6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and most sovereign God, God of power, God of might, wisdom and justice, through You authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted and judgements are decreed. God, assist us today with Your spirit of counsel and fortitude. May Your blessing be upon this august Assembly, the Speaker of this House, all of its Members. God, may they always seek the ways of righteousness, the ways of justice, the ways of mercy, and the ways of compassion. God, I pray that they be enabled by Your powerful protection and infinite wisdom to lead them as they lead this great state in honesty and in integrity. We ask this in the name of Your precious Son, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We shall be led in the Pledge by Representative Parkhurst."
- Parkhurst 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 reflect that Representatives Mayfield and Soto are excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Demmer: "Mr. Speaker, please let the record reflect that all Republicans are present today."

Speaker Lang: "And Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 116 Members present and we do have a quorum prepared to do our business. The Chair recognizes Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "A brief point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Zalewski: "We're joined in the gallery today by Mr. Tony Paulauski.

Tony is the retiring Executive Director of the Arc of Illinois. He was instrumental in any number of pieces of legislation that helped individuals with developmental disabilities throughout his career, 45-year career. He's retiring on Valentine's Day to spend more time with his lovely wife who joins him in the gallery today. If we could give Mr. Paulauski a warm round of applause."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations, Sir. Thank you for your service.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Butler. For what reason do you rise,
Sir?"

Butler: "A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As many of you know, Representative Jimenez and I are very proud to represent the capital city. We're going to start showcasing some of our fine businesses in Springfield. So, tomorrow morning feel free to join us in our offices in the Stratton Building in E-1, Stratton for a free cup of coffee on Representative Jimenez and I from Custom Cup Coffee, a great coffee shop in downtown Springfield. Feel free to stop by from 8 to 10 and meet the folks from Custom Cup. Thank you."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Frese, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Frese: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Frese: "I'd like to introduce my Page for the day. A senior at Quincy High School and soon to become an Eagle Scout, Jake Terry. Jake, would you stand up and wave. ...Jake. And Jake's mother, Jan, sitting up in the balcony. Thank you for being here."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to both of you. Thank you for joining us.

Mr. Batinick, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Batinick: "I think this is a very important point, if I could have the Body's attention for just a quick second. You may have noticed that there is a new person in the Floor Leader chair, Representative Steve Andersson. I think in his first term, everybody realized that he is reasonable and logical. He debates things on the issues. He doesn't jump to conclusions and he does a good job of being calm and helping others around him be calm, including myself. So, I think we can look to... I look forward to the Leadership as Floor Leader from Representative Andersson and I hope we have a Session that where we have some solutions after we have some good, logical, reasonable, spirited debate. Good luck, Steve."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations, Sir. I think he was telling us that you're the only calm person on that side of the aisle.

I'm pretty sure I heard him say that."

Andersson: "Well, I'll let people judge that for themselves, but all I would like to say other than thank you to Representative

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Batinick for saying that is to remind the Body that there is far more that unites us than divides us. We agree on much more than we disagree on. So, I agree, let's have a full and fair debate and I look forward to working with every one of you. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. You're doing a fine job already, Sir.

Mr. Brady is recognized. Did you have a point to make, Sir?"

Brady: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Brady: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention for just a moment. I'd like to introduce you to some special quests with us today that's in the Speaker's Gallery. First, we have our Director of the Illinois State Police, Leo Schmitz. Leo, if you'd stand please with members of his staff and very special Illinois State Troopers. And the special quest of honor today is 8-year-old Hunter Hillman of Bloomington, who is accompanied by his mother, Megan Hillman, and his big sister, Ryan Sale. I'm also joined in our acknowledgment of Hunter and the Illinois State Police by Representative Keith Sommer, whose district Hunter lives in. And now for a brief little part of Hunter's story. Recently, as a second grader at Trinity Lutheran School in Bloomington, Hunter spent lunchtime eating by himself because Hunter was perceived by other children to be different. You see, Hunter has Autism, and being on the spectrum, he has challenges with his social skills and interacting with students. Hunter did not want to tell his mom about this daily problem because as Hunter said, I knew my mom would be sad. So Hunter's teacher

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

concerned about the situation informed his mom, Megan, at a parent-teacher conference. After learning and agonizing over this problem, Megan called a friend for support and advice on what to do. That friend was Jill Riesenberg, who's also with us today and their children, Mark and Kelsey. Jill shared the story... Jill shared the story with her husband, Captain Steve Riesenberg of the Illinois State Police. And in Captain Riesenberg's words, I felt motivated to go help and make this day a little brighter for Hunter. One day, Hunter came into the cafeteria at school to find a seat saved for him by three uniformed State Troopers. Their picture is here in our local paper. All who are with us today, as I said, Captain Steve Risenberg and Troopers Matt Frizzell and Chris Parmley, who on their own time, ate lunch with Hunter. The Troopers... the Troopers enjoyed packed lunches by Hunter's mom, Megan, which met the same dietary restrictions as Hunter's due to his severe allergies. Hunter's popularity soared with other children who wanted to join Hunter and his visitors for lunch. The visit even carried over to the playground after lunch where all enjoyed playing tag and playing on the playground together. This story is very personal for me for I, too, have a son, Tom, who has Autism and faces similar challenges such as Hunter. As Hunter's mother, Megan, said, I hope this encourages others to include children that might otherwise be excluded. She is forever grateful and moved by the Troopers taking the time for Hunter on their day off. In a time of hearing such... so much negative about law enforcement, these gentlemen have asked for no public acknowledgement, but they deserve every expression of appreciation that could be

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

bestowed upon them. It's simply the right thing to do. That's why prior to coming to the Speaker's Gallery today, of which we thank Speaker Madigan for allowing our guests here today in the gallery, Governor Rauner also met with and expressed his appreciation for the act of kindness as well. And maybe the best part is that Hunter has been joined by more children at lunchtime at school. Please help me in recognizing and saying thank you to all these very special people from all of us here at the Illinois House of Representatives."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Brady, and thank you all for joining us. We appreciate you being here and appreciate hearing your story. The Chair recognizes Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Jones: "I ask the Body to join me in a moment of silence in the passing of our colleague's mother, Ms. Pearl Medley, Rita Mayfield's mom. She passed away this past week. So, I'd ask the Body to join me in a moment of silence."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Members. Mr. Jones, thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 19, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 20, offered by Representative Mussman. House Resolution 22, offered by Representative Hammond. House Resolution 23, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 24, offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 26, offered by Representative Lilly. House Resolution 33, offered by Representative Parkhurst. House Resolution 36, offered by Representative Parkhurst. House Resolution 37, offered by

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

- Representative Phelps. House Resolution 41, offered by Representative Reis. And House Resolution 44, offered by Representative Welch."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, House Joint Resolution 7. Leader Currie is recognized."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This establishes the Joint Session under which Governor Rauner will speak to the House and Senate and the people of Illinois, with respect to the State of the State, tomorrow."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves through the adoption of the Resolution. There being no debate, those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 46. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This would propose Rules..."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie, may I ask you to suspend for a moment? The Chair recognizes Mr. Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus."
- Speaker Lang: "And Mr. Demmer, how long do you anticipate the caucus being?"
- Demmer: "One hour."
- Speaker Lang: "The Republicans will go to caucus immediately in Room 118. Democrats will be at ease, but before we go, an announcement, Members. Since there seems to be some

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

confusion, let me announce for the record, Session is canceled on Thursday, for those that did not know. The Republicans will go to caucus immediately; the Democrats will be at ease. The House will be in recess 'til the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Chair recognizes Mr. Phelps."

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

Phelps: "Thank you, Speaker. Tomorrow morning, the Illinois Sportsman's Caucus is going to reassemble and if you're a member or want to be a member, come by at 8 a.m. at the Illinois State Museum. Our special guest is our own director, Wayne Rosenthal will be there. We will have coffee and donuts as well. So, please come by tomorrow morning, 8 a.m., Illinois State Museum."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Barbra Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on January 24, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 46."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gable, for what reason do you rise?" Gable: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Gable: "Thank you. I would just like to announce to everyone that the Chicago Botanical Garden will be hosting a breakfast tomorrow morning. They are one of our state's treasures. So, please plan on stopping by in the rotunda, 8:30 to 10:30 tomorrow morning. Thank you."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia, for what reason do you rise?"
- Chapa LaVia: "A point of personal privilege. Stay here, Lisa, while you're here."
- Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."
- Chapa LaVia: "I just want everybody to hold Lisa Hernandez's son in their prayers. He enlisted in the Marines and he's been there for two weeks now. And she's a proud momma, but she's worried. So, if you get a chance, just give her a hug and tell her that she's in your prayers. And he's going to be fine and he's going to be a fine, fine Marine. Congratulations."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative and congratulations, Representative. House Resolution 46, Mr. Clerk. Leader Currie. There's an Amendment."
- Currie: "I'd like to adopt... adopt Amendment #1 to House Resolution 46."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Leader Currie, now on the Resolution as amended."
- Currie: "Thank you. The Resolution incorporates the Rules that will govern our behavior during the 100th General Assembly here in the House of Representatives. They are substantially similar to Rules under which we have operated for many... many Sessions. And I would urge the Members to note that under the Leadership of our Speaker, Michael Madigan, these Rules have operated to the advantage of all the Members of the House, whether they are Members of the Democratic or the Republican Party. Under this leadership, we have seen proportionate

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

numbers of Bills heard in committee, succeed in committee, and succeed in the House, whether they are offered by Republicans or Democrats. There is proportionality in the way these rules have operated, because the people who are operating care about the dignity, the rights, and the responsibilities of all the Members. These Rules have served us as individual Members well. They have served our constituents well. I would remind all the Members that substantially similar Rules were adopted very recently in the State Senate. They were adopted by unanimous vote. I encourage the Members of this chamber to take a leap from their Senate counterparts and adopt these Rules with that same unanimous vote. I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I appreciate your 'aye' vote on House Resolution 46."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Andersson: "Just an initial question with regard to the Amendment that was just adopted. Can you explain what the Amendment did?"

Currie: "What the Amendment did was to treat all Members who are in a third term fairly and the same evenly... evenhandedly with respect to their ability to be named a Chairman or a Minority Spokesman of a committee. So, under this Rule, any third termer, whether elected or appointed initially would be eligible to serve as a Chair or as to serve as a Minority Spokesman or a Vice-Chair."

Andersson: "So it corrected the discussion that we had yesterday in Rules. Is that correct?"

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Currie: "That discussion is now moot, Representative."

Andersson: "Very good. And what's the case with the exception regarding Leadership?"

Currie: "That did not change with this Amendment."

Andersson: "Okay. So that..."

- Currie: "So all Members are treated the same. If you're in a third term, whether your first term was an appointed or an elected one, you have the same opportunity to serve as every other third termer as a Chair or as a Minority Spokesman."
- Andersson: "Correct. But the previous exception that existed in the 99th Rules with regard to persons receiving a Leadership stipend, that's been removed. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "Well, that was changed, but that's because that had been originally put in the Rules in 2003, when we went to the third term requirement just to make sure the people who were already there were not disadvantaged."
- Andersson: "Thank you. I would agree with you, by the way, Leader, that the Rules are substantially the same at this point. There is one Rule that I'd ask a question about and that's the Constitutional Amendment Rule. I think its Rule 46."

Currie: "Right."

- Andersson: "Can you explain what the intent... what is that change and what the intent is?"
- Currie: "Under the old Rules, any Amendment offered to change the Illinois Constitution had to be approved by the Assembly six months before the General Election date. This only says, you can do it any other time, but it still will not appear on the General Election ballot until more than six months have lapsed in the time of passage. So, if you want to propose a

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

constitutional change, you can do it even in the beginning of September, even though it would not appear on the ballot until two years later at the General Election in November."

Andersson: "And notwithstanding this deletion, there are still Rules governing that time frame within the Constitution itself, correct?"

Currie: "Yes. Yes of course."

Andersson: "Okay, very good. So, if we agree that the Rules are substantially the same, I think I'd like to focus a few questions, if I might, with regard to the existing Rules and whether or not we can make these better, whether or not they can function in a way that serves all the Members that we... or all the people that we, Members, serve. If we could look at that a bit, talking about the Rules Committee. You and I had a good discussion yesterday about the Rules Committee and whether it's procedural or substantive in nature. What's your opinion about that?"

Currie: "My opinion is that it's a procedural committee. It's always been treated as such and that's the way it behaves."

Andersson: "And in fact, though, it does make substantive decisions, does it not?"

Currie: "I would say that we don't actually do that. Rarely... very few Bills, for example, remain in the Rules Committee, even though, there is not a requirement in the Rules that all bills must be assigned to substantive committees."

Andersson: "Right."

Currie: "Nevertheless, we generally assign them, both in the first and in the second year of a two-year biennium."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

- Andersson: "And I think we discussed yesterday that about 1200 Bills did not get assigned last year."
- Currie: "And Representative, our staff are very... a hardworking staff, did a little research and the reality is that most of those Bills were shell Bills. Many of them, a large number, filed after the deadline. So, in fact, there were very... some of them were held because the Sponsor asked us not to move the Bill to a substantive committee. Many were duplicates, there were already Bills in the hopper. So, were a very tiny percentage of Bills that don't fit one of those criteria that remained in the Rules Committee, even in the second year of a two-year term, which generally is reserved for crises, for emergency issues, for problems that have developed that people feel need immediate solution rather than the way we operate in the first year of the term."
- Andersson: "I think that if you took a survey of the Members on my side of the aisle, they might respectfully disagree with the characterization that only the routine shell Bills, etcetera, didn't make it out."
- Currie: "Right. Our staff points out that these are the facts. You may have some alternative facts in your back pocket. Come see me afterwards, if you want to discuss it further."
- Andersson: "Rest assured, Leader, I don't engage in alternative facts or lies, as they might alternatively be known. If we can get back to this, though. With respect, I think that there is a filter that's applied at the Rules Committee level and Bills that some people deem inappropriate never make it out. And I understand you don't accept that premise, but bearing that in mind, that concern, one of the concerns we have is

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

the time frame, the public notice that's required for the Rules Committee. Can you tell me what the public notice requirement is for the Rules Committee?"

Currie: "Well, we have always treated this as a procedural committee. That is, in fact, we discovered over time of not much interest to the general public. So, we do operate the Rules Committee under different time tables from those that govern the work of substantive committees. And remember, anything the Rules Committee does is later... later happens either on a floor vote, if it's an Amendment, or in a committee with an Amendment or with a Bill that is assigned to that committee. So, there are many opportunities for public participation and as you know, we do... we do post the Rules Committee meetings and every posting identifies the topics that may come before the Rules Committee."

Andersson: "Real..."

Currie: "So, we believe that we do respond to the public's interest in notice, the public's interest in participation, and if ever anybody wants to come and testify before the Rules Committee, which happens only once in a blue moon, we are more than happy to hear from them."

Andersson: "But you still didn't quite answer the question. What is the notice requirement?"

Currie: "It is an adequate notice requirement, and you'll see it in the Calendar, you'll see it online. And of course, things have changed. We have so many things that we can do online these days that weren't available 25 years ago. So, in terms of transparency, accountability, we're light years ahead of where we used to be."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Andersson: "And you said that the... that what will be addressed is posted. Now, I will tell you..."

Currie: "Yeah. And what..."

Andersson: "That I had the pleasure to serve on the Rules Committee about four times. Once, most recently in January, January 9, I think it was. As I was driving into Chicago to attend that meeting, I looked online to see what was posted. Nothing was posted, nothing. And then, I looked at our Rules. And our Rules provide something very unique. Our Rules provide that everything is considered posted."

Currie: "Right. And we..."

Andersson: "So, at the moment on January 9 there were 7 thousand Bills that were posted. So, are you..."

Currie: "No."

Andersson: "So... are you taking the position that adequate public notice is to list 7 thousand Bills?"

Currie: "January 11 was a new General Assembly. And to my knowledge, I don't think more than about 500 Bills have as yet been introduced in this General Assembly."

Andersson: "Agreed. This was in the 99th. And so, there were 7 thousand Bills at that point that were available and your claim is that it's reasonable to say that... look through those and guess which one we're going to deal with?"

Currie: "I believe that your numbers are wrong. Alternative facts, yet again. There were no more than about 6600 Bills filed in the last biennium, not as many as 7 thousand and anybody who thought that we might be, as that General Assembly was coming to a close pop out 5 thousand or 3 or 12 Bills, should have another thing coming."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

- Andersson: "So, I guess my point is with... whether it's 7000, 3000, 1000, the idea that the public would be interested in knowing what you're considering, how can they possibly know?"
- Currie: "Just a reminder, the public cares a lot more about Bills that then go to substantive committees from the Rules Committee. And most of the testimony about Bills would better be heard in the substantive committee than in the procedural committee, the Rules Committee."
- Andersson: "Well, I don't disagree with you on that. I do agree with you on that, but the concern there lies in the speed at which things can happen. Let's talk about the last time..."

Currie: "Well, remember..."

- Andersson: "...we... we worked on a budget Bill. That Bill was dropped as an Amendment and within one hour, I think it was a 500 page bill, it spent many billions of dollars, we were voting on it within two hours. How is that fair public notice to anyone who wants to be involved?"
- Currie: "Well, I just would, again, make the point: Bills are not sent from the Rules Committee to the floor; they are sent to committees and committees have posting requirements, six and half days, I believe, before they can be heard. I think the public has every opportunity to find out what's happening here in Springfield. And again, I would just point out that these Rules have operated fairly and effectively to respect the rights and responsibilities of our Members, Republicans and Democrats, upstaters and downstaters. Proof of the pudding, as we used to say, is in the eating, Representative. These rules do a good job of treating us and the people who sent us here fairly and effectively."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

- Andersson: "I appreciate your opinion on that. If we move instead to the scenario where a large number of the Members of this Body disagree with the decision of the Rules Committee, what's the method for discharge?"
- Currie: "There is an opportunity for three-fifths of the Members of each partisan caucus to sign on to and draft a note to say we would like this measure discharged. That has been available for the last several Generals Assembly. I don't know that Members have yet decided that they wish to take advantage of that opportunity, but the opportunity is there. If there is some really important issue and the Rules Committee just plain missed the boat, then our Members can work together to make sure that we have an opportunity as a Body to give full consideration to that proposal."
- Andersson: "And it's an enormous requirement, wouldn't you say?

 That's 72 people."
- Currie: "It seems to me, fair, if we're talking about people thinking that the Rules Committee made a bad decision. Get together, make it work."
- Andersson: "But it needs... it takes more people to override or to discharge from Rules than it does to override a Veto. That's pretty significant."
- Currie: "Well, first, right now, it takes unanimous consent to discharge the Rules Committee that Rule stays. We tried to find a way to give the opportunity for those who vented that requirement is too high. We've found one that isn't so high. So, yeah, it's not..."
- Andersson: "What about this requirement that they sign on to the Bill? What if someone has... what if someone sincerely disagrees

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

- with the Bill, but at the same time feels the Bill should be heard and debated?"
- Currie: "Well, then they can sign on to the Bill and then they can remove their name afterwards."
- Andersson: "What is the point of that? Why do we do that? Why should someone indicate their support for a Bill by signing on to it simply then moments later be deleted?"
- Currie: "Well, my view would be that people who are not for the Bill will not think that this is a matter that must by its very emergency status come before the full Body."
- Andersson: "So, the last area I'd like to cover, if I could, is with regard to the daily Calendar. We talked about this a bit yesterday as well. At present, as we move forward, today is not the case, but as we move forward into the Session, there can be hundreds of Bills that could be ready to be voted on. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "As we get way into Session, yes, there would be a large number."
- Andersson: "Yes, in April or May. Yes. So, at that point... now, I don't know about your side of the aisle, but on our side of the aisle, we don't know what's coming. So, as much as... as much as we appreciate it being fast on our feet and having done our homework, which we do, I think would it not be more appropriate that there be some notice of the Bills that are actually going to be called, even the day before, so that our Members could study those Bills?"
- Currie: "Well, if I were... if I were a Member on your side of the aisle or on this side of the aisle, I would try to be familiar with all the Bills that are on the Calendar because even in

the best laid plans sometimes there's a slip twixt cup and lip. So, I think all the Members have a responsibility to

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

know the Calendar. I would remind you that some points in Session, we frequently go to an alphabetic list and Members are asked to organize their lists by their priority Bills. It isn't very difficult to check with a Member to ask what your priority Bills are. So, I would encourage people to cross the aisle, to talk to their colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to find out what's cooking, which Bills are of particular interest and importance to individual Members. That will give you a really good idea of what's likely to be coming up next." Andersson: "And by the way, I do appreciate that there are times in our Session where we do exactly that and I think that it works well and it honestly gives people a little bit of notice. But I'm not talking about how it can be done, I'm talking about how it should be done. And I'll tell ya, I come out of local government, and in local government there is a 48-hour notice for everything that's going to be on the agenda, it has to be posted and it can't be everything. In fact, there's Attorney General opinions that speak directly to that point. My point here is, even though our Members could do as you suggest and move around the chamber and figure out what's happening, is that really the best way to do it? Wouldn't it be better if simply the day before, a real Calendar's put out saying these are the 10 or 20 Bills that we're likely to consider? You could even have that Rule and then suspend it in emergency. But wouldn't it be more appropriate to all of us, both sides, to be able to have advanced notice so that we can really drill down and not have

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

700 Bills or 100 Bills, but we have just a few bills to consider on a given day?"

Currie: "I would just urge that, yes, there can certainly be changes in the Rules. Everybody may have a favorite set, they may have an individual Rule they particularly dislike, but I would remind the Members that these Rules have worked effectively to give each of you, each of us, a day in the sun that there is not a distinction between what the Democrats get to do and the Republican get to do. There is proportionality in the way these Rules operate and there is fair play for people from every part of the state and people from both political Parties."

Andersson: "I thank you for that. I'll speak to the Resolution, briefly. Folks, we all have the honor of serving here and I believe that everyone in this chamber is here for the right reason, and they want a full and fair debate. And the question is, do these Rules actually generate that full and fair debate? I think of it kind of like the old metaphor of a frog in a cooking pot, right? You put the frog in while the water's cold, then you turn up the heat. He never notices and he never jumps out and he dies, he gets cooked. But if you turn that thing to boiling and then throw the frog in, well, of course, he jumps out. I'll tell you, speaking as having been here now for two years, I think we're more inclined to just be used to this, to be comfortable with something that's unjust. And quite frankly, I think these Rules are unjust. They're not as proportionate as the Sponsor would indicate. And I would actually look to the freshmen who haven't had the pleasure of working under these Rules and say, does this sound right to

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

you? Does this sound like a fair way to do it? Or could we do it in a better way? I mean, think about it. Think about what I said. Local government has a 48-hour requirement and a specific agenda requirement, but we don't. There's a thing in Illinois, a district called a Mosquito Abatement District. Mosquito Abatement District deals with abating mosquitos. They have a 48-hour notice requirement. Literally, mosquitos in the State of Illinois have more due process than the Members of this chamber. I'm sorry, that's not right. Moreover, as I mentioned before, let's say we're not happy with the Rules Committee and we want to discharge something. It takes 72 votes, not 71, 72. So, it is harder to discharge something from Rules than it is to override a gubernatorial Veto. Imagine that. It is harder to disagree with the Speaker and the Members of Rules than it is to disagree and overrule the Governor. I ask this of all of you, I really do, I heard a lot of positive comments about our process in the intervening time while we were gone. I heard a Member speak, actually during inauguration, talking about the fact that four people are not enough to get the job done. That we should be more transparent, that we should be more inclusive in the process. I agree with that statement. These Rules are what hold us back, to make it more positive, to make it more open. I had another colleague, and by the way, the people I'm quoting are all Democrats. I had another colleague who said that she felt that she wanted to push the Speaker towards more thoughtful solutions along with a more open process to allow more ideas to come to the floor. I agree with that concept. These Rules don't do that. And one more that said

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

that they think that the Rules are more restrictive than any other Legislature in the country and they create a lot of control in the Speaker. I agree with that. I'd like to bring that control back to us. So, I ask you, respectively, you don't have to agree with our Rules, but how about we tweak these? How bout we improve these along some of the lines I just talked about, and not leave it simply that, well, we've always done it that way. We've always done it that way. That's never been an excuse that carries any weight for me. Instead, let's look at them afresh, let's be that frog outside of the pot, and let's figure out do these Rules really make sense or can we make them better? I think we can make them better. So, I'd ask you to vote 'no' on these, so that we can work on making them better. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Leader Currie, I appreciate the conversation we had in the Rules Committee yesterday. I would like to bring up one issue that we didn't get a chance to talk about yesterday. I didn't notice that it was in the Rules. This has to do with Rule 66 that is a Motion to adjourn to a time certain. There's a change there... a change that removes the ability for any Member of the House to make a Motion to adjourn to a date that's not been scheduled by the Speaker. And the reason I ask about this, I think that's a peculiar change for the House to make. When you look at the motion to adjourn to a date certain, there's a great description of it in Robert's Rules of Order. It says it's a privileged Motion that takes

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

precedence over all others and is in order even after it's been voted on to adjourn. Why have these House Rules taken the ability for a Member... taken away the ability for a Member to make the most privileged of all Motions?"

- Currie: "Well, in fact of course, all this does is to clear up a conflict in previous Rules. Because our Rules have made it clear for a very long time that it is the Speaker who controls the Calendar, it is the Speaker who controls the schedule. And the change in this language only reflects the fact that that is the rule of this chamber. Our Rules do trump Robert's Rules and all this was, was a technical change, a clarification that the Rule that says that the Speaker controls the Calendar is exactly the Rule."
- Demmer: "A technical change that removes the ability of any Member of this Assembly with the exception of the Speaker, removes their ability for anybody in this chamber, to make a Motion to Adjourn to a date certain."
- Currie: "And any Member can ask the Speaker for a change in the schedule, that's perfectly legitimate, perfectly open. But as I say..."
- Demmer: "But not as this Motion would be subject to a vote?"
- Currie: "We thought this was totally technical because under our old Rules, the Speaker retained that power."
- Demmer: "Was this decision to make this rule change motivated by anything in particular?"
- Currie: "Just to clarify... I mean, what happened in the Rules process is you go through and you see where you have conflicting regulations, conflicting rules, or clarifications that are required and that's what this is."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Demmer: "Thank you, Leader Currie. To the Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's important that we consider the merits of the Rules that are being proposed today. And the important thing to remember is that unlike the election for Speaker, this is not a binary choice. We don't have one choice on the Democratic side and one choice on the Republican side. The Rules of the House are complex and comprehensive and allow for Amendments of all sorts. Allow for Amendments that would make your Bill have a better chance of passage in this chamber. A Bill that if you have an idea for a budget that could end this impasse, if you have an idea for a reform that you think this state needs, if you have an idea for a great law that you think the people of Illinois deserve, these Rules make it harder for you to bring that Bill to a vote. Think of it this way. If you have a great idea on a budget, it's harder to get that to pass the Rules Committee than it would be to get it to pass the House Floor. It's harder to get that Bill to pass from the Rules Committee than it is to pass on the House Floor. You have a few people who control the agenda of the Rules Committee. Your Bill may never even receive a vote. It's harder for it to happen there. So, instead of welcoming new ideas, instead of welcoming competing thoughts, we're instead putting a roadblock at step one of the process. Before we can even get that momentum going, before we can even start to take those steps, we're putting the roadblock at the very front of the line. I think there's an interesting thought that we should all... all should have in mind when we consider how to vote on these Rules, and it's from a political author by the name of John Rawls. And

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

it asks the question, when you're debating and find a question of public policy, ask yourself how you would vote if you did not know which side you'd be on in the outcome. If you were sitting in this chair today and you didn't know if you would be in the Majority Party or the Minority Party, if you didn't know which side of the aisle you'd be on, if you didn't know whether you'd benefit from all the protections and privileges that this... that these Rules put into place, would you vote for them? Would you vote 'yes' today if there was a chance you could be in the Minority Party? I think most of us would honestly answer 'no' to that. We know that on the whole these Rules are not conducive to bipartisan government. Let's take the chance that we have with a debate like the House Rules debate. Let's take that chance and make those a little bit better to make your constituents voices heard a little bit more. Let's take that chance today, vote 'no' on these Rules. Let's get back together and find something that works for everybody. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Leader Currie, as we debate the Rules that we are going to be operating under for the historic 100th General Assembly, is it fair to say we kind of have this unique place in time over the next few minutes, hour or so, or however long the debate takes, and say we don't really have any Rules in place right now?"

Currie: "I think that we're operating under Rules from the previous General Assembly."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Hays: "I thank you because I was going to start eating my sandwich while the Rules were not in place and telling the Clerk that there's a cleanup on aisle two. I'm glad you clarified that. Thank you. You know ... to the Bill. We have a lot of new dynamics in our vernacular nowadays. It's #alternativefacts, is one I find interesting. I posted something under #alternativefacts that reads, the Rules of the Illinois House of Representatives that will be passed on Tuesday are fair and not oppressive as they will allow the voices of my constituents to be heard. And then I followed that with #alternative facts because the fact of the matter is nothing can be farther from the truth. I went against my own self-imposed rule of limiting Facebook posts to my children and my wonderful grandchildren and the puppy next door. On Saturday morning, as many in this chamber and around our state and around our nation exercise their constitutional right to peacefully assemble and protest, I'm going to read that post, an open challenge from my brethren in the Illinois General Assembly who are exercising their constitutional rights to peacefully assemble and protest today, which would have been Saturday morning. Will you stand with me when every single one of my constituents is silenced once again on Tuesday, when the most oppressive House Rules in the nation are established effectively writing 'We the people' out of the Illinois Constitution? Stand with me. Every thinking person in our state knows this is wrong and an end run around democracy and all voices being heard. I am confident that I can count on each and every elected official exercising their right today to continue that momentum and stand up against the blatant oppression that will be

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

facilitated on the House Floor on Tuesday. Even the process by which we got here is questionable. The hearing is in front of the Rules Committee. It has been talked about earlier that the Rules Committee in and of itself is a highly questionable dynamic. These... the original Rules went to the Rules Committee that was posted for a subject matter only hearing at 3:30 yesterday afternoon. Yet, when our members arrived at 3:35, five minutes after the meeting posted for subject matter hearing only started, said, oh no, here are the rules. No notice, no ability to review the Rules and oh, by the way, it's no longer a subject matter hearing. We will be voting here and now. How ironic that Rules that are the most oppressive in the United States of America would be adopted in committee that was posted for subject matter only hearing, and then you change the Rules on that to even contemplate the rules. I mean, that is straight out of Dilbert comic strip. I hear periodically in this chamber, well, these Rules are just building on the rules that Lee Daniels had 20 years ago, Rules that weren't fair to the Minority party in those 2 years. And I would say to that, the 'he cheated too' argument is as weak today as it was when your mother saw through it when we were children. And the truth of the matter is, you cannot have a dynamic where you are silencing the voice of 5.5 million people. The Minority in this state represent 5.5 million people. That's more people than many states in our union and we certainly should have the right to have those voices heard. You know, wrong is always wrong, it really is. And the dynamic that you can have different values on Saturday morning than you do on Tuesday afternoon is pretty

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

questionable. This should be a soul searching moment for anyone who exercise their constitutional rights to say voices should not be silenced, they should be heard, they should be heard in a peaceful demonstration. How on earth could you arrive here three short days later and hit the green button knowing that every constituent that I represent will be muffled? Every teacher, every laborer, every firefighter, police officer, office worker, everyone who's a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent, everyone who really has fed up with the process, and that number's growing, they will have no legislative voice. To my constituents who are listening at this moment, I apologize to you. I apologize to you that this august chamber is about to enter into Rules that silence your voice. You know, I'm going to give you a couple of examples of how petty and small this can be. I had a Bill last year that was a follow up Bill in relation to how we treat property taxes after a tornado. Representative Phelps had an area devastated by a tornado and he brought legislation that would make people whole on their property taxes. I followed that Bill giving the same kind of courtesies to small businesses and there were a couple of tweaks. This is a Bill that came over from the Senate unanimously, a Democrat Senator passed it in the Senate, my Senator from the other side of the aisle. A Bill that almost certainly would have passed out of here 118 to 0, could never get the Bill discharged. When I tell school children, and I've taken to doing this, you know, we like to think a Bill happens in the School House Rock kind of version, I am a Bill, I'm only a Bill sitting on top of Capitol Hill, we all know the song, but I have to now follow

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

that up with here's how it really works. When I stood on the floor of the House of Representatives under the photograph of the portrait of Abraham Lincoln and said, can I get my Bill discharged from the Rules Committee? One person, in the singular, can stand up and say, I object to that Motion and it stays in the Rules Committee. It wouldn't matter if I had 10, 15, 50 cosponsors, it remains in Rules. That's outrageous. You know, my community... my district is actually closer to Indianapolis than it is to Springfield. And I have to tell you, if this is how we're going to do business on this floor, I may lead kids over to the Indiana Capitol to say here's where democracy happens 'cause it damn sure doesn't happen in Springfield. The Rules Committee is not even open to the public. There's no press, there's not a single constituent there. No other state in this union has rules that are this oppressive. Truly ironic, the Rules across the hall in the Senate and the way they are administered, fundamentally different, fundamentally different. My colleagues who have served in this Body who have gone over to the Senate said, wow, you know, I may still be in a Super Minority, but I can get my Bill called. I can have the wonderful constituents over to sit in a hearing and have their voices heard. That's what democracy looks like; that's what it looks like. You win some, you lose some on the vote, but there should be a discussion. There should be a vote. Mr. Speaker, should this Bill receive the prerequisite number of votes for passage, I'd like to request a moment of silence on behalf of my constituents to mourn the death of democracy as it relates to their access to the legislative process."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you for letting... allowing me to follow that wonderful speech. I'm going to go directly... I'm going to go directly to the Resolution. And since somebody brought up alternative facts, you know, we were told that the Rules treat members of the public fairly. The reason I know that's an alternative fact because Members of both sides of the aisle have said that both publically and privately. You know these Rules aren't fair to the Members of the public and us. You know they're not fair to you. I'm going to correct one thing the fine Representative just said. He said these Rules affect 5.5 million people, no they don't. They affect 11, 12 million people because you're being oppressed by it too. Your ability to get your Bill called to the floor is being oppressed too. Let's think about an actual Bill in my situation. We have a company in my district, I talked about it previously, there's pass-through money sitting in the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. Pass-through money sitting in a bank account for work that that company and several companies including some downstate, in the former Representative Bradley's district, that did work over a year and half ago. Pass-through money that's being used as a political football. We have families that are employed by these businesses that did good work for the state of Illinois and we can't get them paid as rank and file Members because of the games that are played with the Rules Committee. This is our opportunity. This will be the foreshadowing of the next two years. Are we, as Representatives, going to allow the State of Illinois to continue its self-destruction which this Body, under... people

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

under this dome as the main cause are we going to stand up and say no, work together on a more fair legislative process as both you and I know needs to happen? I cringe to what's going to happen if this goes off on a partisan Roll Call in Illinois the next two years. We've seen enough carnage. Please vote against these. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. We sit here and we debate these Rules, but these aren't House Rules. These are Mike Madigan's Rules. That's whose Rules they are because all he's doing is trying to get... assure a political outcome. He's not interested in real democracy. He controls absolutely everything that goes on in this chamber and everybody knows it. So, to sit on the other side and pretend like anything that we're doing here is fair is completely ridiculous. In fact, you can argue that we have such concentrated control in the Speaker of the House of Illinois that is unheard of in any other Legislative Body in the entire United States. And that's the truth. And how does he do this? Well, let's talk specifically about the committees 'cause everybody else has covered a lot of the other stuff and the way that that's done is by doling out \$10 thousand stipends to chair people. Because he controls exactly who's going to sit in what committee and who's going to be the chairperson. And the taxpayers are getting ripped off by these \$10 thousand stipends for committee work. Let's put in this perspective. In 2015, 9 of those committees met five times or less. In 2016, 15 committees met five times or less. In fact, in 2016, when you look across the data, the average amount of time

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

that the committees met, and there are 49, was four times. That means those committee chairs made \$2500 per committee meeting. What a waste of taxpayer dollars. 'Cause when the Bills come out, they go to the committee that the Speaker wants the Bill to go to. They don't even go to a committee that would make sense for the topic area. This happens time and time again. So, when he got mad at former Representative Dunkin, as you can easily see, the Appropriations for Higher Education Committee never met again. All those Bills went to the other Higher Education Committee 'cause that's how the control works here. Nothing makes sense, it's all the Speaker's Rules. That's whose Rules these are that you're voting on. They're not the House Rules. I bet you most House Members don't agree with most of these Rules. So, I mean, let's just be clear here. We're wasting a lot of money. We've got new Insurance Committees this year. In fact, we've got two Insurance Committees now. Why? What a waste of money, and we waste time too. So many Bills could be consolidated into single committees, work could get done, but we don't do that. We don't do that. We don't do anything efficiently here, it's all for political purpose. It's all to garner political control over people by handing out stipends. That's what this is about."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I agree with many of the previous speakers that this is one of the most important votes we will take over the next two years. And for a lot of us on both sides of the aisle, this is the first time we will get to weigh in on this important set of Rules

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

that will govern how we operate this Body over the next two years. I'd like to briefly speak to one Rule that is glaringly not in our Rules. So, a lot of the Rules that we are talking about are procedural in nature and our constituents and the public don't generally know about them, but there is one that I have heard many times from my constituents and about... and it's about Amendments being germane to the underlying Bill. That's not how they say it. They'll say why do we ... why do they have extra stuff on the Bills? Why did they change this at the last second? And often I'll tell them a story about a Bill that I had that had to do with oil and gas posting requirements and it got changed to expunge records for cannabis or drug paraphernalia violations. This is the gut and replace. It's famous and it's wrong. The practice of removing language of a Bill and replacing it entirely in order three-day constitutional around the requirement is wrong. Every Bill that deserves a full hearing that we intend to be legislation. At least 46 states have Rules that require that Amendments be germane to the underlying Bill. It's a commonsense rule to maintain the integrity of the contemplative legislative process and it promotes state... straightforward legislating and for the public to know our true intention. On the whole though, we often hear from Members in this chamber that we need active participation from Rank and file, Members on both sides of the aisle to fix the true challenges our state faces. I agree with that, but voting for these Rules will mean perpetuating a system that closes out new ideas, that shuts down all debate, that consolidates power at the top and leaves most of

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

our constituents without a voice in this process. Voting for these Rules shuts out the Minority Party and as has been mentioned, shuts out the voices of our five and half million constituents. Every Illinoisan deserves better and we can do better. We've presented a set of Rules that are better. We need a transparent, straightforward process that returns the power to individual Legislators. We can and should do better. And I urge all of my colleagues to please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. A few weeks ago we had a Member of ours retire; I'm sure many of you remember Representative Leitch. Before he left, he talked to many of us about how this place used to work. He had the opportunity to serve here for a very long time, almost three decades. And he would talk about a time when I could... when he could walk across the aisle to a friend on the other side and work on a Bill, come up with a compromise, find support, find a consensus together. That is long gone. This place has spent the last two decades... the last two decades killing democracy. The reality is democracy is almost dead in this state and if you vote for this, you are voting to put another nail in the coffin. A vote for this Bill means that you are going to vote to give every ability to represent your constituents to one person. And you're going to spend the next two years begging to be able to represent your constituents. That's what's going to happen. Democracy in this state is broken. And I'd like to use a little statement for my friend, my former Representative David Leitch, what has happened in this state is a travesty."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. There are many leaders in this chamber of very noble causes. Minority rights, equality, to name but two, and I would just ask those that are passionate about those two to remember this vote. And are you being selective in your endeavors to further those noble causes, because an affirmative vote for this Resolution turns your foundation to sand. I would just like to close by saying a quote from Thomas Jefferson during his first inauguration. 'Bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will must be rightful must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate would be oppression.' Do not go against your core values by voting 'yes' for these oppressive Rules. Vote 'no' and stand for your beliefs."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Back in 2015, I got a phone call from the Speaker asking if I would support the Rules and I asked for a meeting. And during that meeting, we talked about House Rule 10, which talks about committees and how people get chairmanships. And there was an Amendment made to the Rules last year which was probably... of all the legislation we passed last year, that Amendment to the Rules was the biggest anticorruption piece of legislation or Resolution that we passed. Unfortunately, that provision has been taken out of these Rules, which for me is a poison pill. And I just wanted to let the General Assembly know that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McDermed: "Thank you. Leader, what is it that the proponents of these Rules fear? Do you fear debate on ideas that are not yours? Do you fear that we might prevail on some ideas that aren't yours? Do you fear substantive debate?"

Currie: "I fear nothing, Representative. I fear nothing. These are good Rules; they're strong Rules. They enjoyed unanimous support among your colleagues... your Republican colleagues in the State Senate. I encourage your 'aye' vote."

McDermed: "Well, we know the Rules don't promote transparency. We know the Rules don't represent democracy. We know they don't promote good government and we know this because the Rules haven't solved any of the problems that the people of Illinois still have. To the Bill. We spend a lot of time here talking about the most vulnerable and yet we haven't spent any time actually fixing their problems. The reason that we haven't been able to solve the problems of Illinois are because of these Rules. These Rules suppress transparency; they suppress any attempt that representative democracy, good government, and diversity of ideas. We can do a lot better than that here, Representatives. Let's have some Rules that allow us to bring forth ideas from all of us. Together, the 118 of us, can solve the problems confronting the State of Illinois. Right now, we can only debate Bills that pass by three Members of the General Assembly because Rules don't permit things to come out. How do I know this? Because my Bills don't come out, people, and it's not... not the only one. So, let's have a situation. Let's have Rules where all 118 of us can work to

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

solve the problems of the people of Illinois. Vote 'no' on these Rules. And let's have some rules that actually support representative democracy and put the people of Illinois ahead of procedural rule."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. I have a brief question and then a brief statement. Leader Currie, it's my understanding that Rule 18(g) was first adopted in 2011. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Let me check the Rule number."

Durkin: "Mr. Hoffman, you're a very attractive man, but could you please sit down? You're blocking my view."

Currie: "Yeah, we're checking. We think that that was in 2011...
2012. No, it would."

Durkin: "And have you been the Chairman of the Rules Committee since 2011?"

Currie: "Yes."

Durkin: "Can you cite one particular piece of legislation that has been discharged from the Rules Committee by using Rule 18(g)?"

Currie: "And had somebody... had people submitted a petition, I'm sure it would have been approved. But nobody has taken advantage of this expanded opportunity to insert the will of the 118 Members over the will of the Rules Committee."

Durkin: "Because it's an impossibility. We know that."

Currie: "It's not impossible at all."

Durkin: "I've been around this chamber for some time and it is an impossibility and was set up for failure. Now, last week on the floor... when at the inauguration, I made a statement about both Parties need to respect the priorities of each other. We can accomplish things; we can get things done if we respect

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

the priorities of the other side. To me and my Caucus, our priority is to be given a fair hearing on legislation that impacts their districts, the 55... 5.5 million that I don't think that's unreasonable to ask. represent. Unfortunately, 118(g) (sic-18(g)), the way that it is under the Rules Committee under 118(q) (sic-18(q)) will not accomplish that. It's really unfortunate because there is a better way of going about this. I've introduced my own Rules, HR57, which is our version of how the House should conduct its business. We allow for every Member to have a fair shot to get their Bill posted and be discharged from the Rules Committee, if they don't like the way the Rules Committee is acting or if they're moving too slow. We allow discharge from the Rules Committee with just 71 votes and will also quarantee consideration of Bills or Resolution before the full House. These Rules also, get this... how about this... require public review period on budget Bills. No Bill that provides for an appropriation of the State Treasury can be considered for passage by the House until the third calendar day following the day the Bill was last amended in the House. Why not give a little sunshine to our budget Bills? That's what's in these Rules. And lastly, we have a lot of other things, but I also want to make mention of this, that we also allow for the automatic referral of Bills to committee during the first year of the General Assembly. We believe that everyone, both ... not Republicans, but also Democrats should have a right to have their Bills placed in a substantive committee to be given an up or down vote, nothing more. That's what democracy is about. Now, I will say this that I've listened and I've read

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

a lot of things about my counterparts about how they believe in transparency and fair play. They've campaigned on it time and time again. Whether you're a Progressive, a Liberal, or an Independent, and I know you are, but the fact is, how can you readopt Rules that have Rule 118... that have Rule 18(g) in it, which do not allow for the thoughtful consideration of legislation on behalf of most Members of the Minority Party. And I don't think that's right. There's a better way of going about business and that's with our Rules, House Resolution 57, which should be taken under consideration. And I'm asking those who believe in transparency and fair play who also believe that both sides of the aisle should have their legislative needs... we're asking that we respect their legislative priorities and their needs. There's a way of doing that and that's with House Resolution 57. I'm asking you, for those who believe in transparency, to reject the Rules that are before you today so we can take up HR57 and you can come on and be a cosponsor on the Bill. I would ask that you do that, but also I'd ask you to reject these Bills so we can start this and do this in a more fair, Democratic matter."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close. Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I appreciate the full, open, transparent, and accountable discussion that preceded adoption of House Resolution 46. For the record, Republicans and Democrats are treated fairly under these Rules, under the Leadership of our current and former Speaker of the House. Rules can be abused no matter how good they look on paper. We know there are governments across the world, across the globe that have great-looking Constitutions, but

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

lousy government. These Rules look on their face to be fair and open and transparent; and they act in exactly that fashion. Over the years, Republicans and Democrats, in proportion to their numbers and to the Bills they introduce have been treated fairly by the Rules Committee and by the substantive committees of the House of Representatives and by the full Membership of the House. So, fair numbers of Bills introduced, upstate, downstate, this side of the aisle, that side of the aisle have had a chance to see their day in court. We know these Rules work effectively and I would just remind you, as a final comment, that these are substantially the same as the Senate Rules, John Cullerton's Rules, Chris Radogno's Rules. Those Rules... these Rules were unanimously approved in the State Senate very recently and there is absolutely no reason why we should have less than a unanimous vote on adoption of House Resolution 46 today. I urge your 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 60... 63 voting 'yes', 53 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Speaker, my red button went on, it should have been green."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention, Sir. Mr. Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "Adjournment Resolution. House Joint Resolution #14 offered by Representative Currie.

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives stands adjourned on Wednesday, January 25, 2017, it stands adjourned until Friday, January 27, 2017, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 31, 2017, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Friday, February 03, 2017, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Monday, February 6, 2017, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, February 8, 2017, or until the call of the Speaker; and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, January 26, 2017, it stands adjourned until Monday, January 30, 2017, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, February 07, 2017, or until the call of the President."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves to the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, January 25th at the hour of 11:30 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 25 at the hour of 11:30 a.m."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

506, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 507, offered by Representative Sommer, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 508, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 509, offered by Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 510, offered Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 511, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 512, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 513, offered Representative Bourne, a Bill for an Act concerning public safety. House Bill 514, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 515, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 516, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning investing in Illinois' future. House Bill 517, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning investing in Illinois' future. House Bill 518, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning investing in Illinois' future. House Bill 519, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning work. House Bill 520, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning work. House Bill 521, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 522, offered by Representative Sommer, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 523, offered Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning civil

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

law. House Bill 524, offered by Representative Wheeler, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 525, offered by Representative Wheeler, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 526, offered by Representative Bourne, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 527, offered by Representative McDermed, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 528, offered by Representative McDermed, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 529, offered by Representative McDermed, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 530, offered by Representative McDermed, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 531, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 532, offered Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 533, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 534, offered by Representative Sente, a Bill for an Act concerning property. House Bill 535, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 536, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 537, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 538, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 539, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 540, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning domestic violence. House Bill 541, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

an Act concerning animals. House Bill 542, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 543, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 544, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 545, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 546, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 547, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 548, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 549, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 550, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 551, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 552, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 553, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 554, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 555, offered Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 556, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 557, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 558, offered Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 559, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 560,

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal 561, law. House Bill offered Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 562, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 563, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act 564, offered concerning criminal law. House Bill Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning public House Bill 565, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 566, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 567, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 568, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 569, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 570, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 571, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 572, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 573, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 574, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 575, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State government."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 576, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 577, offered

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 578, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 579, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 580, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 581, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 582, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 583, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 584, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 585, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 586, offered Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 587, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 588, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 589, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 590, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 591, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 592, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an 593, offered Act concerning revenue. House Bill Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 594, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 595, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

revenue. House Bill 596, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 597, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 598, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 599, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 600, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 601, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 602, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 603, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 604, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 605, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 606, offered Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 607, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 608, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 609, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 610, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 611, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 612, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 613, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 614, offered by Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 615, offered by Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 616, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 617, offered by Representative McCombie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 618, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 619, offered by Representative Walsh, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 620, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 621, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 622, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 623, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 624, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 625, offered by Representative Harris, David, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 626, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 627, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 628, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 629, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 630, offered by Representative Harris, David, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 631, offered by Representative Cabello,

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 632, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 633, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 634, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 635, offered Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 636, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 637, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 638, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 639, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 640, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 641, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 642, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. First Reading of these House Bills."

Clerk Hollman: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 4 offered by Representative Davidsmeyer. House Resolution 5, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 6, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 7, offered by 8, Representative Ford. House Resolution offered bу 9. Representative Ford. Resolution offered House by Representative Ford. House Resolution 10, offered bу 11, Representative Ford. House Resolution offered by 12, Representative Ford. House Resolution offered by

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Representative	Ford. House	Resolution	13,	offered	bу
Representative	Ford. House	Resolution	14,	offered	by
Representative	Ford. House	Resolution	15,	offered	by
Representative	Ford. House	Resolution	16,	offered	by
Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 18, offered b					by
Representative	Ford. House	Resolution	21,	offered	by
Representative	Zalewski. Hous	se Resolution	n 25,	offered	by
Representative	Bennett. House	e Resolution	27,	offered	by
Representative	McSweeney. Hou	se Resolutio	n 28,	offered	by
Representative	McSweeney. Hou	se Resolutio	n 29,	offered	bу
Representative	McSweeney. Hou	se Resolutio	n 30,	offered	by
Representative	Welch. House	Resolution	31,	offered	by
Representative	Bennett. House	e Resolution	32,	offered	by
Representative	Bennett. House	e Resolution	34,	offered	by
Representative	Meier. House	Resolution	35,	offered	by
Representative	Bourne. House	Resolution	38,	offered	by
Representative	Skillicorn. How	use Resolutio	on 39 ,	offered	by
Representative	Yingling. Hous	se Resolution	a 40,	offered	by
Representative	McDermed. Hous	se Resolution	a 42,	offered	bу
Representative	Ford. House	Resolution	43,	offered	by
Representative	Andersson. Hou	se Resolutio	n 45,	offered	by
Representative	Ford. House	Resolution	47,	offered	by
Representative	Durkin. House J	Joint Resolut	ion 1	, offered	by
Representative	Beiser. House J	Joint Resolut	ion 2	, offered	by
Representative	Thapedi. House	Joint Resolut	cion 3	, offered	bу
Representative	Thapedi. House	Joint Resolut	cion 4	, offered	bу
Representative	Bennett. House	Joint Resolut	cion 5	, offered	bу
Representative	Ammons. House J	Joint Resolut	ion 8	, offered	by
Representative	Bennett. House	Joint Resolut	cion 9	, offered	bу

6th Legislative Day

1/24/2017

Representative Wehrli. House Joint Resolution 10, offered by Representative D'Amico. House Joint Resolution 11, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Joint Resolution 12, offered by Representative Durkin. These are referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."