."

- Senger: "So, there's two pieces to this. There's the piece that's in Code already with work-related felonies and then there's the piece I'm adding which has to do with felonies committed, the Class 1 and a Class X."
- Franks: "Okay. Because my concern is this. Let's assume, following up on the previous speaker, that someone is already collecting and let's assume that person has worked for the government and is divorced and the spouse through a quadro or some other court ordered entity says you're getting 50 percent of your spouse's pension and then that spouse. So, you haven't been married to your ex-spouse you haven't been married to for years goes and commits a Class X Felony or a Class 1 Felony. So, the person who already has a property right, who's no longer married and is already collecting would also, under this Bill, be precluded, I believe from collecting."
- Senger: "No. That's a contract so that would not be ... they'll still be entitled to their portion of it."
- Franks: "Are you sure? Because the way this is drafted, I'm not sure that says that."
- Senger: "Well, here's... just to make a clarification here. That's the intent and as of today, given all the work-related felonies and situations where we've had... I'm sure there's been a situation there where someone has been incarcerated on

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

a work-related felony that has been in place already. We have not seen anyone to come back to say, no, I'm in a divorce situation quadro and I'm not receiving my benefits now because that... those benefits are basically forfeited entirely."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, your time has expired, Sir. Can you bring your remarks to a close?"
- Franks: "Yeah. I've got more questions, but I just didn't have time. I'll listen to some others, but I just have a concern that people who have earned the right who are innocent could be harmed by this and I want to make sure there's no collateral, unintended consequence."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Riley: "Representative Senger, originally, IMRF and it looks like a school district of some sort had opposition to this Bill. You've amended it a number of times. Did the subsequent Amendments remove their opposition to the Bill?"
- Senger: "Yeah. What the problem was with IMRF, they wanted to make sure today that the police and fire boards would not have any of their power diminished to basically, remove one's annuity in situations, so that's why the work-related have been reinstated to make it clear that the full benefit is forfeited and that's basically brought them back to being okay with the Bill."
- Riley: "You know, I can't hear, so they are not in opposition to the Bill?"

Senger: "They are not in opposition to the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Riley: "Okay, thank you. How about that little, local school district? I shouldn't say little, but..."

Senger: "I'm not sure where that one that came from."

Riley: "...district 88, does that mean anything?"

Senger: "Yeah, I don't know where that came from."

Riley: "Okay. Thank you."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. A lot of these Drurv: comments focusing on the families, I think, are justified comments, but what we need to look at from a criminal perspective is what the Bill is trying to accomplish. And what this Bill is doing, and it's a great Bill and I commend Representative Senger for bringing it before the House, is it's trying to deter the conduct that everyone's concerned about. The worst criminals out there are the criminals that have families and when they commit this crime they know they have a family and they know it's going to hurt their family. And so, if we can do something not only to get our money back but to deter this from happening so that these victims that we've all been talking about aren't victimized then we've done a good and we've stopped corruption at the same time. So, I think what we need to do is focus on is what this Bill is going to do and is going to deter people from engaging in this conduct and if they choose to engage in it anyway, these are people who have chosen not to care about their families. But I think it's wrong for us to let criminals off the hook because they can save their money and then when they get out they have everything that they want. It's sending the wrong message. Illinois has a storied past that we don't need to go

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

into what that storied past is and this floor should be embracing a Bill like this and looking for more Bills like this so that we can show the public that we're serious about

stopping the corruption epidemic that plagues our state." Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz for two minutes." Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Nekritz: "Representative, I just want to see if there's some comparisons to other retirement systems. Does Social Security have anything like this in the Social Security Code?"
- Senger: "Yes, there is. When you're incarcerated for anything, you are denied Social Security."
- Nekritz: "Okay. For any crime?"
- Senger: "For any kind of Social Security or any..."
- Nekritz: "For any crime in Social Security."
- Senger: "I'm... yeah, for any kind of Social Security."
- Nekritz: "So, even a low level..."
- Senger: "Yeah."
- Nekritz: "...Class 4 Felony?"
- Senger: "Right."
- Nekritz: "Okay. And then what about the Federal Government employees' pensions? Do you know if there's anything comparable in those?"
- Senger: "That I do not know."

Nekritz: "Okay, very good. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger to close."

Senger: "Yes, thank you. Again, understanding that, you know, there's the hardship situations out there, but in today's environment this is to really reflect those who, for example,

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

that firefighter that, you know, basically killed his wife and took the annuity out and then gave the power of attorney to someone that wasn't in hardship. I'd ask for your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ford, Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 83 voting 'yes'… 86 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One should not text and drive and apparently one should not text and vote because on House Bill 3939 I inadvertently pushed my 'no' switch and I'd like to be recorded as a 'yes' on that."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention, Sir. House Bill 4033, Representative Golar. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4033, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation will remove the mandate for employees to wear ID badges in a residential program, ID badges in a residential program for individuals with developmental disabilities that are licensed under ID or IDD Community Care Act and Community-Integrated Living Arrangements Licensures and Certification Act. Having workers in these facilities wearing name badges is not in line with a home-like setting. Ladies and Gentlemen, it is important for this particular community, the community in integrated

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

living arrangements that they have individuals that come into these facilities and not wear these ID badges. The community... the people that are inside these facilities, it is more like a home-like setting and that does not mean that this legislation would prohibit the faculty to use badges for access. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Hays, Smith, Thapedi, Unes. Mr. Unes. Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4811, Mr. Sosnowski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4811, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

- Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill has to do with good government and oversight in regards to audits. This Bill looks to imitate and mirror what currently are required of townships, and that is to having audit every fourth year. I know of no opposition since we've modified the Bill and Amendment #1 was adopted, but again, this would affect those government entities that have a budget under \$850 thousand and again, they would be required to have an audit every fourth year."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

record yourselves, Members. It's getting late. Mr. Drury, Hatcher. Please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5938, Mr. Beiser. Please read the Bill."

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill we pulled from the record to get some clarity. I think Representative Franks asked some questions. He's come... he understands what we're doing and this deals with manufactured home... mobile homes being able to get a conventional mortgage by declaring it to be real property at their discretion. It's totally voluntary. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank Mr. Beiser for taking this out of the record. After learning more about the Bill, I stand in support as well. This Bill, I think, would help a lot of folks be able to get cheaper loans by being able to, on their own if they wish to, voluntarily change a deed and make it a real property instead of a chattel thereby being able to be able to get mortgages. I think it'll help a

lot and I'd encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, when a person would voluntarily declare this to be real property as opposed to the mobile

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

home, would that change the assessment procedures from the Mobile Home Act to the Real Property Act?"

Beiser: "That's my understanding, yes."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, that they would voluntarily asked to be taxed as real property. Have you had discussions with the assessor's associations on how would they make this happen?"

Beiser: "No, I have not."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Beiser: "This is an initiative of..."

Sullivan: "But this is a voluntary act that they can do if they so choose?"

Beiser: "Yes, Ed."

Sullivan: "Okay, thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davis, Reboletti. Please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4869, Mr. Stewart. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4869, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Stewart, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Stewart."
- Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment 1 becomes the Bill. It amends the Juvenile Court Act to allow video conferencing in detention of minors. I would move for adoption of the Amendment."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4869, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Stewart."

- Stewart: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill amends the Juvenile Court Act to allow video conferencing in the detention hearings of minors. This Bill is certainly in the best interest of the minors, the best interest of the law enforcement that has to transport these minors. And the Illinois Sheriff's Association is a proponent of this Bill. I know of no opposition. I'm available for any questions. And I would ask for your '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? Please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4080, Representative Flowers. Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4080, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was already adopted. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4080, as amended... Amendment #3 removes the amount that would be paid to the lawyers who help the wrongfully convicted. And I move for the adoption."

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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4080, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Loyola University Life After Innocence project. And this Bill would allow the wrongfully convicted individuals who gave false confessions to be able now to receive compensation. They were coerced into these confessions. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's… All right. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted the Body to know that all opposition has been removed with the Amendment and I stand with the Lady and request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes."

Reboletti: "Representative, how do you vision this would work then? There would be the person who is... has their certificate of innocence they would go to the court of claims and then

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

they would get a judgment. And you're saying that you can get an additional 25 percent what the attorney's fees would be?" Flowers: "Sir, that part has been removed."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. D'Amico, DeLuca, Drury, Smiddy, Sullivan, Walsh. D'Amico, Drury. Please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4097, Representative Monique Davis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4097, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Monique Davis, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was amended to change one word. We changed 'shall' to 'may' at the request of some of my colleagues. So, if an individual does not have a criminal background and has committed a nonviolent crime that is considered a misdemeanor, the judge 'may' allow them to be released on their own recognizance. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill… Well, we'll get to that. No? Mr. Reboletti has changed his mind. Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote… Okay. I apologize. Those

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

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. Please read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4097, a Bill for an Act concerning

criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a technical Amendment. We changed the word 'shall' to the word 'may' to allow the judge total discretion in those who will be released on I-Bonds."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'... Excuse me. 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? Andrade, D'Amico, Stewart. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 56 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no' and Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "I just ask that this be put on Postponed Consideration. It is so amazing to me how we support people's legislation, but something as simple as allowing a judge to do what he already is supposed to do is amazing that people won't support that."
- Speaker Lang: "This Bill will be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. And Leader Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "House Bill 4687, Representative Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4687, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Mr. Speaker, we debated this earlier. This is a Bill that would lower the fee for those trucking medical isotopes within the state. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Well, Representative, I just want to answer a question with regard to this Bill that I asked you about exactly how much revenue and I'm told it's somewhere in the neighborhood of, I believe 60 or 70 thousand dollars that the state will lose as a result of passage of this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker pointed out that this Bill would cost the state a certain amount of money and recently we just passed a Bill that would allow seniors over a certain age to hunt and fish for free and that also changed. It costs \$1, Jack? Only one dollar. So, that was a \$90 thousand change in our GRF. So... and I understand that. I understand that, Representative. I'm just saying is that... is that there's going to be these Bill. I think this is a Bill that tries to keep a business here and if we don't do this, then the business will simply leave, go to Indiana or go to Wisconsin and do the same thing, which we have seen time and time again. And then there won't be any taxes from this business 'cause they'll be gone."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan to close."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Once again, just so we do understand the concept here. We are waiving... we are reducing a fee for instate business versus out-of-state businesses to try and

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

attract and retain folks to Illinois. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4687 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 100 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting
 'present', House Bill 4687, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House
 Bill 3961, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the
 Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3961, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. Maybe we… I could explain it on Third Reading. I move adoption."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3961. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3961, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill mirrors a Bill we already passed unanimously for the credit unions. This is for the bankers. And this deals with consistent audits and asking IDFPR to create rules and consistent methods that all their auditors will follow to do audits at the banks just like they're going to do at the credit unions. I ask your support." Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3961 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 99 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3961, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Under Supplemental Calendar #1 we have Senate Joint Resolution 50, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang, I'm sorry, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Joint Resolution 50 urges Congress to enact the Safe Freight Act to ensure that no freight train can be operated unless it is staffed by at least two properly certified individuals. We've had many accidents with trains, some of which come from the way the cars are loaded, but some of which come because those that are driving the train can't do everything at once. This will also ensure, even though most trains are operated by two or more now, it will ensure that, if this law were to become a Federal Law that the railroads would not be able to diminish

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

the number of people driving the train below two. I ask your support for this Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield for a brief question?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

- Davis, W.: "Representative, is this just... are these trains that are actually traveling outside of their yards and enroute? And the reason I ask that question is because I know that when trains are in the yard some trains are operated by a remote control which, obviously, someone's operating it electronically and there are actually no people in the train at all."
- Lang: "Right. We're talking about trains that are traveling on the tracks out of the yard."

Davis, W.: "Out of the yard?"

- Lang: "Yes, Sir."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 50. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Bill 4082, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk. 4082, Representative Martwick."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4082, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Martwick, has been approved for consideration."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of House Amendment #1. It was recommended adopt in committee. It is a gut and replace of the Bill. It amends the Juvenile Court Act by clarifying the nonjudicial probation adjustment process and the role of the probation officer in that process."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4082. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No furthers Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4082, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4082 provides the following clarifications for the existing non-judicial probation adjustment process. What it does is, it says that if a minor fails to comply with any term or condition of the non-judicial probation adjustment... this is a diversion... it is... so if the minor fails to comply with these conditions the matter is referred to the state's attorney for determination of whether a petition of delinquency should be filed. Secondly, court services probation department has the duty to confer in a preliminary conference when authorized or directed by the court and with the consent of the minor and the state's attorney. Finally, the court services or probation department must confer in a

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

preliminary conference with a view towards adjusting suitable cases without the filing of a petition of delinquency. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4082 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 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4082, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reboletti, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair." Speaker Turner: "Yes?"

Reboletti: "Speaker, on the previous Senate Joint Resolution 50, I believe, I know the Senate took a Roll Call vote. Is that also required here?"

Speaker Turner: "This does not require a Roll Call vote, Sir."
Reboletti: "That's in the opinion of the Chair?"
Speaker Turner: "That is the official opinion of the Chair."
Reboletti: "Is there an appeals process to that, Mr. Speaker?"
Speaker Turner: "There's no appeals process."
Reboletti: "I'm familiar with that. Thank you."
Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang, for what reason do you seek
recognition?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the previous Bill, House Bill 4082, my switch was not working. I intended to vote 'aye'."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request. House Bill 5588, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5588, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. House Bill 5588 is an initiative of the State Board of Education and it is their cleanup Bill. And it makes changes to obsolete and duplicative language throughout the School Code. I know of no opposition. There are 22 changes which eliminate some audit findings and also change the names, for example, teacher certification change to... educator licensure based on Bills that we have passed. I appreciate your 'aye' votes. And be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield?"

Bradley: "Is this a Mautino-only Bill?"

Mautino: "At this point, but be delighted to have you as a ... "

Bradley: "Okay. I'll be on it."

Mautino: "Well, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5588 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 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5588, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5829, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, please read the

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Bill. Excuse me. House Bill 5892, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5892, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 5892 is an initiative of the Attorney General's Office to make adjustments to the Emergency Epinephrine Act passed just a few years. It's going to do five things. It allows school employees and authorized volunteers with proper training to administer an EpiPen to any person and the school or any school sponsored activities. It requires schools to report back to ISBE each instance when they've used an EpiPen so we can better track it. Expands liability protection to allow advanced practice nurses and physician's assistants to provide standing protocols and prescriptions for undesignated Epis. It conforms to state guidelines to allow the EpiPens to be in a secure, unlocked designated area in order to increase better access and it fixes a few technical things that allows a child who is indicated as being allowed to self-carry to actually self-carry. And I do want to clarify that this is not the intent of the Bill to replace school nurses. They are the preferred, qualified health professionals in Illinois schools. And I have no opposition at this moment that I'm aware of. And I'm really happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will you have the record reflect that Leader Durkin is excused for the rest of the day?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5892 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 Reboletti. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 97 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5892, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4204, Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4204, a Bill for an Act concerning condominium property. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Nekritz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."

- Nekritz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to adopt Amendment #1 and debate the Bill on Third."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves to adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4204. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4204, a Bill for an Act concerning condominium property. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For those of us with condominiums and a lot of home owners associations in our

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

districts, we get a lot of complaints from homeowners about the operations of the associations and the associations complain about acts of individual homeowners. This will set up an office... a state office in the Illinois Department of Financial & Professional Regulation that will provide education to both homeowners and the associations. And then ultimately after... we're going to implement this over several years, but ultimately we would provide some mediation services for those organizations that would be voluntary."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

- Reboletti: "Representative, with this new position, is this an actual new salary position or will somebody in the department undertake these responsibilities that the Bill, if passed, would require?"
- Nekritz: "It will have to be somebody new and it will be paid forth by a fee imposed on the units."
- Reboletti: "And that's not a fee that we're involved in whatsoever..."
- Nekritz: "Correct."

Reboletti: "...that we could sweep or take or goes into GRF."

Nekritz: "Under the Bill, as it's drafted now, correct."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Oh, I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4204 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Have all voted who wish? Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 59... Representative Nekritz."

- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to put the Bill on Postponed Consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill to the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bill 5693, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5693, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

- Rita: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a cleanup language for the Architecture Practice Act. And I'd ask for its passage. It's all agreed legislation. No opposition."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5693 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 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5693, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3829, Representative Sente. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3829, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Sente, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sente."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Sente: "Thank you. I'd like to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3829. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Please read that Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3829, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sente."

- Sente: "Thank you. This Bill builds upon legislation we passed last year. It creates a private/public partnership between business and DCEO to develop an annual strategic business and marketing plan. This Bill adds the focus on border counties and border states, so we make sure we are evaluating their best practices to keep businesses in Illinois. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3829 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 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3829, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5523, Representative Sente. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5523, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

day. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read that Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5523, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sente."

- Sente: "Thank you. This Bill was an initiative of the Lake County State's Attorney. It's cleanup language for Article 36. There are two current procedures in statute that are in conflict with each other and so this Bill names the 2012 procedure path as the preferred method. It allows an individual to... an individual a pre-forfeiture hearing right to see a judge within 14 days of a request to seize a vehicle."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5523 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 Evans. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 97 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5523, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5766, Representative Reboletti. Mr. Clerk, please read the... Pardon me. House Bill 4860, Representative Halbrook. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4860, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Halbrook, has been approved for consideration."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Halbrook."

- Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to adopt the Amendment, House Floor #1 to the Bill and discuss it on Third. It becomes the Bill."
- Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4860. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Please read that Bill again, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4860, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Halbrook."

- Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill does is it just creates another way to dispose of confiscated firearms at the law enforcement level via public auction. Currently, there are four ways to dispose of firearms that are confiscated during law enforcement methods. I'd be willing to discuss or answer any questions you might have. What we're trying to do here is just create an avenue via public auction to dispose of these weapons. All of the ways of disposing of these weapons are under court order, so the judge has the final say here. And this revenue will stay in the local departments."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4860 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

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

take the record. On a count of 88 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', House Bill 4860, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5785, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5785, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. This Bill comes out of the consolidation Commission. Amendment #4, which we adopted yesterday, took away all the opposition and the problems with the Bill. It passed out of committee unanimously. What this does is it removes the road districts from the list of the underlying Bill, which gives 15 different types of governmental entities a method to dissolve themselves by annexing 10 neighboring entity of the same type. This would not actually... we added the amended language at the suggestion of the Civic Federation. It would require an affirmative vote by the unit of government absorbed in the unit of government that voted to dissolve. And it was also agreed to by AFSCME as we put in another Bill as well... another Amendment as well. So, I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley for two minutes." Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Riley: "Representative Franks, now you... so you've cleared up the situation with regard to road districts?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Riley: "But how about the issue... is the issue of the concerns of the multitownship assessment? Is that..."

Franks: "Yes."

Riley: "...is that cleared up or is that still..."

Franks: "Yeah, that was taken care of... or was? Oh, we have to do that in the Senate. I know we have... we want to provide that the special districts that contain territory for more than one county cannot consolidate into a single county. We only had time for the fourth one because of the time running out.

I'll we'll make sure it gets fixed in the Senate."

Riley: "Well, I would hope so. Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, does this mirror what we passed for DuPage County?"

Franks: "No, this is a totally different Bill."

Reboletti: "And how is this different from that?"

Franks: "Well, the DuPage County Bill allowed the counties to actually go forward and consolidate if they wish to. I tried to get that Bill passed and we didn't get out of committee. This Bill would give the governing boards of local and municipal government units regulated by different Sections of the Illinois Compiled Statute the ability to stop existing in their current form. This has a couple of very important safeguards here. One, the governing boards themselves have to choose to do so by a majority vote. And secondly, the entity

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

that would be taking them over would also have to have a vote to accept them. So, it's much different than the DuPage deal." Reboletti: "Can you give me an example of how this would work or what jurisdictions have approached you to look for this type of relief or consolidation?"

- Franks: "But you're… you were on the committee that came up with these… with this agreement. There was… there's 15 different entities that would be part of this. It would be Illinois International Port District, civic center authorities, county water commissions, multitownship assessment districts, county historical museum districts, cemetery maintenance districts, public health districts, tuberculosis sanitarium districts, museum districts, solid waste disposal districts, streetlight districts, surface water protection districts, water service districts and water authorities."
- Reboletti: "And I wanted you to read those off, Representative, because you see how outdated and outmoded some of these forms of government are. I mean, streetlight districts, I have no idea why we'd need those any longer. I'm sure that they can be dissolved or placed somewhere else if they still owe any money. And I support this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Moffitt: "Representative, it's my understanding that you've agreed to work with township officials and that you intend to have an Amendment put on there to address some concerns that they still have."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Franks: "I think there was one outstanding concern that we can fix. We just didn't have the time..."

Moffitt: "Right."

- Franks: "...because of this. We thought we had them all done when we came to committee the last time, but we are certainly working with them and we'll get that done."
- Moffitt: "But it is your intent, your belief, that with an Amendment in the Senate that the concerns of township officials will be addressed."
- Franks: "Absolutely. And when it comes back for concurrence, we'll
 show... I'll show you that."

Moffitt: "Okay. Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks to close."

- Franks: "I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. This Bill would simply empower those local government units to follow through on the decisions that they or their constituents make. It's replete with checks and balances. I know there will be a minor Amendment which, when it comes back from the Senate, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote so we can keep moving this. It's very important work of the Consolidation Commission. This is one of the three Bills that our committee came up with. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5785 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 84 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no' and 2 voting
 'present', House Bill 5785, having received the

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4204, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4204 is on the Order of Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz."

- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We debated the Bill previously and I'd ask for your support."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4204 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 60 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no' and 0 voting
 'present', House Bill 4204, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
 Representative Reboletti, for what reason do you seek..."
- Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to compliment you on your quick count right there. You almost... you almost lost it, but you got it right there at the button. So, congratulations. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "I do what I can. Thank you, Representative. House Bill 4068, Representative Moylan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4068, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Moylan, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Turner: "Representative Moylan. Mr. Clerk, please take

this Bill out of the record. Leader Lang in the Chair."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Ah, the love. Mr. Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to reflect that on House Bill 5785 it was my intention to vote 'yes'." Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention, Sir. House Bill 5567, Mr. Phelps. Please read the Bill. Please move the Bill back to Second Reading, Mr. Clerk and read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5567, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted previously. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment

2 is offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

- Phelps: "These Amendments that came to the floor makes this an agreed Bill. So, I'd like to adopt them and debate it on Third."
- Speaker Lang: "Objection on Amendment 2. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment 3 is offered by Representative Phelps."
- 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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5567, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5567 is an agreed Bill between the Oil & Gas Association, the Farm Bureau, DNR and the Illinois Environmental Council. It just expedites the wells and permits for oil and gas, conventional, nothing to do with fracking. I want to thank Representative Bradley, Representative Reis, Dan Reitz, and Kevin Reimer for this Bill."
- 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? Moeller, Nekritz. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 96 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5079, Mr. Rosenthal. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5079, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Rosenthal, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rosenthal."

- Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1 becomes the Bill. And I move for adoption of the Bill and to debate it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, can we move this Bill to Third Reading and then debate it? 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."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5079, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rosenthal."

Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Conservation Police Lodge and it's supported by IDNR. It repeals the current provisions... I guess I'd better get the right Bill, hadn't I? This one provides... this supported... is a Trappers Association and is supported by IDNR and the Conservation Police. And it provides that beginning January 1, 2015, no trapping license shall be issued to any person born on or after January 1, 2015 or who has not previously held a valid trapping license within the three years immediately preceding the application unless he or she presents to the person authorized to issue the license evident that he or she has a certificate of competency. I move to ask

for an 'aye' vote and ask any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Just very quickly, Mr. Speaker, a question."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Davis, W.: "The course that someone has to take, who produces that course?"

Rosenthal: "That's from IDNR, I believe."

Davis, W.: "You believe?"

- Rosenthal: "Yes, Sir."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. So, they put the course online that someone has to take. When they're done they print out a certificate of completion?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Rosenthal: "Yes, and it shows that they have competency for trapping identifying, that they have... that they completed the safety course and it helps ensure public safety as well as protect the species that they are trapping."

Davis, W.: "Are you... do you know how the course works?"

Rosenthal: "I do not."

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

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke, Franks. Kelly Burke. Please take the record. On this question, there are 96 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4096, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, out of the record. House Bill 5575, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5575, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to adopt House Floor Amendment #1. It becomes the agreement with dealing with the arbitration award. And I'm happy to discuss the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

253

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5575, a Bill for an Act concerning

insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

- Zalewski: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 5575 provides that any arbitration worth less than \$75 thousand for bodily injury to or death of one person or \$150 thousand for bodily injury to or death of two or more people is binding on the parties. It also adds language that these changes only apply to policies of the amended delivered after this Act would be signed. In other words, it's prospective. I'd ask for 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? Drury, Reboletti. Reboletti, Reboletti. On this question... Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5577, Mr. Zalewski. Out of the record. House Bill 4691, Mr. Phelps. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4691, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Phelps, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Yes. I'd like to move for the adoption and debate this on third, please."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed
 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr.
 Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4691, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Hi. This is an agreed Bill between IMRF and the Illinois Public Pension Funds Association. It requires transfer of both the employee and employer contributions into this newly created fund. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I'm trying... as I look at the title of the legislation. Could you decode that for me?"

Phelps: "No. Your guess is as good as mine."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "That's it, Sir? We're all trying to go home and that's it? Those in favor of the Bill will say... will vote 'aye'; opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Reboletti. Please take the record. There are 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5674, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5674, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Professional Regulation. It changes several pieces within the various business entities Act. I'd ask for 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? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Cassidy, Drury, Unes, Walsh. Mr. Walsh. Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5080, Mr. Rosenthal. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5080, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Rosenthal, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rosenthal."

- Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This… Floor Amendment 1 becomes the Bill. And this is recommended by the Conservation Police and this legislation is intended to allow the update in the waterfowl outfitter regulations. And I urge adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor... excuse me. Mr. Franks. Mr. Franks waives his right to speak. 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."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Is that permanent, Mr. Franks? Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5080, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rosenthal."

Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the initiative of the Conservation Police Lodge and it repeals the current provisions relating to waterfowl outfitting and includes waterfowl in the current provisions for deer and wild turkey outfitting and provides that providing or offering to provide for compensation outfitting services for deer, waterfowl or wild turkey hunting without a permit shall be a Class B misdemeanor. I ask... urge an 'aye' vote and will answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand I have the right to remain silent as I certainly don't have the ability. So, I apologize."

Speaker Lang: "We understand, Sir. Please proceed."

Franks: "I'd like to ask a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Franks: "Dealing with the… are there any fees in here 'cause I'm under… I'm reading the Amendment #1. Had that been… that's just what we adopted and I'm trying to understand whether these fees that are in here are reduction."
- Rosenthal: "They don't... IDNR does not expect it to be. Right now the fee for outfitters for deer and turkey can be up to 1000 for residents and 2500 for nonresidents. Currently, it's 1000

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

for nonresidents and 500 for residents. And the waterfowl would be similar to that."

Franks: "Is there any specific fees delineated in this Bill? With

those… are we putting specific numbers in the Bill?" Rosenthal: "No."

Franks: "Okay."

Rosenthal: "That would be part of the rules."

Franks: "That's what I needed to know. Thank you."

Rosenthal: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "I'm just very curious if Representative Rita is going to have to pay additional money since he won the turkey hunting raffle at the NRA... or at the sportsmanship thing. Will this cost him additional money?"

Rosenthal: "Only if he's going to be dealing with an outfitter." Ives: "Okay. All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "So, he does know about dead animals. Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Davidsmeyer: "So, what is the actual change here? I don't... I guess I don't understand it. It's taking away a separate provision."

Rosenthal: "Yeah. Currently, waterfowl is not part of outfitting. So, they're going to include the outfitting for waterfowl with deer and turkey and then write the rules under that provision."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Davidsmeyer: "So, is this newly applicable to them or do they have a separate provision somewhere else?"

Rosenthal: "Current... before, they had different provisions for waterfowl and this is going to be included with deer and turkey now."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rosenthal to close."

Rosenthal: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? One more time. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there 97 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We now go to the order of Rita. First, House Bill 5664. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5664, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to speak. I heard my name in debate in the last one, but I need to get through these Bills that I've been patiently waiting. This is an initiative of Pace. It's something that we had a pilot project that we want to make permanent, bus on shoulders. 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? Home stretch, Members. Please take the record. On this question, there are

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4786, Mr. Rita. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4786, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an initiative of the Illinois Tollway. What it basically does is puts the eminent domain procedures in line with the Federal Act. My understanding there's no opposition. It has nothing to do with eminent domain except the process that they would use. Man, it's quiet in here."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Sommer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5878, Mr. Rita. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5878, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've got House Bill 5878. This is an initiative of the mass transit districts. What it basically does... it's something we passed out of here last General Assembly. It raises the procurement that was set many, many years ago in 199... 1973 from 10 thousand to 40 thousand. It still goes

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

through the entire bid process. There's no known opposition that I'm aware of."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Harris, Nekritz, Stewart. The Chair will wait patiently. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5082, Mr. Poe. Mr. Poe. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5082, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Poe, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Poe."

Mr. Clerk."

Poe: "Could we adopt the Amendment and debate it on Third?"
Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes';
opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5082, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Poe."

Poe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill brought to me by a constituent. And what this is, is sportsmen go out and get bait and all it does is change the size of the netting and how big of a net they can cast. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

261

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, regarding your netting."

Franks: "Thank you. So, we're going to triple the size of the net
from 8 feet to 24?"

Poe: "Okay. Basically, what would happen... they're going to go out and cast and get their bait. It doesn't matter how much. And basically, what we're doing... there's a lot of people even in my area, probably even your area, still goes in the Mississippi River. And what happens now, we don't get those license fees because they cross over into Missouri and there's no regulations at all in Missouri. So, they're going over there buying their license and catching their bait out of the river. What this does, it brings it back in line that, I think, all the sportsmen can work with. And another thing about on the mesh size, they enlarge that to an inch so that all the..."

Franks: "Little stuff can go through."

- Poe: "Yeah, right. And then that way we're not killing them and it leaves them in the water."
- Franks: "That makes sense. My question is, why are you excluding the ability to use bighead carp as bait?"
- Poe: "This is... this was done by the Department of Natural Resources. They actually wrote the Amendment and they put these exclusions in and that's why we did that."
- Franks: "Because I like to use big head carp. That's like the best bait ever. I'm just..."
- Poe: "You better amend that and see if we can get the Department of Natural Resources to agree to it."
- Franks: "What's next? Are you going to take away dynamite?"

262

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Poe: "I know, the guy that hands you the dynamite says, you want to fish or not?"

Franks: "Exactly. 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? Davis, Jackson. Monique Davis. Please take the record. On this question,, 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5793, Representative Hernandez. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5793, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hernandez, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez on the Amendment."

- Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to adopt House Floor Amendment #3 and the Amendment becomes the Bill. Can I explain it on Third?"
- 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. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5793, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "So, the Bill will require for state agencies when compiling or reporting racial or ethnic data to use the same

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

classification as the State Employment Records Act and the Illinois Human Rights Act uses. That way it becomes uniformed across agency and ensures that the state is meeting federal requirements. Again, opposition has been removed with the Amendment. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Osmond. Please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5701, Representative Mayfield. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5701, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

- Mayfield: "Thank you, everyone. This is an agreed Bill that gives qualified applicants a chance to get jobs. The practice is recommended by Illinois' task force on employment restrictions and I'm asking for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill... not quite yet, though. Mr. Sullivan comes to the rescue."

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

Sullivan: "Representative, there was earlier some significant opposition from many of the business groups and the Sheriff's Association. Can you explain what part of this... of your Bill that you've changed that has removed the opposition or... I'm assuming it's removed the opposition?"

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Mayfield: "Yes. I'll be very happy to. Amendment #5 was actually language provided by the Chamber of Commerce and I am very, very grateful to them along with IRMA, the cable association and all the other entities that worked with us to draft this Bill. We've been working on this for almost a year, but it was the final Amendment that was provided by the business community that removed all the opposition."

Sullivan: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I'd like to thank the Sponsor for working with all those groups that had opposition. I know that this Bill failed before and many of the folks that worked on this took the advice of many of us to make sure that those individuals were either neutral or supportive. So, I'd urge its 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? Have all voted who wish? Flowers, Ford, Nekritz, Pihos. Flowers. Anyone want to help the Sponsor out? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 57 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no' and the Lady requests Postponed Consideration. House Bill 5716, Mr. Brauer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5716, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill basically takes the 'shall' Bill and makes it a 'may' Bill and it's for electronic filing. I'll answer any questions."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- 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? Ives, Zalewski. Please take the record. On this question, 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4591, Mr. Martwick. Mr. Martwick, 4591. We've already passed that Bill. You don't want to pass it again? House Bill 5569, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5569, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is an initiative based on the positions of every major mental health organization. The organizations representing the National Association of Social Workers, the psychiatrists, the psychologists, the school counselors, addressing a very harmful treatment option for youth. This puts into our Code and it allows our Department of Professional Regulation to enforce those Codes of Ethics and Codes of Conduct on a treatment plan that causes depression, causes suicidal actions and is incredibly harmful to children. The practice of conversion therapy is dismissed by every major scientific organization and should not be utilized. There is not a single scientific basis for the idea of one's sexual orientation being a disorder and we need to prevent this action being taken on our children. We need to protect our children. I eagerly await your questions."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis. The Gentleman does not wish to speak. Representative Ives."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I honestly don't believe there's one single individual in this Body that is absolutely able to stand here and say that they know enough about this area to make a decision on what is appropriate or what is not appropriate. This is something best left to other experts. This is stuff that we should not be legislating on at all. We have no purview in this department. We have no expertise in this department. It's absolutely something that should not ever be legislated on. Let people decide for themselves what they need to have for themselves. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. As the Sponsor said, there is no scientific evidence that any of this works, any of the conversion therapy works. And people who are declaring their sexual orientation just need the support of everybody around them and not be told that they're wrong, not be told that they're sick or that there's a problem with them. So, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "To the previous speaker, the experts have weighed in. This is codifying the positions of every major mental health professions organization, their Codes of Conduct, their Codes of Ethics. This gives the Department of Professional Regulation the tools they need to protect the victims that I have heard from who have been horribly, horribly humiliated and abused. And I strongly urge a 'yes' vote."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

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? Have all voted who wish? Crespo, Smith, Thapedi, Turner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 44 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no' and the Bill fails. Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "I need 47 for Postponed? Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch on House Bill 5085. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5085, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Leitch, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this Bill does now is permit state universities to do research on industrial hemp."
- Speaker Lang: "Is that what the Amendment does, Sir? Is that the Amendment?"

Leitch: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed
 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr.
 Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5085, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cassidy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3685, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3685, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an initiative with the Secretary of State's Office. It indicates... it gives the Secretary of State discretion to grant a minimum waiver of 30 days or less if a person who is a religious bus driver, a senior citizen transportation and for-profit ridership arrangement, if they fail to keep their license active for 30 days or less. I know of no opposition."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Drury. Please take the record. 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3830, Representative Golar. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3830, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Golar, has been approved for consideration."

269

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar on the Amendment. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3830, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a gut and replace. It is an initiative of DHS and it would require the Inspector General of the Department of Human Services to report substantiated charges of financial exploitation of any individual to the health care worker registry. I'll be happy to take any questions. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, my analysis is indicating that we've already passed an identical Bill, House Bill 4021, that Representative Evans was the Sponsor of. Is that correct?"

- Golar: "Not that I know of. There was a Bill, 2915, which passed the Senate by a vote of 55-0-0."
- Reboletti: "My understanding is it's still… that 4021 is identical and this would be duplicative. You don't have that indication, Representative?"

Golar: "No, I do not."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

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

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Have all voted who wish? Davidsmeyer, Kay. Please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, on behalf of the Speaker, and Leader Turner and I who spent the day in the Chair, I want to thank all of you for your cooperation. We got through a lot of Bills today. So, thank you very much. I have an announcement for the Members which will be helpful to you. You do not have to make requests to have your Senate Bills reviewed. You do not have to make requests. All Senate Bills will be reviewed. Everybody get that. All Senate Bills will be reviewed. And now, allowing perfunctory time... the Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Just briefly, Mr. Speaker. Happy Easter to everybody and safe travels to everyone. And I'd also like to wish my dear friend John Anthony a happy 38th birthday this Sunday. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we did not do the Agreed Resolutions. Mr. Clerk, please read the Agreed Resolutions." Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 999, offered by Representative Franks and House Resolution 1001, offered by Representative Monique Davis."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Agreed Resolutions... Leader Mautino 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. Representative Flowers is recognized for an announcement."
- Flowers: "Would the Ladies of the House that would like to take a picture with Miss Clara meet me right in the front, please.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

We're going to take a picture with Miss Clara and Representative McAsey for the pregnancy Bill."

- Speaker Lang: "Ladies of the House are requested in the front for a photo. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Mautino moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, April 29 at the hour of 12 noon. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, April 29 at the hour of 12 noon. Have a great trip home, everyone."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 122, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 217, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 220, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 231, offered by Representative Sommer, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 452, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 507, offered by Representative Leitch, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 585, offered by Representative Tracy, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 642, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation, Senate Bill 643, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 728, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Senate Bill 741, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1626, offered by Representative

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Daniel Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1996, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1999, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2003, offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2583, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2628, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2717, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2758, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2774, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2829, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act law. Senate Bill 2928, concerning civil offered bv Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2989, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2995, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3023, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 3038, offered by Representative Andrade, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 3108, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 3112, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 3171, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 3225, offered by

09800119.docx

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3258, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3276, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3283, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3287, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 3324, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3364, offered bv Representative Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3374, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 3412, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3421, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Senate Bill 3433, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3513, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3514, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3521, offered bv Representative William Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Senate Bill 3557, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 3558, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning human trafficking. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution #42, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, is referred to

274

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

the Rules Committee. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3786, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 3787, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 3788, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 3789, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 3790, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 3791, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3792, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3793, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3794, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3795, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3796, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3797, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3799, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3800, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3801, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3802, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3803, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3804, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3805, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3806, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3807, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3808, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3809, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3810, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3811, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3812, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3813, a Bill for an Act concerning government.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

House Bill 3814, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3815, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3816, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3817, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3818, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3822, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3823, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3824, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3826, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3835, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3836, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3837, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3838, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3839, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3840, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3841, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3842, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3843, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3844, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3846, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3847, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3848, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3849, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3850, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3851, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3852, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3853, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3854,

276

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3855, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3856, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3857, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3858, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3864, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3865, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3866, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3867, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3868, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3869, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3870, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3871, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3872, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3873, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3874, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3875, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3876, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3877, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3878, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3880, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3881, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3886, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3887, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3889, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3890, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3891, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3892, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3893, a Bill for an Act

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

concerning revenue. House Bill 3894, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3895, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3896, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3897, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3900, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3901, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3903, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3904, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3905, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3906, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3907, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3908, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 3913, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3914, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3915, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3916, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3917, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3918, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3919, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3920, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3921, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3922, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3923, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3925, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3926, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3927, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3928, a Bill

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3929, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3930, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3931, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3932, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3935, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3938, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3941, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3943, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3949, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3951, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3952, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3953, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3954, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3955, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3959, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3960, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3962, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3964, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3965, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3966, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3967, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3968, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3969, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3971, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3972, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3973, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3974, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3975, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3976, a Bill for an Act

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	l	3977	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3978	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3979	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3980	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3981	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3982	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3983	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3984	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3987	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3988	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3989	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3990	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3991	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	l	3992	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	l	3993	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3994	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	l	3995	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3996	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3997	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3998	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	3999	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hous	se	Bil	1	4000	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	
concerning	gaming.	Hou	se	Bi	11	40	01,	а	В	ill	for	an	Act	
concerning	gaming.	Hou	se	Bi	11	40	02,	а	В	ill	for	an	Act	
concerning	gaming.	Hou	se	Bi	11	40	03,	а	В	ill	for	an	Act	
concerning	gaming.	Hou	se	Bi	11	40	04,	а	В	ill	for	an	Act	
concerning	gaming.	Hou	se	Bi	11	40	05,	а	В	ill	for	an	Act	
concerning	liquor."													

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4006, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 4007, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 4008, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 4009, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 4010, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 4011, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 4012, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 4013, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 4014, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 4015, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 4016, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 4017, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 4022, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 4023, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 4024, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 4025, a Bill for an Act concerning urban problems. House Bill 4026, a Bill for an Act concerning urban problems. House Bill 4027, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 4028, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 4029, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 4030, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 4031, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. House Bill 4032, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. House Bill 4034, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4036, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4037, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4038, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4039, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4041, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4042, a Bill for an Act

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

concerning safety. House Bill 4043, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4044, a Bill for Act an concerning safety. House Bill 4045, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4046, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4047, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4048, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4049, a Bill for Act an concerning safety. House Bill 4050, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4051, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 4052, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 4053, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 4054, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 4055, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 4057, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 4058, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. House Bill 4059, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. House Bill 4061, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 4062, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 4063, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 4070, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4071, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4072, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4073, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4074, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4078, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4079, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4081, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House House Bill 4085, a Bill for an Act concerning alternative dispute resolution. House Bill 4086, a Bill for an Act

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

concerning alternative dispute resolution. House Bill 4087, a Bill for an Act concerning notices. House Bill 4088, a Bill for an Act concerning notices. House Bill 4089, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4090, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4091, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4092, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4093, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4094, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4095, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4096, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4097, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4098, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4099, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4100, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4101, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4102, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4103, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4104, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4105, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4106, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4107, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4108, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4109, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4110, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4111, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4114, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4115, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4116, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4117, a Bill for an

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4118, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4119, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4120, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4121, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4126, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4127, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4128, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4129, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4130, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4131, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4132, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4133, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4134, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4135, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4136, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4137, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4138, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4139, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4140, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4141, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4142, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4143, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4144, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4145, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4146, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4147, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4148, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4149, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4150, a Bill for an Act

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

concerning	civil law.	House	Bill	4151,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil law.	House	Bill	4152,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil law.	House	Bill	4153,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil law.	House	Bill	4154,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil law.	House	Bill	4155,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil law.	House	Bill	4156,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	civil law.	House	Bill	4158,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	human righ	ts. Hous	se Bil	Ll 4159	, 3	a Bil	l for	an	Act
concerning	business.	House	Bill	4160,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business.	House	Bill	4161,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business.	House	Bill	4162,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business.	House	Bill	4163,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business.	House	Bill	4164,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business.	House	Bill	4165,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business.	House	Bill	4166,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business.	House	Bill	4167,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4170,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4173,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4174,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4175,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4176,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4177,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4178,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4179,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4180,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4181,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	employment	. House	Bill	4182,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	business.	Second	Readi	ng of	th	ese l	House	Bi	lls.

119th Legislative Day

4/10/2014

There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."