67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports Representative Barbra Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4045. Committee Reports. Representative Barbra Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment 5 to House Bill 2376, Floor Amendment 5 to House Bill 3052, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 6, Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1905; approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 1479."

Speaker Turner: "The Body will come to order for regular Session.

And with leave, we will use the Quorum Roll Call from the 8th

Special Session. Leave is granted. Representative Harris, for
what reason do you seek recognition?"

Harris, D.: "Point of personal privilege, if I may."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Harris, D.: "Well, I was going to try to say something pertinent during the 4th Special Session, but we passed over it so quickly that I didn't have the opportunity. But if I can, Mr. Speaker, you know, yesterday we had a Committee of the Whole on transportation funding. And the individuals who testified yesterday during that Committee of the Whole talked about the economic consequences if the money is not appropriated from the Road Fund and the other funds to make the payments to contractors and others that contract with IDOT. We talked about 25 thousand people being out of work if we don't

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

appropriate those dollars. This morning in the House Revenue & Finance Committee meeting we heard testimony from the Department of Lottery and the director of the Department of the Lottery about the fact that as of July 1 if we don't make payments to the multi-state lottery game and the Mega Millions Consortium, we are going to be excluded from those games. We will be in breach of contract. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this to me is the height of political stupidity. It's bad enough that we are doing this to ourselves regarding the budget overall, it's even worse that we have the Road Fund, we have the lottery, where the dollars are in the funds, they are sitting there. It has nothing to do with how we spend general revenue funds. It has nothing to do with an overall budget. It simply has to do with an appropriation that has to be passed by this Legislature and signed by the Governor and the dollars flow. You know, the lottery in my opinion is a goose that lays 700 ... excuse me ... 680 to 700 million dollars of golden eggs every year and we're screwing around with it. Last time we did this, lottery sales dropped by 20 percent. Today the director of the lottery testified that simply because of the headlines about the multi-state game and the ... and the Powerball... lottery sales ... Powerball sales have dropped by ten percent. Those are dollars which are not going into our General Revenue Fund. Well, they don't go into our General Revenue Fund. They go into the Common School Fund and the Capital Projects Fund. Those are dollars that aren't going to be there next time if we don't simply pass an appropriation aside from a budget. Now, God forbid, that we don't have a budget. That horrible situation I... I pray that we can avoid

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

it. But if it should come to pass that we cannot reach an agreement, I appeal to the Speaker of the House, I appeal to the President of the Senate to prepare legislation to put before this Body and the other chamber to move these other state funds, these non-GRF funds. Get these funds appropriated so the dollars can flow and I appeal to the Governor to be prepared to sign those... that Bill quickly so that we can... we can avoid this really utterly stupid situation about not having an appropriation in place to make these funds flow which are already there. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 162. Representative Dan Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: do pass Short Debate for House Bill 4075, and Senate Bill 1427; do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 1381 and recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2572. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 1281 and recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 162. Representative Yingling, Chairperson from the Committee on Government Consolidation reports on the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Services reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends be adopted House Resolution 402 and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1607. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil Law reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 948. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends be adopted House Joint Resolution 64, House Joint Resolution 67, House Resolution 437, Senate Joint Resolution 21, Senate Joint Resolution 22, Senate Joint Resolution 31, Senate Joint Resolution 32, Senate Joint Resolution 34, and Senate Joint Resolution 39. Representative Will Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Health & Healthcare Disparities reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends adopted House Resolution 60. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1227. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Community College Access & Affordability reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends be adopted Senate Joint Resolution 40."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Demmer: "I have a Page today. I'm glad to welcome Patrick Powers, who's a constituent of mine from Dixon. Patrick is going to be junior at my alma mater, Sterling Newman High School. Just like to welcome Patrick and thank you for being here."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Members, on page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 173. Representative Sims. Please proceed."
- Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 173. It's agreed language that amends the Public Aid Code and states that the department may not deny a request for delay of payments of a nursing home... bed tax of nursing home that have not been paid for services provided during the month in which the assessment is levied. Again, this is agreed language. And I ask for any questions. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Andersson: "So, I'm sorry, I couldn't quite hear that. You said that we're talking about a delay in payments and what's the impact, Sir?"

Sims: "Correct. It's when the… so, when a… for a nursing home when the bed tax has not been paid and in… in the situation where the… the bed tax has not been paid then the department cannot deny payment to that… to that nursing home or the hospital."

Andersson: "And then what happens?"

Sims: "Then it will eventually get paid."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Andersson: "It will eventually get paid. You said it's agreed."

Sims: "Yes."

Andersson: "Looks like it came out of committee 7..."

Sims: "The Amendment... the Amendment recommends that it reflects an agreement between all parties. So, it's agreed language and it removes all the opposition and concerns that the department had."

Andersson: "So, there's no opposition whatsoever at this point?"

Sims: "Nope. None."

Andersson: "Did it come out of the Senate unanimously then? It looks like it did."

Sims: "It came out of the Senate unanimously, it did."

Andersson: "Yes. Thank you very much."

Sims: "You're welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Bellock is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Bellock: "Thank you. I'm sorry I couldn't hear if HFS is still opposed to the Bill or are they okay with it now?"

Sims: "This is agreed language with HFS. So, they're in support."

Bellock: "Okay. Thank you very... Okay. Thank you very much,
Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sims to close."

Sims: "I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 173?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. On this question... Voting's open.

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

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 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 173... The House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 173. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 531, Leader Currie. Out of the record. House Bill 2545, Representative Davidsmeyer. Out of the record. House Bill Representative Christian Mitchell. Out of the record. House Bill 3222... Excuse me. House Bill 3519, Representative Butler. Out of the record. House Bill 3745, Representative Conyears-Ervin."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 of House Bill 3745.

It simply allows postings of after-school programs in a commonly used area. And the Amendment codifies existing process."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Andersson: "So, you know what my question is right?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Absolutely, Representative."

Andersson: "I probably should say it for the record. So I don't understand why this is needed. Why is it... can you point me to where this is prohibited right now, where they can't do this right now?"

Conyears-Ervin: "So, it is not something that is prohibited, but it is something that we're doing just to codify existing practice."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Andersson: "So, they can do it right now. There's no law against it, right?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Correct. And there's no law for it."

Andersson: "I'm sorry..."

Conyears-Ervin: "And there's no law for it."

Andersson: "...I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I can't hear."

Conyears: "You can't hear me?"

Andersson: "Right. I could not hear that answer."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Members."

Andersson: "So, you said something and I honestly could not hear the last thing you said."

Conyears-Ervin: "That's okay. We're just trying to make it very clear that schools can do this, Representative."

Andersson: "Okay. I appreciate you answering the question after a few times. My difficulty with it is it's not against the law they can do it. And so, to me enacting legislation to say you can do what you can already do is duplicative. So, with respect I don't disagree with the policy of... of your concept, I think it's good. It's just one of those where I think it's unnecessary... unnecessary legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Representative, I'm reading your Bill and I noticed that the advertisements must be consistent with the guidelines established by the school board governing content. So content size in any other reasonable limitations on advertising. I just want to understand what when you say that the school

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

board can govern the content, what exactly... what sorts of content are you looking to allow them to regulate as part of this Bill?"

Conyears-Ervin: "So, that's a good question, Representative, and I'm glad you brought that up. Even though this is something that we are allowing groups to do, I want to be clear that the school board still has discretion and jurisdiction as to what is posted."

Breen: "So..."

Conyears-Ervin: "So this Bill provides the authority to the school board."

Breen: "So, may the school board prohibit a community group from posting if they are religious in nature?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That will be up to the school board and they would need to consult with their attorneys."

Breen: "But I'm asking you from this Legislature, do we want to give school boards the ability to prohibit community groups from posting. What I'm saying, we could clarify it right here and we could tell school boards, you can't allow such... you cannot prohibit groups. So, say they're advertising a Bible study. Can it... why is it that a school board can determine that they do not want to allow Bible studies?"

Conyears-Ervin: "So, what we do want, Representative, is to allow the school board to have the discretion and the jurisdiction based upon its school board. So we know that understand throughout this chamber that it's very important to school boards to maintain their own discretion."

Breen: "Except... and let me just say that this Bill would... I know the previous speaker said that this Bill doesn't change the

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

law, I think it actually does because it requires school boards to permit community groups to advertise events and after-school programs. It's a 'shall'. So, we are forcing school boards to permit community groups to advertise events and after-school programs. And I... one of the problems of doing this is you just pointed out, if you have a school board that prohibits a Bible study but allows say you know a dance class, they are going to be violating the U.S. Constitution. And the problem is... I might also give you an example if the school board says we don't the pro-life group advertising because were not with them, they can't do it. You know, maybe ... you know, and so the problem is I'm looking at your Bill, I'm hearing the answers to your questions and I don't understand how you can give a school board, a government entity, the ability to discriminate on the basis of content when we are forcing them to advertise community events."

Conyears-Ervin: "So, Representative, I am not giving that type of authority. If that is your perception of the Bill that is not the intent of the legislation. The intent of the legislation is to allow after-school programs to be posted in commonly used areas. That is the simple intent of the program of this legislation."

Breen: "But students are allowed to have Bible studies at their schools. So a Bible study is an after-school event or it's an event or after-school program pertinent to students' interest or involvement."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, are you finished with your questions?"

Breen: "That was a question."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Conyears-Ervin: "Oh, what was your question? I thought that was a statement."

Breen: "My... my question is... You know what, I'll just go to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are forcing school boards to advertise and in so forcing them specifically giving them the ability to discriminate on the basis of the content of the message that we're forcing them to advertise. That is a very dangerous precedent. I mean, this Bill might not be a bad idea. We have no idea why exactly it's necessary, what harm it was meant to remedy. It might have a good harm that it's meant to remedy. The problem is the Bill needs some very specific language protecting the First Amendment rights of those community groups that are doing the advertising. And frankly, it needs some good guidance to school boards to tell them, no, you cannot discriminate against the Baptist church that want... that's having the Bible study in favor of some other group or the dance class. You just can't do it. So, at this point, this Bill again maybe there's some value to it, but at this point, there are way too many problems with it to go through. So, I respectfully urge a 'no' vote at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Willis: "Thank you. Is this not really something that is totally necessary. I think it's good; I love this Bill. And as from someone that comes from a school board, that is our job to make sure that we have pertinent information available to our students. I think the Amendment that comes from the Senate it

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

limits it saying that it can't be used for advertisement, correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Correct."

Willis: "It says it's got to be a free thing, and it clearly states, pertinent to students interest and involvement in what their school activities may be. So, I don't see where the prior speaker was saying that it very well could be that the school board agrees that it's okay to put up a post that there's going to be a Bible study class free of charge down the street. Is... there's nothing that prohibits the school board from approving that. Am I correct in the way I read this?"

Conyears-Ervin: "You are correct, Representative."

Willis: "Okay. On the same token, they could also say that we're going to be having a community picnic at the YWCA to just get people to come out to see the different things that they're doing there. And that announcement can be approved by the school board and put up there, correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That is correct, Representative."

Willis: "It also could be something that says we're going to be having a concert in the park and we'd love to have you come and see this concert and that concert might be done by the Salvation Army, it might be done by the Marine Corps Marching Band, it may be done by just a group of music enthusiasts. But as long as the school board approves it, it's okay to have to it posted. Is that correct?"

Conyears-Ervin: "That's correct, as long as the school board approves it."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Willis: "Right. To the Bill. As a former school board member, that is one of the responsibilities of a school board to make sure that advertisements and groups that use the school building. While we do... our main purpose is to hire the superintendent, and in many places it's the superintendent that makes these decisions. The school board does oversee the responsibilities of the superintendent. I see no problem with this Amendment that the Senate had in. I actually think it closes any loopholes that... that could be in there so that we don't have bulletins being posted just by anybody up there with no rhyme or reason. I think this is a good Amendment and I would certainly urge the Body to concur with it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Conyears-Ervin to close."

Convears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, in this legislation we are simply allowing the schools... the organizations to post in a commonly-used area. It actually just spread the word of after-school activities allowing students to know what their options are. On one aspect we hear that the school districts do not want to be restricted. They do not want to be told exactly what to do, they want to have the leverage, and that is something that I always hear from the other side of the aisle. In this legislation, we are specifically giving the school district leverage to their discretion as to what will be posted. So we want to make certain to make that point. The school district will have discretion. Ultimately, the key point is the students will understand all opportunities available to them, again, while still giving the school district the discretion to what to post. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3745?' This is final action and requires 60 votes. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 66 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3745. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 760, Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. When House Bill 60... 760 was first drafted, it was drafted as a debt limit extension for a school district in my legislative district. In the process of working through this, we added many hoops for any school district in the future to ask for a debt limit exemption. This is very good legislation because it ensures to us that any school district that ever ask for this again will have to jump though these hoops. Public hearing, pass a referendum and... and do all of those niceties and make sure they follow all the technical rules. When it came back from the Senate, it had additional school district for Mr. Zalewski. That's really all this does. Please note that yesterday we did something like this for Mr. Long when that school district hadn't even jumped through all of those hoops. So these school districts have done all of the things that the... would be required under our new statutory framework for ensuring that school districts are providing public notice and passing referendums and that type of thing. I would ask your support on the Concurrence Motion."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Andersson."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Andersson: "Thank you. And you actually answered... I can't see you, Lou, but I know you're there... you answered... but I want to be absolutely clear. So, the voters approved this referendum unqualifiedly, correct?"

Lang: "Yes, in both of the school districts, Sir."

Andersson: "Okay. And we are only... what we're doing is we're increasing the debt limit. And this is similar, if not identical, to the Zalewski Bill we... we worked on previously and quite frankly, we've done this a number of times. Is that correct?"

Lang: "We have done this many times in our... in the General Assembly. Most importantly though, aside from just extending the debt limit for two school districts, we're adding all of these technical requirements now so that in the future any school district that wants to make this request will have to do much more, just as these school... two school districts did in their process."

Andersson: "So we've added a procedure to ensure that we're doing right, if you will?"

Lang: "That is correct, Sir."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski is recognized."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I want to thank the Leader for adding the language for my school district. I want to commend him for his work on this issue. This is a... I think he's built a stress test for school districts on whether or

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

not we should on a go forward basis allow for debt extension limits. And this stress test needs to be satisfied and it's done so in this codification in here... in his Bill along with the... I'm fortunate enough to say that my school... or my... yeah, my district passes the stress test. So, this is a good piece of legislation. It reforms the way we've done things with respect to these extensions prior. And I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Olsen is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Olsen: "Thank you. Leader, would you suggest that the modifications that you've included in this Bill would improve transparency to the public when a school district is requesting a debt limit extension?"

Lang: "That's a great question, Representative. And that's what it was all about. And so, requiring public hearings, requiring specified information at the public hearings relative to how much this is going to cost taxpayers, relative to all of the details that would underlie the public referendum. All of this must now be disclosed at public hearings."

Olsen: "And would... at the public hearing, specifically, this legislation would require notification and disclosure of the interest cost. Is that correct?"

Lang: "That is correct. All of the interest, all of the figures and facts that anyone would want to know, probably more than most people would want to know, but we're making them jump through these hoops for purposes of transparency."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Olsen: "When I think... to the Bill. This is a very, very important point. This Bill is about transparency. Obviously, it includes this exception for the school districts in Representative Lang's and Representative Zalewski's district which was approved overwhelmingly by the... by the voters, but it improves transparency to the voters, not only of the principal but of the interest and the borrowing cost. So, that's why, in some of these cases, the debt with debt limit extensions I have a concern about the transparency to the voters of whether the voters fully understand what they're voting on. But this improvement in the transparency of this process is a significant improvement. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "I appreciate the kind words. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 760?' This is final action and requires 60 votes. All those in favor signify by voting '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 this question, there are 69 voting 'aye', 40 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 760. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2545, Representative Davidsmeyer. Out of the record. House Bill 3691, Representative Gabel. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 25, Representative Zalewski."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 25 is a Blockchain Task Force that we wish to engage upon. The Senate had made a change they requested of the department. I ask for a Concurrence."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 25?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting '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. With 106 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 25. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, Democrats will immediately... will caucus immediately in Room 114, Republicans in 118. And the House will stand... and the House will stand in recess 'til 12 p.m. or the call of the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 295, Representative Nekritz. Please proceed when you're ready."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm ready. Sounds kind of hollow in here when no one's in here. So, earlier this year we adopted House Resolution 295, which honors Miriam (Mimi) Cooper, who is a long-term board member in High School District 214 that I, along with Representative Harris, have the privilege of representing. Mimi couldn't make it down to Springfield when we adopted the Resolution, but she's here today. And I... so I want to recognize her. She's joined by her husband, her sister, and Superintendent Dave Schuler, and the

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

board... and fellow board member Bill Dussling. I just wanted to say briefly that Mimi has been on the board... was elected to the Board of Education in 1989, was six years as President and four years as Vice President thus serving more than 81 thousand graduates during her time on the board. District 214 has been ranked among the top 35 open enrollment schools in Illinois by U.S. News and World Report and is considered among the states most challenging schools by the Washington Post. And I think one of the things that makes Mimi stand out is that she helped to establish the Katherine M Lee Women's and Children's Center, which helps low-income female immigrants in 214 to gain basic skills in speaking, listening, reading, and writing English. So, I... I know there's not a whole lot of us in the chamber, but if we can give Mimi a warm round of applause and thank her for her service to District 214."

- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber and congratulations.

 Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 for House Bill 445."
- Speaker Lang: "House Bill 171, Mr. Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 171, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Yingling."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling, do you wish to explain this on Third Reading?"

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Yingling: "Yes, that would be fine."

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 for a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 171, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling."

Yingling: "Thank you. The Floor Amendment we just adopted added the provisions of Senate Bill 3 and House Bill 607 which are the two major pieces of consolidation legislation that are sitting on the Governor's desk. What we added to that is a pilot program that would allow voters in three counties in the state via referendum to put the question on the ballot as it pertains to whether townships should be consolidated. This was an effort to address some of the… some of the concerns and issues that have been brought to my attention and..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling."

Yingling: "Yeah."

Speaker Lang: "We'd like you to take this out of the record for the moment."

Yingling: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Chair recognizes Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Stewart is excused for the remainder of the day."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 200, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 200, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman, does Amendment 1 become the Bill?" Hoffman: "Yes, it does."

Speaker Lang: "Move it to Third, Mr. Andersson. 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 200, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 200 is an attempt to provide a workers' compensation reform in the State of Illinois. I... at the forefront admit... or at the beginning I admit that this is not an agreed to Bill. However, we have attempted to put into this Bill several of the provisions that were contained in House Bill 4068, which was the... Leader Durkin's Bill regarding the issue of workers' compensation. Again in addition to that, there are several provisions that have been removed from House Bill 2525, which was the Democrats attempt for reform on workers' compensation that has passed both the House and the Senate. In light of some of the negotiations, we removed some

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

of the items that we thought were important in our Bill. However, what this Bill now contains is items that are identical to House Bill 4068... several items that are identical to House Bill 4068, which as I indicated earlier, the Republican version of workers' compensation. It would reduce certain benefits and clarifies that hip and shoulder injuries... or injuries to the leg and the arm, this would clarify a recent supr... or a recent court case that said differently. That was contained in House Bill 4068, which was the Republicans' Bill. It provides for the offering of PPD, which is permanent partial disability awards, for subsequent back and neck injuries. That provision is identical to what provided for in the Republicans' legislation. establishes a prescription drug formulary, which was also contained in the Republicans' legislation. It increases fraud penalties, which was contained in the Republicans' legislation. It establishes an annual report with data related to self-insured employee... employers that was contained in the Republicans' legislation. It eliminates mandatory rotation of arbitrators outside of Cook County, again, contained in Republican legislation. And it clarifies that the state is not required to provide an appeal bond when appealing a workers' compensation decision. There are also items that were in House Bill 4068, the Republican legislation, that we address, but we did not fully agree that are contained in this Bill. But we attempted to listen to what the others had to say and we attempted to put it in this Bill. On the issue of traveling employee, it codifies a standard for traveling employees. I agree, this isn't the

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Republicans' exact language, but it deals with the issue that was dealt with in their Bill. It provides for some changes in the medical fee schedule, in that it requires the Workers' Compensation Commission establish fee schedules ambulatory surgical treatment centers and accredited ambulatory surgical treatment facilities. That is not in current law that was, I believe, was some provisions that were talked about and were contained in the Republicans' legislation. It was also in our legislation. We do address the issue of AMA quidelines, not fully to what the other side of the aisle would want, but it is addressed in this Bill. There are additional concessions that have been requested by the other side of the aisle and we did indeed take these out of the Bill. We took out the ability for employers to request review of their premiums by the Department of Insurance. This does contain strong rate review, which we demand and believe has to be part of any workers' compensation reform, but we took out the ability of individual employers to request review of their premiums by the Department of Insurance. That was raised by Representative Brady, and I believe it was raised in debate by Members of the other side of the aisle on House Bill 2525, our Bill. We also removed our provisions contained in House Bill 2525 regarding the issue of causation. We removed protections for employers related to repetitive injuries. We removed incentives for employers for existing safety groups to return to work group programs, and removed the task force to study workers' compensation insurance rate premiums, all issues that were discussed and were agreed to be taken out of a final Bill. We also have used the other

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

side of the aisle's... Republicans' language in the fraud violations and immunity for fraud investigations. So, this legislation certainly isn't everything that... that the other side of the aisle wanted. The ... we talked about issues with regard to the fee schedule and increasing the reduction in the fee schedule from what we did in 2011 to doctors and hospitals. That has met with severe opposition from the providers and runs into our concern that this would result... that would result in less money going into the system for medical treatment of injured workers and would reduce access to treatment for injured workers, and that is our concern. So this is an attempt to provide good, solid rate reform, an attempt to take out some of the issues Republicans had, an attempt to take some of the issues that were contained in your Bill, which is House Bill 4068, put them in this Bill... issues such as reducing benefits, establishing a prescription drug formulary, increasing fraud penalties, establishing an annual report regarding self-insured employees, eliminating mandatory rotation of arbitrators, and clarifying that the state is not required to file an appeal bond. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. The Chair will move this to Standard Debate, which would mean three in opposition, two additional Members in support for five minutes each. The Chair recognizes Mr. Andersson for five minutes."

Andersson: "Initially. Thank you for that, Mr. Speaker. And I have a point of inquiry. What's the vote requirement for this Bill?"

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Speaker Lang: "This Bill requires 60 votes, Sir."

Andersson: "Thank you, Sir. So I'm going to speak to the Bill and rather to the process and to the process that we're going through right now. So, as of yesterday, negotiations on... actually, I'm going to speak to all four Bills that we're ultimately going to cover. The negotiations were ongoing and they're going very well from all reports. There's no indication that that's stopping and in fact, I think there's more negotiations scheduled today. So, we're still working on it. This... there's been no indication that that's going to stop. There's been no indication that this is somehow... that these Bills have become a final best offer that we either have to take or leave. So, I have to ask myself, what's going on? What is happening? If it's not a final and best offer, which it certainly doesn't appear to be 'cause we are still negotiating, then I ask what are we doing here with this? Why are we doing this? You have to understand that we now can't vote for these Bills. And I'm certainly going to urge every Member of my caucus not to vote for these Bills. Not necessarily because they're all that bad, some of them might be right there, some of them might be close, but if we vote 'yes' now, that ends that negotiation. Those negotiations are over because we've already agreed with you, and we're not quite there yet. So it's not right for ... this is not right, quite frankly. So I... again, I ask myself, what is going on? Then I had the pleasure to read Cap Fax, and Cap Fax says, anyway, today's Bills are being called as defensive measures. Sources say that while negotiations are to continue with Republicans, they characterize today's scheduled vote as just

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

show business, Member management. That's what that says. And I believe that's probably true. And if that's necessary for Member management on the Democratic side, then I guess we go through this. But I want you to understand, we want to continue the negotiations, we want to get there. This isn't it. So like I said, I'm urging a 'no' vote and I'm also going to urge my Caucus, with the exception of the individuals who are part of those negotiations, really not to debate these Bills right now because these Bills are not ripe. This is not what we should be doing. If we need to do it for your side's Member management, okay, I get that, but let's get back to the business of the real negotiations that are happening and then let's bring either these Bills back, if this is the best we're going to get, and then we'll vote for them on real. But until we're done, until we're done, let's not do that now. So I don't want to say anything or do anything that will derail those negotiations, but I'm respectfully saying I'm urging the 'no' votes because this is not the time for this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady, do you rise in opposition?"

Brady: "What made you think so? Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed for five minutes, Sir."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative Hoffman, first off, I want to thank you for something that you've been pivotal in and that is spearheading these discussions. In fact, I believe, June 21 was the first discussion that we had to try and come back together and talk about workers' comp and make some changes. So, thank you for that. Your words were correct when you said these were... that House Bill 200...

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

there's attempt to take... some Republican things out of the Bill, so that's successful in this Bill. What's in this Bill is not some of the things that we wanted, but for really a point of clarification for me and it goes along Representative Andersson's discussion, did we not meet and discuss last evening and discuss workers' comp?"

Hoffman: "Yes, we did and I'm hopeful that we'll meet again today."

Brady: "Okay, then, I'm confused because... and it doesn't take much, Jay, but I'm confused because if we're going to meet again, which we are very engaged to do and very enthusiastically ready to do so, why this now?"

Hoffman: "So, it's our concern that there's only three days left. And the Governor has asked as a precondition to the budget that certain things be done. We have four Bills here today that have attempted to show compromise, to show we're willing to work with you and get them passed over to the Senate, get them on... hopefully, get them on the Governor's desk, and then he can decide. If he wants more, he knows where we're at today; we can start negotiating as soon as this is over. But we only have three days left. And this is an honest attempt... and I don't view it as showmanship... it's an honest attempt to show that we are willing to go way further than halfway to try and meet the demands of the Governor. This... it's my belief... and I'm not trying to take up all your time... so... but it's..."

Brady: "Sure you are."

Hoffman: "No, I'm not."

Brady: "Yeah."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Hoffman: "It's my belief that we shouldn't even be doing these items as a precondition to the budget, but here we are. And we're doing it in a sign of good faith."

Brady: "So, is... this is your idea to move this Bill now. This... this is what we've... we have come to believe that our negotiations have gotten to the point where you think it's a good idea to move this Bill now?"

Hoffman: "I think this reflects the status of our negotiations currently. And it contains items from your Bill, the Republican Bill, contains items from our Bill, and we removed items that you had objected to. And I'm not..."

Brady: "That's how you negotiate?"

Hoffman: "...I'm not trying to say..."

Brady: "That's how you negotiate in good faith?"

Hoffman: "Well. I'm willing to sit down and negotiate again with you tonight, tomorrow, Friday, and God help us if it goes over, as long as it takes to get an agreement."

Brady: "To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. So, I guess the mindset is with the Governor indicating a previous workers' comp Bill that we did not have input into that he would not sign House Bill 2525. Now, this Bill that takes some of the things out that we've been trying to negotiate, Representative Hoffman has indicated negotiations still ongoing, and he's as encouraged as I am to continue that. We're going to now try and pass a Bill that has less of a chance to be signed by the Governor than the previous Bill, House Bill 2525. Now, I am far from the greatest negotiator, but I don't... I simply do not get that. I do not understand that how that is something in good faith that one would take as a positive sign that

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

negotiations continue and now we're going to be asked to vote for a Bill that the Representative, himself, indicated attempts were made to take out Republican initiatives. We're very close on a couple points and I'm just... I'm frustrated... I'm frustrated that this is the way that we're going to continue to show all of you how close we are and how hard we're working by doing this. I think it sends the wrong message. I intend to vote 'no', but I certainly want individuals to know I want to stay engaged. I offer, again, to continue our, what I thought, was fruitful discussions. And I would just say to Representative Hoffman, I'm... I'm surprised that there's any indication that this is your idea to pass... to try and pass this Bill now. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock for five minutes."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'll keep it brief. I would just reiterate what our Floor Leader and then what Representative Brady just said that we thought we were still in ongoing negotiations and we would like to negotiate some more on, not only on this Bill, but on the property tax and the pensions. And so, I'm disappointed that we're moving ahead on this Bill right now 'cause I do think that we can come closer to what we're talking about here and especially on the other two Bills also. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walsh for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Walsh: "Representative Hoffman, on this... through this negotiations, and this is something that's been ongoing, what two years, on worker's comp reform?"

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Hoffman: "I believe that it's been nearly two years since we had the Governor's working groups began. They ended last summer. We moved forward with our Bill, passed it out of the House and the Senate, and then I... I'll take that Represent... the Representative's statement that was July... or June 21, when he and I began to sit down."

Walsh: "So, with our Bills that we passed, in this current Bill,
House Bill 200, how many of the Democratic initiatives are in
this Bill that we truly wanted?"

Hoffman: "Well, our biggest... our biggest, I guess, goal was to get insurance rate review in this Bill."

Walsh: "And is it in the Bill?"

Hoffman: "It is in this Bill."

Walsh: "How many of the other side of the aisle's concerns and issues have we addressed in this Bill that weren't in our Democratic Bill before?"

Hoffman: "I would add one other... one other caveat. It was always our goal and our stated mission that we would make sure that the 2011 cuts and any additional changes to the workers' compensation system were reflected in premiums to employers and that would be taken care of in the rate review language. We also indicated that we wanted to get rid of fraud and abuse in the system, so we increased and enhanced the fraud unit and changed the language and made it tougher if you're a workers' compensation fraud. Now, all the rest of these things... I believe nearly all the rest of the things that are in this Bill were not put forward by us. We along through this process, as you indicated over two years, have listened to the other side and attempted to address their issues,

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

including the Governor's Office. We don't want to take away benefits to injured employees, yet there are provisions in here that would do that and we're willing to compromise. And we've attempted the compromise throughout this entire process."

Walsh: "So, on a procedural note, House Bill 200 is being read here today. How many days does that have to take place in the Senate? They need two days or three?"

Hoffman: "It... it would take three. So, if we pass it here today, we send it over to the Senate, it gets read today."

Walsh: "Is there room for negotiations if this... the talks continue to change this Bill in the Senate and bring it back on Concurrence."

Hoffman: "Yes."

Walsh: "So basically we're running these Bills today for a procedural to make sure that we have time to get it over there and get read and see where it goes from there. Would that be a fair statement?"

Hoffman: "Well, that... that's one of the reasons, the second reason I would state is that I'm concerned that maybe, because of actions not on our side of the aisle with actions that are from the Executive Branch that everything blows up. Okay? If that happens, we want to have on the Governor's desk workers' compensation reform, property tax relief as well as consolidation of local governments and pensions. That's why we're calling these today."

Walsh: "Well, so... To the Bill. We, over the course of the last five months, six months, have been putting ideas forward.

We've finally gotten a response; we've been negotiating. And

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

I believe that, and I talk to Jay all the time, there's been good good faith negotiations going on. To where the point, we have reached almost 70, 80 percent of what has been asked of us. We need to move this along. And it's not our plan to go along and put these non-budgetary items in front of the budget. I go home into my district and people say, why can't you pass a budget? I'd love to pass a budget; I'd love to pass the revenue to support a fully balanced budget. But we have these ancillary items that we've been playing this political game with between the Governor's Office and the Legislature. And here we are today, June 28, three days left of the Special Session and we're trying to address these concerns. And so, we're moving a Bill to say, hey, here's where we're at. This is where we're at. Let's move forward. That's what we need to do. There is no way, in my opinion, that we can walk out of this chamber on June 30 without a balanced budget in place. There is too much at stake. So these items that we're putting up here today need to be addressed. Please, will you do that? They need to be addressed. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente, do you rise in support or in opposition to this Bill?"

Sente: "Support."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, five minutes."

Sente: "I'm not sure if I'm in a sad dream or an alternate reality.

That was the last thing I expected, honestly, to hear from the other side. It's... we passed May 31, we're coming on June 30. What... what I expected to hear... there's so many non-budgetary items of such complexity, pulling the politics

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

aside that we had to negotiate and come somewhat close together. And we have people about as far apart on both sides of the aisle at each extreme and so the come together for a win-win negotiation is a really hard task. But this task, for each and every item, has been going on for almost three years. And when I hear that are we going to continue to negotiate? I'm going to tell you, I'm going to speak for myself and many of the Members I know on this side, we've gone way past where I want anyone to negotiate. I'm kind of disappointed that on the non-budgetary items we would go even any further because it's past where I feel comfortable supporting, except I'm going to because I want to give the Governor the items that are important to him so we can get there. The comment was made that in Capitol Fax someone said this is Member management. I don't know who talks and says things like that, but it doesn't speak for me. I don't feel that way at all. I feel... genuinely, I want to get voting for things that we have already discussed. And so it's always, it's not quite enough. When is it enough? Ninety percent isn't enough. We don't have enough time. The budget itself is a big, big item. We're going to spend all day tomorrow discussing what's in that. I can't think of anything that would be more transparent than that so we all have our say. That's about the only thing that I think we should still negotiate because we have to get through the budget, then we have to get through the revenue and the bimp and get it to the Senate, and get it done. Please, listen to what you're saying on your side, it doesn't make sense. It's not like we just started this yesterday or last month. We did not. We've been talking about these issues in working groups

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

for three years. And the damage we're doing to the state is way past what any of us should be able to stomach. Please, reconsider your option and support these Bills."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think most of it was... has been said and I thank the previous speakers on my side of the aisle, 'cause I agree with everything that they said. I want to just reiterate a couple points. First of all, it has been our strategic comparative that we ensure that employers, businesses, people who do business in Illinois have lower insurance premiums. That's why we want rate review. We're 1 of 39 states who don't have... 39 states have it, we want to join and be the 40. We want to reduce those premiums. We want to make sure that the changes we make to the system that were made in 2011, will be made this week, hopefully, are reflected in those premium reductions. Not one thing... not one thing in this Bill increases benefits for injured workers. Not one thing in this Bill does anything to help an injured employee. Now I've spent my life trying to protect people who were injured on the job. I've spent my life working for working men and women. And I spent my professional life and political life doing just that. It doesn't make me happy that we're not helping injured workers in this Bill. But I'm willing to do it because I'm willing to compromise because the Governor... the Governor is using us in making sure that we pass these types of Bills as a precondition to making sure that the state is solvent. We're on the brink of bankruptcy, if we could do it. So, we've got to do something. We've got three days. I understand and am willing to continue to talk, but this is

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

where we're at and this is where we should begin today on our negotiations, right here. Right here. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This Bill requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Guzzardi. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Guzzardi: "I just want to take a second to address my friends on the other side of the aisle. There are many of you whom I consider genuine friends, people whom I've spent a lot of good time with down here. I think about my classmates, the folks who came in with me, Keith, and Peter, and Steve, and Grant, Avery, and Terri, and Batinick, and Tim. And I think about the freshmen who came in that I've gotten to know and the veterans over there who have shown me the ropes. And I think you're all good and decent people. And it's been my pleasure to have beers with you guys and play basketball with you guys and get to know you over the past couple of years. Please take a win. We... we are going to put Bills on the board that are not 100 percent of what you want here, but they're going to be awfully darn close. You guys have the opportunity... maybe it's not going to be these Bills, but at some point in the next 72 hours, vote on Bills that you can go home and say

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

we got reform. Take a win, please. The state needs you guys to rise to the occasion right now. Take a win. Let's vote on the Bill... reform issues that you guys keep bringing up, we're trying to reach out to you. Take the win. Go home and say you got the reforms. And let's pass a budget and solve this. The state needs this. It's you guys... it's on you guys. It's up to you; the question is in your laps right now. And look, if the question is, you know, should the AMA guidelines be partial consideration or 50 percent consideration? If those are the kinds of questions that are going to impede us from solving a budget crisis and saving this state, good gracious. I think you guys... I... I really just... I'm speaking... this is... I'm not being put up to this. This isn't a Lou lecture of the day of whatever. This is just me speaking to you all, Member to Member, friend to friend, Illinoisan to Illinoisan. Please, consider the welfare of this state. Take a win. Let's all go home. Let's solve this thing. Let's fix our state, please. I urge you guys to reconsider your approach and to join us and to get this thing done. Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Jones. You did not wish to speak, Sir? Thank you. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on June 28, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 171."
- Speaker Lang: "On page 7 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 484, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 484, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. A fiscal note and Home Rule note has been requested but not filed at this time."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie is recognized for a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move that the fiscal notes, the other notes are not applicable."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson on the Motion."

Andersson: "I'll be brief. We object."

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? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 64 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion prevails. And the notes... the note requests are held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Motions."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 484, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill deals with a local property tax freeze. And let me just start with a little background. We've had many discussions over the last several years about property tax freezes. Some of us seem to think it's a really great idea. Others, and I would include myself among them, have serious reservations. First of all, a lot of us do believe in local control and many who

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

support local control also recognize that for large parts of the state, there already is a limitation on the ability of local governments to raise property taxes. That's called the PTELL... the Property Tax Property Tax... the Limitation Law, and that means that many communities, particularly the most populous, are under the gun. They cannot raise property taxes more than 5 percent or the cost of living increase, whichever is lower. So, for the last more than 25 years that law has been in effect. Property taxes as a general proposition, indeed, have not been out of control in the State of Illinois. People on the other side would argue that first of all, a property tax freeze is very popular and that when property values are rising, the value of a freeze looks that much more attractive to the electorate. I think... I can certainly understand that perspective, but I think it's important to know that part of the reason property taxes are high in the State of Illinois is because this state, unlike most of our neighbor states, does not fund public education at an adequate and equitable level. Sixty-seven cents of the average property tax dollar in Illinois goes to fund public schools. Nationally, that number is closer to 40 cents. So if your people wonder why taxes... property taxes are as high as they are, I think a significant part of the answer is to say that this state has never taken its responsibilities to fund public education as seriously as have most of our neighboring states. That's background from the perspective of do we need to freeze at all? Well, I'm here to say as someone who has never seen a freeze she really liked that I'm prepared to offer Senate Bill 484 to you today. This is my effort, this

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

is our effort, to say to the Governor, although we don't think we need non-budgetary items to govern budgetary decisions we understand that it is very important to the person who currently occupies the second floor that we do that. So we are prepared to go a good long way toward what it is that Governor Rauner has requested in order to see to it that we can have a budget, so that we can see to it that poor and vulnerable populations in the state, that school children are able to go to school in the coming year. We think that meeting those responsibilities is sufficiently important that we are prepared to go out of our way to meet the Governor's requests. And let me tell you how far out of the way we have gone with this one. Although three years ago the Governor said he would be happy with a two-year property tax freeze, today, his demand is four years. Well we started out with the proposal that would freeze property taxes for two years. Under the provisions of Senate Bill 484, we're talking about exactly what the Governor requested, exactly what he asked for. This is a four-year property tax freeze. Let's talk about some of the items that are in that freeze. We started out by saying we should exempt Home Rule units of government. The Governor said, no, I want Home Rule units to be included as well. And quess what, Senate Bill 484 that does include Home Rule units. There is an exemption for debt that's been approved by the voters, that's what we said in this Bill as well. And then finally, the... the... in the Governor's version, debt which was not approved initially by the voters would not be exempt from the property tax freeze. It is not exempt under Senate Bill 484. There was a question about school districts. Many school

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

districts in this state face serious financial difficulties, at least 100, 110 out of the 852. In our original Bill, we talked about allowing those districts to be exempt from a property tax freeze, the Governor and some of the people in the House wanted a more stringent standard for permitting school districts to go out from under the property tax freeze. Well, in Senate Bill 484, we have a very stringent definition of what school districts would not be subject to the freeze and that definition means that there are only 19 of the... of the 842 school districts in the State of Illinois, only 19, those who are absolutely at the brink of collapse from participating in the freeze. So this is a very tough, very stringent Bill when it comes to freezing property taxes. Practically nobody is exempt and the pinch is going to feel, is going to hurt... the shoe is going to be pinching very hard on all the school districts across the state. Let me tell you that the center for tax and budget accountability tells us that under a two-year freeze for school districts alone, the losses of money that they might have otherwise anticipated will be between 430 and 830 million dollars. So, if anybody thinks this property tax freeze lets a lot of people off the hook, I think it's time for you to have another thing coming. Let me tell you about the second part of this Bill. Since everybody knows that a property tax freeze doesn't mean that my property taxes are frozen and it doesn't mean that your property taxes are frozen, what it means is that the local government cannot raise more than X amount of money, but how that money is allocated among the people who are taxed depends entirely on property values, the amount of property that is

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

in the district and so forth. So, the second part of this Bill actually provides relief, it actually reduces taxes for all of the homeowners in the State of Illinois. It does so in several different ways. It provides a significant expansion of the general homestead exemption. All... all homeowners who are living in their houses for at least a year get a significant break on their individual property tax Bill, with or without a property tax freeze. We also expand, significantly, the senior homestead exemption. We provide for other kinds of relief for veterans, for people with disabilities. And I would be happy to answer your questions. And I would appreciate your support for Senate Bill 484."

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. This Bill is on Short Debate. The Chair will place this Bill on the Order of Standard Debate. Mr. Andersson is recognized for five minutes."

Andersson: "Thank you again for that, Mr. Speaker. Just the same inquiry I had to begin with, the vote requirement on this."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill requires 71 votes."

Andersson: "Thank you, Sir. I'm not going to reiterate my comments on the earlier Bill because they're going to be the same, but I do want to... Can you lower the volume in the chamber a bit? Thank you, Sir. I want to speak to the few comments that were made about my thoughts, and Will, I'm just going to use your name in debate. You're a friend, a huge friend. And I want to get to a win with you and you know that I want a budget as much as anybody else in this place, but this is about the process right now. And what you're asking us to do, and I guess I didn't explain it very well before. What you're asking

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

us to do, if we were negotiating a contract, is in the middle of the contract negotiations that are going on when we're going line by line and we're making progress... in the middle of that, you hand me a contract and say sign this. And I go, wait a minute, we're not done yet. We're working over here. Yeah, I know, but sign this. It doesn't make any sense. That's the problem here. All I'm asking, I think these Bills are darn close and I do... I'm more than willing to take a 90 percent win, I'm more than willing to take an 80 percent win. Hell, you have idea how low I will go to get a... a budget. You have no idea, but that's only me. But the point here is, you do this now, you interrupt those negotiations. You interrupt them. That's all that I'm saying. We want to get there with you; we absolutely want to get there with you. But this isn't about 90 percent right now, this is about finishing those negotiations. And if you told us this is it, this is the best it's going to be, then we're ready to vote, but that's not what we're being told. The negotiations are happening right now. So I'm telling you, we can't do this. We can't vote in good conscious on this. This isn't about not taking the win, it's about finishing the work and then taking the win together. And I'm absolutely with you, but I'm with all of you on that. And I'm sorry if I can't explain it any better or if it doesn't make sense to you, I apologize for that but I still have to urge a 'no' vote until we finish that or we get to impasse and then let's vote on whatever's there. That's all I'm saying. But I'm a thousand percent with you, we got to get this done. We have to get this done. There's no option. Thank you, Sir."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris for five minutes."

Harris, D: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I just want to say that my... my distinguished colleagues from the 65th District really laid out some very accurate comments in terms of whether or not this Bill is in final stage, whether or not negotiations should continue. And I certainly hope that they do because I don't know that this is the final product. However, if it is the final product, then... then I think we need to look at it as the possibility of that. So, question of the speaker ... or excuse me ... of the Sponsor, if I may, Sir? Representative, if I can. First of all, this is... we... we use the term freeze and my concern is that the year that one of my property taxpayers gets a higher bill than they did before after this... should this become law, they're going to say I thought you all passed a property tax freeze. So would it not be more... because there are other thing besides the ... the levy extension that goes into the property tax bill, correct?"

Currie: "You're absolutely correct. And I think I explained that in my opening..."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Currie: "...I wanted to explain why we added provisions that actually would provide real relief to homeowners across the State of Illinois."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Currie: "Because you're right. If there are changes in property valuation from this..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Currie: "...part of town to the other, that's going to have an impact on where the local government collects the money.

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

There's nothing in this Bill that guarantees an individual property owner..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Currie: "...finds taxes are frozen..."

Harris, D.: "Right, okay."

Currie: "It just means that the district is frozen."

Harris, D.: "Okay, I only got five minutes..."

Currie: "Oh, sorry."

Harris, D.: "...so bear... bear with me. And the provisions of House Bill 156 are in here which adds for exemptions. So indeed if there is a limitation with the increase in these exemptions, a property taxpayer should see a benefit from those various smaller exemptions, correct?"

Currie: "That's exactly right."

Harris, D.: "All right. And that... I think that makes sense.

Regarding the two major exemptions, one on pensions and the other on debt service. I can unders... and I know there is one in there for the... for leases of buildings or... that was required by the bond council which I understand."

Currie: "And that's standard..."

Harris, D.: "And..."

Currie: "...language."

Harris, D."...and it... would it not be fair to say that concerning pensions, it's not the local municipalities that determine pensions. I mean, aren't pension benefits determined right here in this building, signed by the Governor, that the police and fire get the benefits that we have determined they should get. And then we turn around and say to the municipalities, oh by the way, you have to pay the cost. Is that fair to say?"

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Currie: "Totally fair and very well put. And remember that most of the pension obligations under this Bill will accrue at the municipal, county level, not in school districts."
- Harris, D.: "And... but having said that, can the municipalities play some games and... and take dollars that they may be getting elsewhere and put them into... into the pension line of their property tax bill thus driving up the pension line of their property tax bill which increase... increase property taxes. Is that something..."

Currie: "Well..."

Harris, D.: "...that could happen?"

- Currie: "...I certainly hadn't contemplated that. I certainly hope they wouldn't do that and it may be that somebody could file an action against a local government that lied essentially about its pension obligations."
- Harris, D: "One of our Members suggested that perhaps on the property tax bill we ought to put a line specifically for pensions from year after year so that the taxpayers know indeed what those pensions are and if they're shifting dollars into a pension line."
- Currie: "I believe we already have that on our property tax bills."
- Harris, D.: "I know we do in Cook, I don't know if they do throughout the rest of the state. All right, if I may, and you... you went from a two year to a four year which is... which is what the Governor wanted. And... just briefly to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is... this is a property tax limitation. To use the word freeze is inappropriate because it is possible that a property taxpayer could indeed see a higher bill one year than they did the previous year.

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Is this Bill perfect? No. Would we like to see some other provisions in here that... that the Governor has... has suggested? Yes. But at the same time there is some modification, it is four years, it is a tough Bill. I'm telling you, I'm hearing from my districts and they're not real excited about this at all. Nonetheless, if this is what it takes, whether or not this is the final Bill and I hope perhaps that it isn't and negotiations continue, but if this is what it takes to help get us to a budget, then I think we really, seriously, need at looking to vote 'yes' on the Bill. I don't think it's as bad in its overall composition. Even though it could be somewhat better, I don't think is as bad to ser... to deserve a 'no' vote on its face. So, I encourage you to look at it very carefully. I'm comfortable voting 'yes'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Well, first of all, I would thank... like to thank you Representative Currie and Representative Zalewski for working with us, negotiating over the last couple of days, because I don't think there's anybody here that doesn't want some type of property tax relief and we've talked about it for a long time. So, one of the questions that I think I want to pose to you was the issue regarding the pensions. So that was an issue right off the bat for us, because we feel that our pension proposal that we had treated the pensions like other expenses

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

so we did not want to exempt them for that reason. But I'm not sure exactly what your reasoning was."

Currie: "I think that one of the other speakers explicitly laid it out. We're the ones who decide what the police and fire pensions will be at the local level and it's the locals who have to pony up the money to pay for them. This is primarily about municipalities, counties and so forth, not about school districts. But the idea that we should tell them this is what you have to pay and then turn around and tell them, but you can't pay it, because we're not allowing you to raise the money it takes to meet the demands we've put upon you. So that was the rationale behind the pension exemption and I do appreciate, Representative, the courtesy you have shown us in these discussions. I think they have been civil, I think they have been helpful, and I think that we have moved close together. I would say most of the movement came from my side, I would say that we are 90 to 95 percent of what the Governor has asked, but I didn't sense that there was about to be a falling down of final barriers. And just as ... just as with this general discussion about the state budget, I think that we were at something of an impasse. I think it's important ... it is June 28, June 28. The fiscal year begins in just a couple of days. The idea that we should wait, wait, wait, I don't think makes much sense given that the calendar is not going to wait for us."

Bellock: "I'm going to address that issue in another minute, but I wanted to address the second issue that we had. Because in our proposal we had the referendums that we feel that the taxpayers would want. Especially regarding the property tax

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

relief that they could strengthen that if they wanted to by deepening it below a zero percent. Or if they wanted to, they... they could extend it and that would be by referendum. So, what was your opposition to that?"

Currie: "Yeah. My opposition to it is, first of all, it's a new item. All of a sudden in the stew, the Governor says he's got to have this referendum proposal after a four-year freeze that can extend the freeze that can actually lower the rate. And my understanding is the five percent number in your proposal means that in some districts you could have as many as, oh maybe, 125 or 130 people trigger a referendum for the whole community. This is new. The Governor's old proposals did not include this voter referendum. I don't think that we need it in order to have a tough, tight, property tax limitation or freeze Bill, whichever way you want to call it. And that was just not something that we were, at that point, prepared to consider. But you shouldn't throw out all that the Governor wanted because a late coming idea that somehow bubbled up to the top of his head is not included in this."

Bellock: "I think that... well, one of the... well and also... I... I had spoken with Representative Zalewski before that we felt that we still would still like to have some more negotiation on this. The problem with this is that, unlike the last Bill, this is a Senate Bill and this Bill takes effect immediately. So this Bill needs 71 votes, but we won't have the opportunity to address it over in the Senate because this is a Senate Bill. So we wanted to have more discussion with you about two of these issues that we've just discussed to see if there was any other movement on that. But I just wanted to point out in

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

answer to what you just talked about with the referendum. I think the Governor... what he is addressing here is the issue as to why he went to four years is because the tax increase if there is one or revenue was for. So addressing that, he was trying to address, also, other issues that the voters, our taxpayers and our constituents, could address by themselves regarding a referendum. And that is something that they can address to either lower or extend this issue. But I appreciate all..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Bellock: "I will. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. I have appreciated our negotiations, but we would like to move forward on this. We did not know we were going to voting at this point on this issue. And I will explain again to everyone, this Bill becomes effective immediately. It needs 71 votes, and it is a Senate Bill. So the action on this now could be the last action unless it's approached on a different Bill. Thank you. I would appreciate your support 'no' on this Bill at this time, even though I know all of us want property tax relief but we need to have a stronger Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski for five minutes."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't need that long. I just want to emphasize a couple of the points that have already been made. One is this is an incredibly difficult Bill for a lot of Members of our caucus to support in its current form. It's four years of limiting the extension that pre... creates a great amount of restraint, an undue amount of burden on local government's ability to manage their own resources. To

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

the Gentleman's point from Kane about a negotiation and a contract, I appreciate his point and he's well spoken, he does a wonderful job as a Floor Leader, but this isn't the sale of a used car and this isn't the sale of a house. This is the State of Illinois needing a budget in two days before catastrophic consequences and it's on fire and this caucus is trying to grab a hose. We've done it time and again and we are compromising in every which way we possibly can. There are plenty of vehicles out there for us. If there's ways in which we can continue to work together, that's great, but the time is now. We need to start putting forward our plan, get to a point where we have agreement, move some of these issues forward and get to the business of a budget. This caucus stands ready to work. It has worked. It has compromised. It has done the things necessary to reach agreement with the Governor's Office and your side of the aisle. Please join us, take yes for an answer, and vote 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for five minutes."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So just for clarification, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "So this is a Senate Bill and it does need to go back to Senate on the Concurrence Motion only. Is that correct?"

Currie: "It would require 71 votes. It could go back to the Senate and there are always, of course, trailer Bills. There are later Bills. But today is June 28 and the first of July is right around the corner. We think it's important not just to have conversations but to start getting the ball rolling."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Ives: "Okay. So I just want to know whether or not they can change
 it in the Senate at all at this point."

Currie: "No, but they... they could refuse to concur and send it back to us for further work."

Ives: "Okay. So regardless of what we do today, this Bill, prior to going to the Governor for signature, must go to the Senate one way or the other, correct?"

Currier: "I'm sorry, say again."

Ives: "Prior to this Bill going to the Governor, it's not going straight from our chamber to the Governor, it must go back to the Senate."

Currie: "Has to go back to the Senate. The Senate has two options:

Concur, should this Bill get 71 votes here; non-concur, send it back to us for further consideration. The Bill that came over to us from the Senate did not meet the Governor 90 percent of the way. The Bill that come to us from the Senate did provide for many more exemptions. It meant not just 19 but some 120 school districts were exempt altogether from its provisions. So this is a much tougher version of the Bill the Senate sent to us. But yes, the Senate would have the opportunity to..."

Ives: "Okay."

Currie: "...say we don't like what you're doing..."

Ives: "Well, thank..."

Currie: "...go back to the drawing board."

Ives: "...thank you for... thank you for clarifying that. I think that's an important clarification. Because, you know, last cycle we basically... last Session time, we basically took 17 votes on a property tax freeze vote. And most of those failed,

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

but believe it or not, one or two of them actually moved from the House to the Senate. And what happened in the Senate, they completely died. Nothing happened, nothing. And it's... I find it quite interesting because even Speaker Madigan voted in favor of Representative Batinick's permanent property tax freeze and before us today is simply a temporary one. So to me this is a backtrack from something that this chamber had already proved last year, including with major votes by all sorts of Leadership folks on a permanent property tax freeze. As far as I can tell, we're backtracking. And there's no quarantee should this House pass this Bill today and it go over to the Senate that the Senate actually agree and sends it to the Governor. So, it seems to be pretty much a charade especially when you've got us believing from what we've been told by our Leadership and I'm not in these discussions, but I'm told there's still negotiations going on about this Bill. So, I'll be honest with you... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. You know, this Bill does nothing to really solve the cost drivers to property taxes ever increasing problems. We're not with this Bill or have we in any other Bills really solved the pension crisis that affect not... not our state funds, but I'm talking the local level pension funds. I'm talking districts or municipalities where 100 percent of the property taxes they collect only go to pensions, but we write the pension rules. This Bill gives them no flexibility to manage those costs; they can't manage those costs. Even if you put pension levy outside of this freeze, you're still going to have a balloon in those pension levies as they shift money over to that levy and do whatever they can to reduce the other part...

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

the part that is frozen. So we've got fake reform here. We've got no control for the cost drivers, no control for local municipalities cost for workers' compensation. No control for collective bargaining reforms, prevailing wage rate reforms, and everything else. All the cost drivers that have an everincreasing impact on property taxes are not taken care of in this Bill. That's why it's fake reform. And I find it really concerning that you're doing this when our area actually has the highest number of underwater mortgages in the entire nation. This is not a topic we should be playing around with. We're down... we're down to the lowest construction starts as well when you look across the nation for... for... or at least our region where family home construction is down 75 percent compared to prerecession. We are top numbers in terms of how much we're for paying property taxes not just compared to the region but across the nation. And we're doing nothing to affect the cost drivers of property taxes and until we do that this is all..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Ives: "Thank you. Vote 'no', please."

Speaker Lang: "That completes the speakers allowed under the rules.

For those whose lights are still on, I apologize. Leader

Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Remember that in this Bill, 90 percent, 95 percent of what the Governor wanted, the Governor got. We had productive discussions with Members on the other side of aisle. They're now telling us that... that we're moving too quickly. But June 28 is not too quickly. June 28 may not even get us over the goal line. Of course, we can continue

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

conversation. Of course, there are always trailer Bills. There are many more opportunities, but I think we've gone more... further than I personally would have liked to have gone in order to respond to the Governor's demands. His late-blooming request for this voter referendum doesn't make any sense in the context of what this Bill does. I urge your 'aye' votes in order not just to solve this problem, but to make it possible to solve the most important problem facing the people of Illinois and that is the continuing lack of state funding for important programs: school children, vulnerable elderly, victims of domestic violence. Let's try to make sure everybody understands we're ready to get the job done. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the passage of the Bill.

This Bill requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Bill will

vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

Have all vote who wish? Last time. Mr. Clerk, please take the

record. On this question, there are 59 voting 'yes', 46 voting

'no'. And the Bill fails. Mr. Sims is recognized. For what

reason do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Sims: "Mr. Speaker, I've sat here and listened to the debate all day and I'm frustrated. I'm frustrated, Mr. Speaker, because I hear members on the other side of the aisle continue to talk about we're almost there, if we just had more time. We just heard the Majority Leader say that 90 to 95 percent of what the Governor asked for was in this Bill. That's on top

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

of the 90 percent that was in the pension... that's going to be in the pension proposal, 70 percent that's in the workers' compensation proposal, 80 percent that's in the local government consolidation proposal. How much is enough? How ... when are we going to stop playing games and understand that the single most important issue is the State of Illinois having a budget? Now, we've attempted to meet the other side of the aisle time and time again. We've attempted to work with you on non-budgetary items. But we're still being... these games are continued to be played. Individuals across the State of Illinois cannot afford for us to play games. They cannot afford for us to play politics with their lives. They want a budget, they deserve a budget, they demand a budget. And Mr. Speaker, I believe it is imperative that we move forward with our agenda, so that we can give a... get a budget to the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy is recognized. For what reason do you rise?"

Cassidy: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just voted for that property tax freeze. I voted against it 17 times because I fundamentally believe it is bad public policy. I decided to take this vote even when it... even when I knew it wasn't going to pass, even when I knew it wasn't going to be a recorded vote because I wanted to set an example for my friends on the other side about stepping outside of your comfort zone, taking the hard vote, doing what you don't really want to do in the name of compromise, in the name of saving the lives of our

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

constituents. And frankly, at this point, in the name of getting our garbage picked up because our dumpsters we're repossessed today. It's time to get down to business, take the hard votes. I just survived hitting the green button on this. My fingers aren't burning, I'm not in pain. We've got to get this done. The Sponsor made clear there were ways to get more Bills across to the Senate. It's time to get to 'yes', y'all, please."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Martwick: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, colleagues, people in the gallery. You know, I want to share with you something that as we approach this budget deadline that's been weighing on my mind really more than almost anything over the course of the last week. During a recent revenue hearing, we had a subject matter hearing on the effect of credit downgrades to the State of Illinois. Now, we had a financial expert come and testify and he kind of rushed through his testimony and I stopped him and asked him to repeat something that he just said. And this is something that has been turning in my stomach for a week and I imagine it's about to turn the stomach of anyone who's actually paying attention right now. In Illinois, we are spending annually, every year, we are spending a billion dollars in additional interest simply because of credit downgrades. Let me repeat that. Not a billion dollars in interest on our debt, we are already pay interest on our debt. We're paying a billion dollars a year more in interest than we should have to pay simply because we

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

cannot put our financial house in order. Can you imagine what we could do with an additional billion dollars a year? Can you imagine if we dedicated a billion dollars a year towards paying down our pension debt? Can you imagine if we put a billion dollars a year into a property tax relief fund where schools could lower their property tax levies in exchange for additional funding for education? Giving real property tax relief, can you imagine that? And the only reason that we don't have this additional billion dollars a year to put towards worthy programs is because we don't address our financial problems and don't pass a budget. A billion dollars a year wasted, gone, poof. That makes me sick to my stomach. All we need to do is agree on the numbers and instead we have these incessant discussions over things that are not related to the budget. Okay, we're having them, we're meeting, we're making great progress, but there's three days left. Do you really want us to spend more money when we get downgraded on July 1, to waste more money, the government's money? Oh, wait, wait, wait, wait, let me stop for a second. This is a democracy; I forgot it's not the government's money, it's the taxpayer's money. We constantly hear that we need to stand up for the taxpayer and we will argue about a million dollars here and million dollars there and yet somehow a billion dollars a year wasted doesn't make it into the discussion. This is the most irresponsible part of this budget, this impasse that we've had. We have a Governor who is a financial expert, he's a billionaire for God's sake making money, and he has let us plummet into this condition that we're in now. It's time to solve this, folks. Let's stop hurting people,

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

let's stop wasting our taxpayers' money. Let's stop making the problem worse for the next generation. My God, I've got a 10-month-old son and I'm so worried about the can that we're kicking down the road that he's going to have solve. Let's get to 'yes'; let's solve this thing."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Reick: "To the Gentleman who just spoke. I wish we had heard that speech when we were passing like \$5 billion of new spending that went through between January and May, it would have been a better speech then. To the Lady from Chicago who was fingers are not on fire for having voted for the property tax freeze, I think that the issue is not one of freezing, but it... the issue is one of who's responsible for what. And I think in this state, according to the Constitution, the State of Illinois has a primary responsibility for paying for K-12 education. It's right there, all you have to do is read it. Unfortunately, we have allowed that to... we've observed that more in the breach than we have in the adherence as we do many things here. I will continue my little travels around the State of Illinois. The Speaker's house in Chicago is worth \$294 thousand and in 2016 he paid \$4600 in property tax, 1.5 percent of its fair market value. I've been going around to different districts in the state to see what a house worth \$294 thousand would pay if he were in other districts. I did mine, I've done some others. So, I decided I was going to look at Harvey District 152. If Mr. Speaker's house was in Harvey District 152, if you could find a house in Harvey

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

District 152 that was worth \$294 thousand, the 2016 tax bill would've been \$16,413.88. We don't need a property tax freeze, folks, we need property tax reform. We need a cap, we need a hard cap, we need a cap that tells the state to do its job. Stop bleeding our local governments and our local taxpayers for something that is the responsibility of this Body. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock, for what reason do you rise?"

Bellock: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Bellock: "Okay. I just want to thank Representative Martwick for pointing out some of those issues that you just talked about and I'm going to be brief 'cause I know we have a lot of other work to do. But for months we've talked about how the Governor has set this agenda about reforms, but a lot of people don't think that reforms have anything to do with a budget. You just pointed out in several issues why reforms do because reforms turn into money. Pension reform, we now have estimated a \$250 billion unfunded liability. That is money and that's why that's important when you're talking about a reform for the budget. Two, the property taxes. We have the second highest property taxes in the United States, everybody wants relief. That's why we need a good Bill with a lot of input and to address that issue because that is millions and billions of dollars probably, so that money goes into a reform as to why it's important for a budget. And then the ... the pensions... worker's comp, one of the highest issues, top priority for all of us. Because all we talk about is how

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

everybody is leaving Illinois and unless we would get workers' comp reform, we are not going to keep the businesses here. If we don't keep the businesses here, we don't keep our residents here. We already have the second highest outward migration of people of our state, also from the City of Chicago. So, those three issues that we've put and we have negotiated on, those relate to money and that relates to why the reforms are key to the budget of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Page 5 of the Calendar, House Bill 4045, on the Order of Third Reading. Leader Currie. Mr. Martwick to be handling this. Please... There's Amendments? Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4045, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill is read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick, are you handling the Amendment?" Martwick: "I am."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

- Martwick: "I'd like to move to adopt Floor Amendment 1 and 2. I guess we'll handle them one at a time. So, I'd like to move to adopt the Amendments and debate it on Third."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of Amendment 1 will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Martwick."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

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 4045, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4045 is the product of negotiations on changes to our pension system in order to provide long-term savings to the systems... various systems. I want to begin by saying that I know Mr. Demmer ... I expect him to speak shortly ... I want to thank him for his participation, Leader Demmer, in... in these negotiations that we've had. They were productive and... I think that we resolved a lot of issues and I think we have a good path to move forward. So, there were eight items that generally we spoke about, eight items on this list. And on that list, we were able to come to agreement on seven of those eight items. So, starting with the consideration option for Tier 1 active employees. What this does is this is how do we... what do we do to provide savings to the... the employees who are active and still in the Tier 1 system going forward. President Cullerton put forth a plan that suggested that if we forced employees to choose between two bad options, he felt that that would be constitutional. I think it's safe to say that not only do I disagree with that in terms of the analysis of constitutionality, but I think it's safe to say that a majority of Members, most of the Members that I spoke

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

to on the Republican aisle ... side of the aisle about that provision, disagree with it. If it is unconstitutional to unilaterally diminish benefits, I don't believe it makes it constitutional to say that you must choose and both choices diminish your pension benefits. I believe that that would be found unconstitutional and... and our view of that was we've gone too long wasting time on court cases. We need to put in place things that will provide savings. So, what we did was we took the option 2 of President Cullerton's plan which says that you can opt to receive a lower COLA upon retirement and you would delay the implementation of that COLA. And in exchange, we will give you a cash refund of 10 percent of all of the contributions that you've made and we will lower your contribution going forward. To me, that is consideration. What we did was we made it what I believe is constitutional consideration by offering the employee the choice to not take it. So, we have put status quo as an option. You can choose to take it; you can choose to keep what you have. We believe that employees will choose this. People will find value in cash up front and a lower contribution rate, and we believe that each person who does that will provide savings to the system. This was in agreement with our group. Item two was the pension buyout for Tier 1 vested, inactive members, right? So these are members who work for the government for a time, vested in a Tier 1 pension, but left the state... left the government and are no longer contributing to their pension, but they have a balance in there. And so at retirement, they could choose to have this pension benefit, whatever it amounts to, or what we have suggested is that we would offer to them

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

through SURS, SERS, and TRS a pension buyout. This is a buyout that was proposed and... by Representative Batinick. It was a... I was the chief cosponsor on this, we worked on this together. Again, we have agreement on this. This allows inactive... inactive members the choice of saying I will take a discounted present cash value buyout of my obligation or, if I wish, I can keep it. Again, Representative Batinick has said from the floor many times, he believes that the number of employees that opt into this will be higher than even the systems project because history says that every time an option like this has been offered, more people take it than is projected. And I agree with him. I think that this is something that will provide savings to the system. Next, one of the provisions of Leader Durkin's plan was the creation of Tier 3 hybrid plan. This is a hybrid where there would be a defined benefit portion and defined contribution portion. These would be better benefits than Tier 2, but it would be a slightly lower benefit from the defined benefit end but a defined contribution complement that would make the overall benefits better. It would shift some of the cost, the new cost of this to the local government, and we believe that this is a good thing. It brings in the concept of a hybrid-defined, benefitdefined contribution plan and it is an option again. I mean, it... this... so what this would do, I apologize, this is they would be new, noncovered employees would be... start out in Tier 3. They could have the option to participate in Tier 2, so it's up to them. Again, they get this choice. And let's see what else do we have here. So there are some changes in there. I advise you, so I don't have to go through all of

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

them, look through your analysis. There are some differences certainly between Tier 3 and Tier 2, but again, we believe that this would be reform that would address some of the Tier 2 issues and would provide savings to the systems. Finally, another item that was requested was a voluntary, defined contribution plan for Tier 1. So, in this, again, we agreed that GARS, SERS, state universities, TRS are required to create a voluntary defined contribution retirement option. This would be limited to no more than five percent of the members and this is language that is identical to House Bill 4065 in Leader Durkin's. Okay? In this Tier 1, your defined benefit assets are frozen and the future accrued services counted towards the defined contribution plan. And then there is a voluntary defined contribution plan for Tier 2. So, again, we have a Tier 2 problem. We're trying to help solve that Tier 2 problem by creating a voluntary, defined contribution plan. So, now the State Employee Retirement System can offer an optional, defined contribution plan for Tier 2 employees who are coordinated with Social Security. Again, this is by agreement. So, let me see if I missed anything; here, I think I covered everything here. There were some budget-related pension math that was requested. This is pension spiking, smoothing of assumptions, and calculation of payroll for the contribution. Those items have been handled by the budget working groups because they provide budgetary savings today. So, we've let the budget ... but my understanding is that those items, which Leader Durkin proposed in this Bill, have been largely, if not entirely, agreed to by the budget group. So that part of pensions has been agreed to,

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

even though our group did not take that up. The last item of the eight items, so that's seven items that there was agreement on. The last item was related to SB 1, which is the Education Reform Bill. And the question was, how do we handle what we're going to do going forward with Chicago teacher pensions? Now I understand that there is disagreement on that and I respect that. But this is an item that Speaker Madigan made very clear that this was his condition that SB 1 be signed as it is. And so, during our negotiations with Leader Demmer, I suggested that that was a conversation for the Speaker to have with Leader Durkin and they should decide that issue and that I would not put that on the table for what we're doing here, because that was part of how we're going to handle education funding reform and how we're going to treat the City of Chicago in those ... so that was not for this discussion. If I remove that item and the seven items that are left, we have agreement on it. And again, it was a very productive. I'm grateful to Leader Demmer for his participation and your staff I think we worked together. In addition, we have made an agreement to continue negotiations and not only just for the purpose of what we're doing here today but for the future to address things like problems with the General Assembly Retirement System, to address the problems a Tier 2 fix. We plan to continue these discussions immediately and work... continue to work next year towards those things. I think that this is a good Bill. I think this represents by and large a very, very, very good compromise on things that can provide savings now to the budget and going

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

forward in the future to our systems and provide some flexibility. I respectfully ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Before we proceed, the Chair recognizes Mr. Spain for a quick introduction. Normally, we wouldn't do this during debate but please proceed, Mr. Spain."

Spain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I'm grateful for your courtesy and I apologize to Representative Martwick for the interruption. But I rise to direct the Ladies and Gentlemen to the return of an old friend and as we are here engaged in a very difficult time, it's so wonderful to have visits from a friend and mentor to many of us, someone that served with distinction who'll always be recognized as one of the great statesmen of the Illinois House of Representatives. Please join me in welcoming back, Representative David Leitch."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome back, Mr. Leitch. Want to say hello?"

Leitch: "I do want to say hello. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You look a lot like Lou Lang. I'll never forget when... well, I won't go there. It's so kind of my Leader, Jim Durkin, to come down... to invite me to come down and share some time with you today and I have so much respect, first of all, for this institution. I have to tell you about a week ago, my son's fiancée from the Philippines came to this country. And if you were to sit with her and if you were to listen to her sheer joy, her tears of joy about being in this country and about the exceptionalism of this country and the opportunity that she believes was available in this country, it would just make so many of us just throw off all this gloom and doom we hear and make a whole new perspective on all the problems that we think are so big that really aren't that big and sort

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

out what's really important and what's not important. And I will tell you, even after almost 30 years, every time I step on this floor I feel a twinge because of what this institution represents. And so I am so proud to have been a Member and I am so proud to be associated with you, both sides of the aisle, who are choosing to make a difference and serve for our citizens. I know we are having a rough time, okay, we have rough times in this country. But it is with such gratitude that I feel personally to have been a Member here and to share with you the respect I have for each Member here who is giving of themselves and taking themselves away from their families to work for the betterment of Illinois. So, thank you, Leader Durkin. I really appreciate your invitation and thanks to each one of you. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Leitch. Thank you for being with us today, David. Returning to Mr. Martwick's Bill, the Chair recognizes Mr. Demmer. This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. It will be moved to Standard Debate. You have five minutes."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And before we begin, could you let record reflect that Representatives Andersson and Sosnowski are excused for the day."

Speaker Lang: "Yes, Sir."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative Martwick, I appreciate your opening remarks and how you laid out some of the details of this Bill.

And I also appreciate the work that we've been able to do together over the last several days. We began meeting, I

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

believe it was, Sunday evening. And we've met several times, both in formal and informal settings, to talk about this. And I believe that's... I know to this point we've been negotiating in good faith and for that I'm grateful. I think that's something been missing from this chamber for too long. And so when we're able to sit down and have frank discussions, I believe that's a step in the right direction, I think everybody would agree. I think that the basis of good faith negotiations is a level of trust. In that, there has to be a both a give and a take that there are concessions that are made by each side. You accurately described that we identified eight points around which we needed to do some negotiation. Some points were minor and we didn't spend much time on at all and we were essentially in agreement from the beginning. Some points were major and needed extensive discussion and we had to come back over the course of a couple of days to check in on our progress there. So these eight items are not of equal weight. There are some that are the crux of the legislation and some that were incidental to the legislation. When we talk about where we find ourselves today, you had indicated that we have agreement on several of these points. I'll point out on something that we thought to be very central to this legislation, the option for consideration, we had a significant concession there. And we adopted the proposal that was brought by your caucus as one that we thought we could support and we could live with. That was a significant part of the original, underlying legislation and significant part that we are willing to yield on. My question for you is, when we come here today with legislation that you

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

categorize as being, you know, seven out of the eight items agreed to, we had entered in good faith negotiations and given on a few of those categories with the idea that we'd be talking about this Bill in its entirety. It's not good faith negotiation to look for agreement and then to... when you got you're satisfied with to walk away and to offer legislation. What incentive would we have to give on an item like consideration if we thought that we wouldn't have the ability to get other items that we were concerned about? Why run a Bill today? Why run a Bill today when all through our conversations we've been talking about this as a package? We've been talking about all eight items and whether we got to agreement on all eight of those or not is not the issue. One item is simply not decided yet. Why run it today?"

Martwick: "Well, I appreciate your concern and I think that your...
you know, your characterizations of the way that we've gone
about this process are accurate. And so again, I would repeat
my gratitude and my respect for the way that these things
have been done. The thing that I like most about this is that
the focus of our negotiations really were what is and what is
not good policy. We were able to put politics aside and focus
on policy. We have a fundamental disagreement on the policy
of how do we handle the Chicago teacher pensions. And from
the very beginning... from the very beginning of the... the first
thing... first meeting we had, I said to be fair that's just
not something that I am willing to put as a part of our
negotiation. It's something I cannot consider. It's...

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Demmer: "Instead, let me offer that we both agree that it was a decision that would need to be made between Speaker Madigan and Leader Durkin."
- Martwick: "That is correct. Yeah, we did agree to that. That that would be a decision they would make. The items that were left on the table we worked together to find what I thought were good policy solutions to this. I admit that some of these things were give on your part and take on our part, and give on our part and take on your part, but I think that the fundamental goal from both of our sides was to get to a Bill that would provide savings in the future without getting our... us tied up in another lawsuit that might just delay it and that was the way I saw these negotiations going. So with seven of the eight items agreed to, the eighth item being subject to another discussion."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick, please complete your answer and Mr. Demmer, please bring your remarks to a close. Mr. Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe another Member will yield me time."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick."
- Reick: "Hello, Mr... Hi, Mr. Speaker. I would like to yield a minute or so to Mr. Demmer, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Well, I think he wanted you to yield him... Mr. Butler wants to give Mr. Demmer a full five minutes. You can save your minute, Sir. Mr. Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Butler, for the generous offer. All right."
- Martwick: "So, Tom, I'm sorry. And I'll be brief..."

Demmer: "Sure."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Martwick: "...but I know I need to answer your question. I just feel that having the agreement that we have and knowing that the rest of the agreement needed to be handled by the people, I felt that at least at this time there was enough to lay out this Bill, put it before the General Assembly before we run out of time, and see if we can't get the votes necessary to at least put this package to the next chamber."

Demmer: "I appreciate that, Representative. We... we have a couple days left. We, in fact, we've spoken about meeting again today following this vote. We've also spoken about the important part of recognizing that there's both a political and a policy discussion that are happening at the same time here. What I... what I've seen and heard is that this exercise on the floor today seems to be more about politics than it is about policy. I'd suggest that we have an opportunity to revisit things that we consider not to be 10 percent of the legislation or 5 percent of the legislation... Frankly, I don't know who's assigning these numbers to these Bills that we agree on 70 or 60 or 30 or 50 percent of it. I don't know where those numbers are coming from. What I'm talking about today and what we both agreed is that we identified items, some of which were very small pieces of the puzzle, some are very large pieces of the puzzle. We feel very strongly that in order to get to a point where we think we have an agreement on pension reform we need to have an answer on the treatment of Chicago teachers' pensions, an answer, one way or another. We have deferred that to the Leaders. The Leaders met this afternoon. I hope they discussed that. I hope they have some feedback for us on how to proceed with that because that's central to

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

our side of the aisle and probably to Members of your side of the aisle as well, to understand how that's going to be handled going forward. So, when we're trying to work in good faith, when we're trying to come to the negotiating table, how are we supposed to come with a... with items were... we're willing to make concessions, not knowing negotiations will end. We don't have the ability to run legislation in this chamber and to get it called for a vote the way the Majority Party does. Fine, I understand that. But when we're engaging in good faith negotiations, if we want to have candid and frank and honest discussions with each other, we have to have a respect not only for the items that we're discussing but for the process of how we go about negotiating. We have to work together to make sure that if we enter this agreement and we say, let's work together on this package that we've introduced, these eight items, let's get an agreement to walk out either we're together or we're not. But we walk away from that negotiating table knowing where each other stands. Instead, we've been at the negotiating table and an Amendment drops and we, you know, we're unaware of it. I don't know if there's another Amendment being filed. I don't know if another Amendment will follow this vote today. It makes it very difficult for us to go in good faith negotiations when we're seeing tactics like this. And I appreciate that this may not have, you know, been your grand plan all along. I appreciate the fact that there are other dynamics at play, but I think we need to understand that if we really want to work together it's not for one side to assign to the other a take it or leave it proposal. It's that

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

we both come out of a... of a room with a handshake agreement and an understanding about where each other stands. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield the remainder of my time to Representative Reick."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick is recognized. Your light was on, Sir, so I guess you've got 1:47 plus your own 5 minutes."

Reick: "No. Well… okay, okay. Well, we'll… we'll work it out. As a former short stop, I… I've dropped out a lot of relays in my time. I have a very quick question for the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reick: "The one thing I'm looking at in this Bill which indicates to me that we haven't gotten to a complete Bill is the fact that if we moved more and more of our people into define... and... and trust me when I say we need pension reform. I'm not arguing that... that issue. If we move more and more people out of our defined benefit plan or a defined benefit plan or however you want to do it, into a defined contribution plan, where does the money come from to pay the benefits that are being accrued right now by Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 people? I mean, the only way you pay for pensions is to... it's... it's sort of like a pay... pay forward type thing. How do... how do you rectify the issue of not having enough money going into the plan? GARS is a perfect example of that because so few of us are now members of the General Assembly System. Can you answer that question for me, please?"

Martwick: "Well, the... the short answer, Representative, is that the money will come from our state budget in order to fund these systems. So, anytime that we make a correction and we

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

start up new systems, you are right. We... we... when we move people to a new system, then we don't have those new people funding the old system. Ultimately the money does work out the same, right? Because you are... you still have to deal with unfunded liabilities one way or the other and the money will work out the same. It shifts things around a little bit without a doubt. As for GARS, Representative Demmer and I have..."

Speaker Lang: "Please continue your answer, Sir."

Martwick: "Representative Demmer and I have discussed, at least initially, some frameworks that we will take up next year to try and correct the problems that we are facing with GARS, some options. And we're committed to working that out; and I think we'll have good legislation next year. I'd be happy to work with you."

Reick: "Well, that's why I would like to see that on this Bill rather than have this Bill voted on today. And I would like to yield the balance of my time to Representative Batinick, please."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick for 4:37."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "Representative Martwick, I want to just go back real quick to the point of personal privilege you had. 'Cause I thought it was real important for this Body and I 90 percent agreed with it. I'm going... I'm going to tell you the 10 percent I don't agree with. Okay? I want to be specific here.

1) The Governor's is out. It's not on the Governor... it was for you guys to negotiate with the Governor before May 30.

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

It's 71 to pass it; it's 71 to override it. It's on this House right now. That's #1. 2) We've always been hearing we don't want these reforms. These reforms are holding up a budget. The reforms are holding up a budget. The reforms aren't holding up a budget. What the reforms are holding up is a tax increase. We have to understand that give and take. The budget's ugly without it, but the reforms are not holding up a budget. The reforms are holding up a tax increase. And therein lies the trade. It's a little bit more of two-way street than maybe you guys recognize but to the Bill. I... this was dropped late. And I understand there's a 10 percent refund and drop buyout of the COLAs. How much money does that save us?"

Martwick: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat your question? I apologize."

Batinick: "So there... there's a 10 percent buyout of the COLAs. A change in the COLAs and you get a 10 percent re..."

Martwick: "Yeah. So that's the same provision that was in... in Leader Durkin's Bill, which is... so our current employees will have an option to keep their plan as it exists or they can opt into what was option 2 in Leader Durkin's plan, which is in exchange for a 10 percent refund of the contributions they've made to the system, plus a lower..."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm... I'm tight on time. I just..."

Martwick: "Sorry."

Batinick: "...you don't know the dollar amount in terms of what it saves us on..."

Martwick: "No."

Batinick: "Okay."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Martwick: "Well, they say ... well, whatever the systems estimated." "Right. And here's my concern, and this is what's tough Batinick: being on the Minority Side, I don't know if this was dropped last night or this morning, but I'm reading some of your language some of it that I actually like on the buyout. But as you recall, the Senate actually passed a Bill and sent it to us that had buyout language that would've possibly cost us billions of dollars gone in the wrong direction. And I question the way some of the language is written here and I'm reading it this morning. And we already passed something out of one chamber that was... that would... that would've cost us... that would've cost us money. So, we have to be careful of what we're doing here because we can't do a trailer Bill. If this Bill goes through all the way to the Governor's desk, we can't undo it because once we give it to them the Constitution quarantees it. Do you follow me, Representative?"

Martwick: "Well, I don't think the Constitution would guarantee language in a buyout. That is an option. That's not... that's not a benefit that they're guaranteed on their day... first day of employment and it is... it's an optional."

Batinick: "COLA wasn't guaranteed for people on some of their first day's employment, but once we gave it to them it was guaranteed. So I guess my concern is in sifting on top of what Representative Demmer had... had spoken with, I'm going through this language, I got to... I would like more than an hour, couple hours or two to really... to really go through it because this is something that can't be undone. This is something that can't be changed with a trailer Bill. So for that reason alone, on top of all the other reasons that we

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

were talking about, we have to be extremely cautious on a Bill like this. And I think dropping it hours before we're going to vote on it... little... with... with new language, little tough to do."

Martwick: "Well... and what I would say is that 1) it's a House Bill in the House, so it still has time to go to the Senate. There is still time for Amendments. Much of this language has been around for the last three years. There's no effective date. We can run a trailer Bill at any time. And again, I don't believe that this would fall into that benefit enhancement category that would be subject to constitutional protection. That's a discussion that we had in our meetings. That's what legal staff believes is the case. These are not benefit enhancements. They're options that can be chosen and we can change them or tweak them at any time. In fact, if we don't get enough people to opt in to certain buyouts, we can always sweeten them or if we find too many, we can reduce them. We feel that we have that flexibility."

Batinick: "Right. And I got 22 seconds, so I'll go to the Bill.

I understand what you're saying, that you can tweak... that you can tweak the alternative options, but once you offer them that option, I believe the Constitution is going to say it's there for good. So thank you for your time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell for five minutes."

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

Mitchell, C.: "Representative Martwick, so you've said in your beginning that there were eight items on the table and that on seven there was rough agreements. I just want to sort of

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

walk through them one-by-one. So, in the proposal by the Republican Leader, there was a proposed consideration model, which as I understand it had a forced choice, two different options, both involved diminishment. And what happened was the Democratic side of the aisle came back and said here's an alternative formulation, doesn't have a forced choice. We believe this is constitutional. And that was agreed by the GOP."

Martwick: "That's correct."

Mitchell, C.: "So, let me just note that agreeing to not do something illegal isn't a concession, it's acquiescence to reality. So I hope the Gentleman from... from Dixon understands that. Let's go to item #2. So the Republican Bill also proposed a pension buyout plan. Is that reflected in this Bill, Mr. Martwick?"

Martwick: "It is."

Mitchell, C.: "There was also a proposed Tier 3 option. And I believe House Democrats said let's actually have a Tier 2 to opt in and delayed effective date, but I believe we went with the Tier 3 plan. Is that correct?"

Martwick: "That is correct."

Mitchell, C.: "Next item. House Republicans asked for an optional defined contribution plan for Tier 1. Is that in this Bill?"

Martwick: "It is."

Mitchell, C.: "Item #5. House Republicans asked for an optional defined contribution plan for Tier 2. Is that in this Bill?" Martwick: "It is. Yes."

Mitchell, C.: "Item #6. This is going pretty quickly. I believe that the Leader's Bill also included a... four pension changes

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

from the Governor which resulted in reducing the pension payment, but I... my understanding is that these were also agreed to and are in this Bill. Is that correct?"

Martwick: "They are... I don't believe that these are in the Bill, but these were agreements that will make their way into a bimp if there is a bimp."

Mitchell, C.: "Into a bimp Bill..."

Martwick: "Yes."

Mitchell, C.: "...correct. All right. So, item #7. There was an ask about the elimination of a GARS, but after further discussion that was removed from the conversation. But there are going to be continued good faith negotiations on that agreed to by both sides, correct?"

Martwick: "We are going to address that problem in the future. We just want to do it right not... again, this was... this was one where I was very happy to say that we took politics off the table and said let's do good policy. And we agreed to hold that off so that we could do it right."

Mitchell, C.: "Okay. And the last item was about the Chicago Teachers' Pension Fund. And that is not agreed, correct?"

Martwick: "That's correct."

Mitchell, C.: "Okay. So, there was a question earlier, I believe also from the Gentleman from Dixon, about where are we getting these numbers from. Well, when you divide seven by eight, you get 88 percent, right? So that's why we're saying close to 90 percent. So let me just speak to the Bill. We find ourselves in a situation where it's almost Groundhog Day, right? So a proposal came out of the Senate that included a bunch of Republican items. And ultimately, Republicans still didn't

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

vote for that Bill. So we find ourselves negotiating against side of the aisle did ourselves. This initiate conversations on pension reform. We passed a pension reform Bill that the Supreme Court struck down that was, by the way, here a majority by Democrats despite being mostly a Republican plan. But there's a whole bunch of things that Democrats would like to do in addition to passing a budget. We would love to raise the minimum wage, we'd love to have paid sick leave, we'd love to raise taxes on millionaires to pay for college affordability or for rural infrastructure or for general infrastructure like trains and roads and bridges. But we're not tying these things to the budget. And what we find ourselves in, and I heard this from the Representative from Plainfield, is you're saying that our... what we get out of this entire budget process is the honor of raising taxes to pay for a hole due to a large backlog of bills that the Governor helped blow in the budget. That's our reward. And you're wondering why we're having trouble continuing these negotiations. We're negotiating against ourselves. And the bottom line is, you keep mentioning negotiations between the Speaker and the Leader, but the bottom line is that, frankly, that side of the aisle is not empowered to agree. Look at the Senate experience. Leader Radogno had a bunch of things she thought she'd agreed to. She went down had a conversation with the second floor and all of a sudden none of it was good enough. That keeps happening in these working groups. If we were doing this negotiation and I were talking to Nick or to Sarah or to Steve or to Tim or to Grant we'd be done by now. But that's not who we're having conversations with because

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

you ultimately have to take them back and figure out what the second floor wants. And the bottom line is we are dealing with a Governor who does not know the difference between capitulation. And what compromise and capitulation. Seven of eight items: 88 percent, 90 percent on education funding reform. We went from a two-year freeze to a four-year freeze and a voter referendum the Governor didn't initially ask for and it's still not good enough. You want to end this impasse? Take the liberty to go down, right now, and say we want you, Governor, out of this. We are going to negotiate in good faith and we are cutting a deal. You do whatever you want to with your TV and your mailers. This impasse ends tomorrow. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "All time has expired on the debate on this Bill.

Mr. Martwick to close."

Martwick: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill represents good faith negotiations, good faith compromise and savings to our pension systems that will help our state down the line. Is it everything we would want in terms of savings? No. But it will not keep us tied up in court in some sort of useless lawsuit that will just delay and make things worse. This provides real savings now. It addresses real problems. This is the definition, really, of reform. It makes things better. It's what we can do within the guise of the law in the four corners of what the Supreme Court has told us. And I think, by and large, we all agree on this. If we all agree, maybe it's time to make a 'yes' vote. Let's make some progress. Let's move towards that budget. Let's get it done. Please vote 'yes'."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of the Bill.

 This Bill requires 60 votes. Those in favor of the Bill will

 vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted

 who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there

 are 61 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

 received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

 passed. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bill 171, Mr. Yingling.

 Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please place this

 Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 171 a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Yingling, has been approved for consideration."

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

Yingling: "I move to adopted Floor Amendment #2 and I would like to discuss 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 171, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling."

Yingling: "Thank you. So, just a quick recap on what this chamber has done so far, as it pertains to government consolidation, is we passed Senate Bill 3 which was a major piece of

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

government consolidation legislation in a bipartisan... in a bipartisan way, and we received a Supermajority of votes on that. That is sitting on the Governor's desk right now that he can sign. We also passed House Bill 607 which was a major piece of consolidation legislation as well that allows for township... road commissions to be consolidated into township government. That is also ... that Bill is also on the Governor's desk waiting for his signature. On HB4067 was introduced earlier, I think about a week ago, and in that Bill it contained everything from SB3 and then added a voter initiated petition for consolidation. So now, I want to walk through what... what House Bill 171 does. So, House Bill 171 includes all the provisions from the House's version of Senate Bill 3, which is sitting on the Governor's desk. It also includes the provisions from House Bill 607, which is also sitting on the Governor's desk. As it pertains to... in... in the interest of trying to compro... I mean, compromise and come up with maybe a little bit better of a Bill, we added a pilot program to ... to... for 60... I'm sorry... to House Bill 171 that allows three counties in the State of Illinois to initiate consolidation process via a referendum process. And it outlines the process in this Bill. As you recall, we started a couple years ago and I got to give my seatmate credit. Representative Conroy introduced the Bill, which is now the DuPage... which was commonly referred to as is it a DuPage Consolidation Pilot Program. And at that time, we let DuPage go through the consolidation process and we, in the General Assembly, analyzed its outcomes. We later expanded it to Lake and McHenry and now we're expanding it to all of the state. So,

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

this... this pilot program that we're looking to do in these three other counties is based upon that model. Additionally, what we've added here, which was in Senate Bill 3, is we allow for street... street light district consolidation and the reduction of board members on a home... for the home equity program and also allows for tax rebates from that program. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill's on the Short... on the Order of Short Debate. The Chair will move this to the Order of Standard Debate. Mr. Demmer is recognized for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative Yingling, for... for offering this today. I think we've had an opportunity to work together on several pieces of consolidation legislation in the past, a couple of which we're kind of seeing again today as a result of Floor Amendment 2, right?"

Yingling: "Correct."

Demmer: "So, we had Senate Bill 3 which passed this chamber, passed the Senate, it's on the Governor's desk. Many... both Republicans and Democrats together voted for that. So that... that part of the Bill has been passed and it's on the Governor's desk. House Bill 607 also passed with bipartisan support and is also on the Governor's desk, right? So, two of... two of those portions of this Bill are already able to become law if the Governor signs those. So, really what we're talking about today that's new or different is that we have a... an expansion of a citizen initiative for three counties:

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

for Cass, Henderson, and Cumberland counties. Is that correct?"

Yingling: "That's correct."

Demmer: "So it seems, just by looking at these originally, is that those... are those the three smallest counties that have township government?"

Yingling: "Right. So... so in looking where to do the pilot program we identified... it was based on population and also to try and extrapolate data from the center of the state, that geographic region."

Demmer: "So wouldn't a more effective pilot program, if we really wanted to see how this would be implemented include different kinds of counties..."

Yingling: "Wait, I'm..."

Demmer: "...some counties large and small. We're not... we're not necessarily going to learn for Will County a lesson from how the smallest county in the state with township government implemented this program."

Yingling: "Right. So the policy of consolidation in the state has always recognized the geographic diversity of the state and that what's good from one part of the state might not be good for another part of the state. We have an enormous amount of data from populated counties. What we're trying to get here is data from less populated counties."

Demmer: "But a pilot program, if we want to learn lessons from this would include... because of the geographic and regional differences you... you mentioned, wouldn't that include counties that are different in geographic and regional characteristics and in population characteristics?"

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Yingling: "Well, like I..."

Demmer: "We... we chose..."

Yingling: "...I said..."

Demmer: "...three of the same."

Yingling: "...we already have data from populated counties."

Demmer: "Okay."

Yingling: "We... what we're trying to get is from less populated counties."

Demmer: "Wouldn't you like to see the citizen... I think we've talked about this citizen initiative before. Wouldn't you like to see this citizen initiative expanded to more counties?"

Yingling: "Wait, I'm sorry. What was that, Representative?"

Demmer: "I know we've talked about citizen initiatives before.

Wouldn't you like to see this initiative to empower citizens expanded to more than just the three smallest counties in the state?"

Yingling: "Yeah. If this is... if this works then, yes, absolutely.

If there is... if there is... if this pilot program is successful then absolutely."

Demmer: "So this referendum for that pilot program cannot be applied before the General Election of 2020. Is that correct?"

Yingling: "That is correct."

Demmer: "And then how long would you think we'd need to evaluate that to determine whether it worked well in those three counties?"

Yingling: "So, just to address the 2020 remark... the 2020 component here, is that I... I don't know if I'm going to get 71 votes on this. So it's going to push us off 'til next summer. So 2020

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

was the first available election date. The... I think we need to... we need to see... I'm curious to see if it happens quickly, if it happens... if doesn't happen at all. Similar to what we did with the DuPage Consolidation Pilot Program."

Demmer: "So in this model if we can't implement it until 2020, we're applying this only to the three smallest counties in the state that have township government. We might not know until what, 2024, '25, '26 about whether anybody even took advantage of this option. And then we... were a full decade away before any other county in the state... before citizens in other counties in the state can be empowered to consolidate their government?"

Yingling: "We could..."

Demmer: "Is a decade?"

Yingling: "We could..."

Demmer: "Are we willing to wait that long?"

Yingling: "We could know in 2020."

Demmer: "We could know, but we might not. We have three of the smallest counties in the state. They might not choose to do this and we'd have no lesson at all. Why not expand this to more..."

Yingling: "I mean, I..."

Demmer: "...than just the three smallest counties?"

Yingling: "Well, that's kind of... you know, that's what a pilot program is. We look at a pilot program and we figure out: What are the benefits? What are the detractors? You know, what works, what didn't work? And then go from there."

Demmer: "And I appreciate the idea of a pilot program. I guess I just suggest, we don't have geographic, regional or

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

population diversity by choosing the three smallest counties in the state. We should expand this to everybody. Citizens across the State of Illinois should have the ability to weigh in about how they want... they want their local government to be responsive to them. The last thing I'd mention is that, unlike the other three Bills that we've worked on today, there haven't been direct negotiations on this Bill. I certainly welcome that opportunity to do so. I think we can make this Bill, which is a... is a baby step towards something we discussed before, I think we should work to expand that to include other counties, to take into account the needs of people across the State of Illinois and to actually empower citizens to do something in sooner than a decade from now. I think this is too important of an issue for us to take a... you know, a last minute initiative that hasn't been negotiated and put it before the House today. So, for that reason, I'm going to have to urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative Yingling, how were the counties that are contained in your Bill chosen?"

Yingling: "I will respond to that in a moment, but I just want to follow up on something the previous speaker said..."

Hammond: "Sure."

Yingling: "...as it pertains to negotiation. It wasn't until just about an hour ago that a Member from the Republican side of the aisle came over and asked to negotiate on this. This is something that I took on myself because it was something that

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

was important to the Republican side of the aisle. And in the interest of getting a budget and getting these non-budgetary items off our plate so we can finally debate what we're supposed to be here to debate, which is a budget, I took it upon myself to ... to put forth this proposal. At no time did any Member of the Republican Caucus come up to me and say, hey Sam, I'd like to negotiate with you on government consolidation until just about an hour ago. So, it wasn't as though there weren't negotiations. Nobody from the Republican side wanted to even engage with me until an hour ago. So this is... this... what I'm putting forth here is my... a good faith offer to say, listen, I understand that this is an issue that's important to the Republican side and this is what I've put together. So, I... I don't want it to be categorized as some sort of disingenuous attempt because we've got to clear this off our plate so we can finally negotiate a budget. It's been too long. To your question, Representative Hammond..."

Hammond: "If you... if we may, Mr. Speaker, may we reset the timer, please?"

Speaker Lang: "No. You may proceed."

Hammond: "Really?"

Speaker Lang: "Asked a question, he's answering your question."

Hammond: "He was pontificating for an hour... or a minute and thirty seconds in my time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "You can have somebody give you a minute and thirty seconds of their time."

Hammond: "How were the counties chosen, Representative?"

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Yingling: "So, again, they were based on population and they were randomly selected through the middle portion of the state where we're trying to acquire more data."
- Hammond: "At any time, were the Members..."
- Yingling: "And they also... it was also, too, based on the similar number of townships that these counties have."
- Hammond: "At any time, was there any contact by you or someone from your staff made with the county board chairs or members of the county board asking them if they would be interested in this?"
- Yingling: "No. The county has nothing to do with this consolidation mechanism."
- Hammond: "Now, one of the counties in the Bill, Cass County, is in my district. The other two counties are in Representative Frese and I believe, Representative Phillips' district. Did you speak with either of those Representatives? Would..."
- Yingling: "I did not. They were randomly selected counties."
- Hammond: "So, you thought that was okay to just randomly select these counties and not talk to your colleagues that it involved?"
- Yingling: "It's data-driven, Representative. It's based upon population. It's based upon likeness of the number of townships that are in these counties."
- Hammond: "Regardless of that, Representative, I think that it would've been respectful to have at least given your colleagues a heads-up. And to your concern about the fact that no one asked you to... to negotiate with you on this, again, if you don't reach out to the colleagues that are involved in this consolidation, how are we to know? How are

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

we to know that we should be asking to negotiate with you, Representative?"

Yingling: "You know what, I am the chairman of the Government Consolidation Committee."

Hammond: "Oh, well that explains it."

Yingling: "Actually, yeah. It pretty much..."

Hammond: "Many of these..."

Yingling: "...does."

Hammond: "...many of these counties, Representative, may have a township of 100 people. When we're going to take a... a citizens' petition for 10 percent, that's going to be 10 people making a decision for that township."

Yingling: "Representative, under..."

Hammond: "You really think that's fair?"

Yingling: "...under the 4067 provision, every county was included and it wasn't 10 percent, it was 5 percent. So, in order to balance the interest of... of the various Members in this chamber, the 10 percent mark... it was raised from 5 percent to 10 percent and then we looked at the populations of the counties."

Hammond: "To my colleagues and to the... to the Bill. I would just say that this Bill is done in a way that there was never any discussion with colleagues on both sides of the aisle. And more importantly, there was no discussion with the colleagues whose counties are affected by this. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Butler: "Representative Yingling, when was the Amendment for this Bill filed?"

Yingling: "I'm sorry. What was that?"

Butler: "When was the Amendment that we're considering on this Bill filed?"

Yingling: "I believe it was today."

Butler: "June 28."

Yingling: "What is that?"

Butler: "June 28, today, right?"

Yingling: "Yes, today."

Butler: "So that doesn't leave a lot of time for discussion or negotiation, especially with people whose districts include the counties in the 'pilot project'. A month ago, when we considered SB3, and you and I had a lot of conversations on SB3, including some provisions concerning my home county of Sangamon, including some discussions you had with Mr. Olsen. And during the debate on SB3, I very specifically said, SB3 will be vetoed by the Governor without a trailer Bill, with the citizen-led initiative. So, is this... and you shook your head in affirmation, if we could pull the video, when I said that. Is this... is this your..."

Yingling: "Wait, I'm sorry, what was that last part?"

Butler: "You shook your head in affirmation when I said there needs to be a trailer Bill on the citizen-led initiative. Is this your answer on the citizen-led initiative?"

Yingling: "Yes, it is."

Butler: "Did the words... in our discussion, did the words 'pilot project' ever come up?"

Yingling: "I don't recall."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Butler: "Did the counties of Cass and Henderson and Cumberland ever come up?"

Yingling: "I don't recall."

Butler: "This is a bad faith effort. I sat on this floor a month ago and I told all of you that this was show of good faith. The reason you had Republican votes on SB3 is because of the work that this caucus did with the second floor to allow Republican votes to be on that Bill because we thought it was a good piece of legislation. And this is how... this is... this is the faith that we're shown back, a pilot project?"

Yingling: "The..."

Butler: "I think... to the Bill. You wonder why our side is frustrated when we have these... this... this summer stock theatre going on here today on these four Bills. This is why we're frustrated, because there are not good faith negotiations going on. There needs to be good faith negotiations going on."

Yingling: "With SB3 and HB..."

Butler: "To the Bill, Sir. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. If we want to get real, we need to have good faith negotiations. You know that Mr. Demmer's our point person on this. You filed this Amendment today. Pick up the phone and call him. You know that Mr. Frese or Mrs. Hammond or Mr. Phillips represent those counties that are in these Bills and you don't talk to them? That's not good faith at all. So, if we're going to get this deal done, and we want to get this deal done, there needs to be good faith. I yield my time to Representative Ives."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives for 1:50."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd... I would like to talk about one more thing. So the Amendment was filed today. Did your Amendment go through committee?"

Yingling: "Yes."

Ives: "It went through a committee?"

Yingling: "Yes, we had a committee meeting this morning."

Ives: "The Amendment that we're discussing now, this final Amendment, Amendment 2..."

Yingling: "That is..."

Ives: "...did it go..."

Yingling: "...that's Senate Bill 3, which overwhelmingly passed this chamber, and House Bill 607, which overwhelmingly passed this chamber. Both those Bills were heavily debated and that's what that additional Amendment did."

Ives: "I'm not on that committee, but I'm hearing that was a shell game and that this... this Amendment should've gone back through committee. So, that's not a good faith effort. Let's move on though. How many... in the DuPage consolidation model, how many... how many consolidations have they done? How many?"

Yingling: "I don't have that number on me, Representative."

Ives: "They've done three, all of them pretty much a scam. First one: Fairview Fire Protection District, where they turned it into an SSA, charging those residents three times more than the pay for fire district did. The second one: Century Lighting District, which is in my district, another scam. Where DuPage County took it over, made that into an additional cost to the county and charged those... and is charging them under the same SSA filing more money than before. So what, in your Bill, does anything... if you do consolidation, what does

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

it do to really save tax dollars? Is there any mandate saying that you can consolidate when you save tax dollars? Is that in your Bill anywhere?"

Yingling: "The... I'm sorry. The expansion of the DuPage pilot program?"

Ives: "I'm talk..."

Yingling: "Is that in the Bill?"

Ives: "Anywhere in your Bill, does it mandate that these consolidations going to take place when and if..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Ives: "That's my final question. Is are you... do you have anything
 in your Bill that ensures, when we consolidate, tax dollars
 are saved?"

Yingling: "There... there was nothing in 4067 to do that so."

Ives: "Thank vou."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis for five minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Representative, I'm a member of the Consolidation Committee. We did meet this morning. And so, to... it's clear to the rest of it, and we did vote on this Amendment and it did pass. My question is, did we or did we not, yesterday afternoon, have a very long and robust discussion... or not yesterday, I'm sorry... two days ago on government consolidation?"

Yingling: "Yes, we had a very long Committee of the Whole meeting, as it pertained to that."

Willis: "And during that we discussed the... the Durkin Bill which was, I believe, 4067, if I'm..."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Yingling: "Yes..."

Willis: "...correct?"

Yingling: "...we discussed that at length."

Willis: "Okay. In a number of the things that came up in that, you, as the chairperson of Government Consolidation, I'm assuming that is how you helped shape this Amendment. Is that not correct?"

Yingling: "That is correct."

Willis: "Okay. So, we have gone... to the Bill. We have historically oftentimes come up with pilot programs when we're trying something new. And we have done a pilot already, which we have expanded in our previous Bills on consolidation. This is a new type of way of doing consolidation with voter initiative. Mr... let me ask you again, Representative. One of the things that the key concerns that, I think, many Members of the committee and many Members of this floor brought up was the 5 percent threshold for allowing consolidation to come forth by the voters. Is that not correct?"

Yingling: "That is correct. There was a great deal of concern that 5 percent was simply too low."

Willis: "Right. And so that was one of the reason that you put forth this 10 percent threshold."

Yingling: "That is correct."

Willis: "Okay. Now, if we had gone through and put a tenth percent threshold on a very large county, like Cook County, what kind of havoc would that... would we actually have ever been able to probably see anything come forth on that on a pilot?"

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Yingling: "Again, the reason that there was focus on counties that have lower populations was because it was more achievable to get this question on to the ballot."
- Willis: "Right. So we had to have someone come up with 10 thousand signatures. The likelihood of actually seeing anything happen during the pilot period would be pretty slim. Also, the current pilot program that we are now expanding to the entire state, those counties are mostly in the northern part of the state. Is that not correct?"

Yingling: "That is correct."

- Willis: "So that was another reason that you chose to go for the center part of the state to look at different demographics?"
- Yingling: "Right. Exactly. As I... as I discussed earlier, we have an enormous amount of data right now, as it pertains to the populous counties. And we're trying to gather more data on the less populated counties in the more rural parts of the state."
- Willis: "Okay. To the Bill. This Bill is not something that just got thrown together, willy-nilly, like perhaps the Bill that we debated a couple of days ago on the House Floor on the Committee of the Whole. This one took a lot of forethought. It has taken a lot of, I think, constructive criticism, constructive work. It is not something that we ignored Members on the other side. In fact, it has a lot of input from people on the other side, previous to this week, that we've been... that I know from working with the chairperson that he has worked on, really, this entire Session on trying to make sure that he brings forth the best... best practices in consolidation. One of the reasons we do a pilot program is to

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

make sure we're doing best practices and we don't have to come back and clean up mistakes that do oftentimes get made if we've rushed to put things in for the entire state. I would urge this Body to vote 'aye' on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling to close."

Yingling: "Thank you. Again, I want to underscore that 90 percent of this Bill is SB3 and House Bill 607, which we overwhelmingly passed in a bipartisan way, which is sitting on the Governor's desk. This was an attempt to address concerns that were brought up by the Republican Caucus in... to try and compromise. We've got to move these non-budgetary items off our plate, so we can finally get to a budget. We have about 48 hours left of that. It's time to move this off our plate. I would encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill requires 60 votes. 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, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bill 162, Mr. Zalewski. Mr. Zalewski, before you begin, the Chair recognizes Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House… excuse me… on Senate Bill 484, I just want the record to reflect I wish to have been voted as a 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Record will reflect your intention. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 162."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 162, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #1. It becomes the Bill. It becomes the EDGE tax credit. I'm happy to debate it on Third."
- Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 has been offered by Representative Zalewski and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment..."
- Zalewski: "No."
- Speaker Lang: "...say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amend... Excuse me. Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "I wish to table Floor Amendment #2 and only adopt Floor Amendment #1."
- Speaker Lang: "Wish to withdraw Amendment 2?"
- Zalewski: "Withdraw... I wish to withdraw Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment 2, Mr. Clerk, so only Amendment 1 is on the Bill. And the Chair recognizes the Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 162, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 162, we've just Zalewski: had a few hours of back and forth on this chamber's inability to work together. This is a proof positive that it's possible. This is an agreed Bill that extends the EDGE tax credit for five more years. It happens to make a number of reforms to the program as well including changing the amount of the credit to a less... to a different amount based on the amount of training a company is willing to do, based on the job creation a company's willing to do, and based on where in the State of Illinois a company's wishing to do this... this new job creation. It has strong new reporting requirements with respect to who gets the credit. It has a new but-for clause, which basically it strengthens the department's ability to test whether the... whether the company's actually willing to invest here in Illinois. It has NBE and WBE and DDE reporting language and auditing language in here that makes sure that minority companies are able to participate in... in this program. Small business creation is going to increase as a result of this program. And it does retain some measure of retention, so that, if the state finds itself in the unfortunate position of having to deal with a company that may have to relocate, there exists a limited amount of ability for the department to work with this. This is agreed language with the department. I'd like to thank the Gentleman... Minority Spokesperson, Representative Harris. I'd like to thank Representative Wheeler. I'd like to thank Representative

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Davis for their work on this Bill. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields. You have two minutes, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative Zalewski, we've talked about this Bill many times. I want to just thank you for the… back and forth we've had on this. I know it's been moving very quickly in the last few days, but I do agree with your statement that this is an opportunity for us to demonstrate what we can do here. And the fact that… that not each side got every single thing that was possible that they could've asked for was something that… Excuse me, one second, Mike. Can we move this to Standard Debate, please, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes, at your request, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Much appreciated..."

Speaker Lang: "That'll give you..."

Wheeler, K.: "...thank you."

Speaker Lang: "...an additional three minutes."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Sir. Mike, I just want to go through one of the… couple of the elements here to make sure that some of the Members in… on both caucuses here are aware. 1) One of the things that I've been advocating for… for a long time is the fact that we've now leveled the playing field between our larger corporations and our smaller businesses in how they can take advantage of a tax credit. Would you say this Bill is an excellent first step in that direction?"

Zalewski: "Yes."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

Wheeler, K.: "I would agree. And I think you'll see that the business community has been a strong supporter of this variation of the Bill. Everybody from IMA to NFIB and many in between are in favor of this Bill including the Chamber. Mike, can you work with me just to talk about the clawback provision that's in here. This is a little different than what we've talked about in... in other iterations and what was in the Keep Illinois Business Act. This Bill... this Amendment, I guess, is going to provide us with the opportunity to clawback the entire length on an agreement, which we didn't have in the previous EDGE agreement. Is that right?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Wheeler, K.: "And then the funds that are clawed back in the case that a company does not complete the terms of their agreement that would allow those funds to actually go to the local workforce of development board in the area where that agreement... the project was slated. Is that right?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Wheeler, K.: "So then, ultimately, we're actually helping support the local workers by virtue of the fact that they're going to be able to be retrained through the funds of that workforce development board since they're the ones who are probably locked out of the situation where they were expected to have jobs. So, I think that's a great thing that everybody can agree with is a step in a better direction. Wouldn't you agree with that, Representative?"

Zalewski: "I would agree."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. This is... this is an opportunity for us to improve something. It

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

may not be a homerun as everyone hopes for. I'm not sure that everyone's going to agree and vote for this, but this is something that we actually are going to take a win on. And we have that opportunity in front of us. I'm kind of excited about it in a special way. At this point, I'm just going to turn it over to the next speaker and urge everyone to vote 'ves'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli for five minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The previous bit of legislation that was passed was a textbook example of how not to work in a bipartisan manner. It was a failure of the system to even see that Bill on the House Floor. And yet, now we follow it up with this piece of legislation that I want to thank Representative Keith Wheeler and Mike Zalewski 'Z' for working so hard on this. It's a compromise Bill and guess what, I don't believe the guy on the second floor is exactly thrilled with this bit of legislation. But you're going to see votes from our side of the aisle for it, because it's a worked out compromised bit of legislation. Right now here tempers are high, stress is almost off the charts. We need to step back, look at this Bill as an example of how negotiations can work and do work. I thank the Sponsors of this Bill for their leadership. They did a phenomenal job. I encourage an 'aye' vote. We need to do more of this, not less of this. running out. Thank you for your leadership, Gentlemen."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This Bill requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

who wish? Please record yourselves. Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 14 of the Calendar, Mr. Clerk. HR445, Mr. Harris. Mr. Clerk, apparently there's an Amendment."

- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Greg Harris and has been approved for considerations."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris, the Amendment becomes the full Resolution?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes, it does, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. On the Resolution, Mr. Harris is recognized."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. HR445 is a Resolution dealing with the response of our congressional delegation to the TrumpCare Bill and requesting that the Governor of Illinois firmly state to our congressional delegation that it is against the interest of the State of Illinois and the people of Illinois for TrumpCare to become law. This Bill was heard in a hearing earlier when the U.S. House of Representatives had first begun to introduce the TrumpCare proposal and the CBO had scored it as a massive loss of coverage for 24 million Americans. When that Bill passed out of committee, it was requested that I not bring it to the floor until we had seen what action the U.S. Senate took. It was the belief at the time that the U.S. Senate was going to take the House Republican Bill and either kill it and not call it or that they would make it better or less

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

mean, in the words of President Trump. What happened... what we saw this week was just the opposite happened. The U.S. Senate took a bad Bill in the TrumpCare Bill that was introduced into the House and made it worse. And this is going to affect not only the citizens of Illinois in their private lives, it is going to have tremendous detrimental effect in the State of Illinois on employment, in jobs, on income, on increasing costs to seniors, on massive premium increases, and 900 thousand people losing coverage. And to that end, let me just tell you, under the new Senate proposal that will go back to the House that President Trump would like to have us pass into law, 22 million people we now know from the CBO score this week will lose insurance coverage. In the State of Illinois almost 900 thousand people will lose coverage. Seven hundred and fifty-seven thousand, four hundred non-elderly Illinoisans will lose coverage. Children who will lose coverage under this Bill, 151,900. People will disabilities under this Bill who would lose coverage, 19 thousand. Adults loosing coverage, 221,400. Elderly persons losing their ability to get Medicaid and stay in nursing homes, 34,900. And here is a portion of it that very few people ever notice that is hugely important. People who have private health insurance, employer-sponsored health insurance, who would lose coverage under this proposal, 301 thousand. The job losses in the State of Illinois will be tremendous, too, at a time when this General Assembly is continually focusing on attracting and retaining employers to the State of Illinois. And while health care is one-sixth of our state's economy and one-sixth of our national economy, 329 thousand jobs were

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

created this year in health care, but in Illinois should TrumpCare pass, there will be a loss of 46 thousand jobs. Forty-six thousand jobs will leave the State of Illinois if the \$1.1 trillion impact on our national economy goes forward and Illinois has to pay its share. Senior cit... premiums for senior citizens will be allowed to double. Premiums for senior citizens will be allowed to double. Members of the President's Commission on Combating Drug Addiction and the Opioid Crisis have declared that enactment of this Bill will cause irreparable harm to the effort to combat opioid addiction in this country. Block granting and per capita caps will cost the State of Illinois \$4 billion in federal revenue each year, \$40 billion over the life of this program. And for those of you who thought that politicians in Washington would take a political look at this and try to push the worst effects of this forward, you would be wrong. When... if TrumpCare were to take effect, 68 percent of the losses of coverage and benefits will occur between now and the end of 2018. So, as all the Members of Congress and everyone who runs for office next year will be going out and will be talking to our constituents, talking about how we've helped them as a government, 900 thousand of them will have lost their insurance, 46 thousand will have lost their jobs, our state will have lost \$4 billion. And then as a bonus in the Senate plan, the actuarial value that insurers must put on their plans and on their premiums actually drops from 70 percent to 58 percent. Therefore out-of-pocket costs, deductibles, and premiums will have gone up for every single person who pays insurance, so that insurers, the large insurers, are able to

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

put more money directly into their pockets. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is bad public policy because it endangers the health and... of our citizens. It is bad public policy because it would cause tens of thousands of jobs lost in our state. It will cost our state billions of dollars. We need to send a message to the Governor and our congressional delegation to stop this madness, protect the people of Illinois, and oppose TrumpCare. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentlemen's Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Mr. Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "On page 12 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 4011. Leader Lang."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Lang: Amendments 1 and 2. This is the Bill that we debated in the House that created a fund for safety and security grants for not-for-profit organizations: mosques, synagogues, cemeteries, all kinds of not-for-profit organizations that could include schools as well. When the Bill left the House some, particularly on the Minority side of the aisle, did not want to vote for it because the fund of money that would be created would have been given to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State would have created the regulations and handled the program. We listened to your concerns and in the Senate we took this away from the Secretary of State and turned it over to the Illinois Emergency Management Agency, IEMA. They would create all of the necessary regulations to run this program. There is no money in this Bill. There's no appropriation authority in this Bill. This creates a fund of

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

money to protect the most vulnerable not-for-profit organizations in this state, which you know are under some security risk. Some of these organizations may use the money for special doors or alarms or lights, but the amounts of the grants, if we provide them because they're all subject to appropriation, would be determined by IEMA not by the Secretary of State. So, in an effort to compromise with those on the other side of the aisle who said, no, we think this should be a gubernatorial branch agency, this... these Amendments were put on the Bill. I ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Demmer."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Demmer: "Representative Lang, thank you for the clarification about how the Senate Bill changed this to IEMA. I have a question about when IEMA... should they receive money subject to appropriation, will this run through an existing grant program they have or will they create a grant program for the purposes of these funds?"

Lang: "This Bill creates a new grant program but, again, subject to appropriation and... and the..."

Demmer: "That's subject to oversight? I mean, does IEMA have a...
you know, just to make sure the dollars that are appropriated
are spent appropriately."

Lang: "Right. The Bill very specifically gives IEMA all rule-making authority, so you and I on JCAR can take a look at whatever they're doing, Sir."

Demmer: "Excellent. Thank you for the clarifications."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Ives: "Representative Lang, I'm sure you are a part of the Democrat budget Bill that dropped yesterday."

Lang: "Well, I'm not..."

Ives: "Did you help with that at all?"

Lang: "I'm not certain what you mean by a part of."

Ives: "Did you help have... did you have any input into that Democrat
budget Bill?"

Lang: "All Democrats had input into that."

Ives: "Oh, okay. Well, that's good."

Lang: "We're a very open and welcoming Party."

Ives: "Okay. So I just wanted to know, did you in your budget Bill put in money for this program you're asking for?"

Lang: "I think you'll find that there are no new programs in the spending plan that will be before you."

Ives: "But certainly this program that you're advocating for would require money from the state. Is that correct?"

Lang: "That is correct."

Ives: "And you did not put it into your budget Bill?"

Lang: "No, we did not."

Ives: "It's not in there."

Lang: "This is an austere spending plan which comes in dramatically below even the Governor's estimates."

Ives: "So, why are we doing this Bill when there's going to be no money put into it?"

Lang: "Well, we don't know what our receipts will be for the next fiscal year. And perhaps I'll convince you, Representative, and other Members on the floor to at some point provide a

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

supplemental or at some point provide some seed money to this program. I think we can agree that there are many not-for-profit organizations, the ones I suggested and hundreds of others, who are at a security risk from terrorists, foreign and domestic."

Ives: "I just wanted to point out that this is something you obviously are very passionate about, and there's no money for it and you didn't even add it into your budget Bill. And we have, you know, approaching \$16 billion in back bills, and this is just another one of those things where, you know, because of past decisions this Body has made you're not able to fund things nor can you ever fund all the wants of this Body. I... I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

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

Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Representative, I've just... in terms of reading the changes from the Senate and I was one of the ones that I... I've... was against the Bill originally because of the grant of money that, you know, we just didn't have any money, so it was kind of a false promise of hope there. But I want to make sure you... I know there's a question about in terms of defining the realm of expenditures. So this is intended, I see under (g-5)(1) in Amendment 2, that in order to get the money you've got to identify and substantiate prior threats or attacks by a terrorist organization, network, or cell against the not-for-profit. And, so is that... that's what you're trying to get after with this Bill. So, I mean, these are... this is a very

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

serious stuff by a terrorist network, terrorist organization, the terrorist cell, correct?"

Lang: "That is correct, Sir. You will recall perhaps that when we first debated this Bill, there had been a series of attacks on mosques, on Jewish cemeteries, on Jewish community centers, even on some public schools. And they're... many of them simply don't have the available resources to put in new alarm systems, new lights, new secured doors. And the idea here was let's create a program where we can help them when we are able to."

Breen: "Right. But... and I think you're... the Bill as it's come back from the Senate has kind of... it is... while we... I hear your list of... say if you're attacking a public school then that... I hear that, but I think you've... it sounds... it reads here at least that it appears the Senate really kind of narrowed and specified, I mean, really going after terrorist organizations, networks, or cells. So I think, at least as best I can tell, this is a little more... at least if you're going to put, you know, it terms of putting the money towards the security preparedness we have narrowed it a bit coming back from the Senate. I mean, am I reading that correctly?"

Lang: "It is slightly narrower. The most important part is we're going to allow..."

Breen: "Yeah. Might call it more focused even."

Lang: "Correct."

Breen: "Yeah."

Lang: "We're going to allow IEMA to set the rules and regulations.

And again, just as with the Gentlemen from Dixon, you and I

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

serve on JCAR, we're going to work on this together when the rules come through."

Breen: "Sure. And then in terms of... when we're talking about indicating... on the application you've got to indicate the symbolic or strategic value of the site. And that's the sort of thing the... I mean, kind of our classic example is, I mean, a synagogue is a symbolic site or maybe there's a historic synagogue or some sort of historic site, those might be subject to special... I mean, special security risks by terrorists, whether they're going after... whatever our equivalent of the Vatican would be or going after some of the most holy sites in our state."

Lang: "So, that's why we've left broad rule making power for IEMA to deal with those issues which is why I think it was actually a good change in the Senate that we removed it from the Secretary of State and allowed this program to live in this new agency."

Breen: "Fair enough. I'll be supporting your Bill. Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4011?' This is final action. It requires 71 votes. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those 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 94 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Bill 4011. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, on Supplemental Calendar #1, under Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 948. Representative Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 948, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1281. Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second..."
- Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, out of the record.

 Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1281."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1381, Representative Phelps. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1381, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1427, Representative Hays. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

67th Legislative Day

6/28/2017

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading."
- Speaker Crespo: "Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House will adjourn until Thursday, June 29, at the hour of 10 a.m."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill
 210, offered by Representative Daniel Burke, a Bill for an
 Act concerning gaming. First Reading of this Senate Bill.

 There being no further business, the House Perfunctory
 Session will stand adjourned."