86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come in to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on November 8, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1607."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. We shall be led in the prayer today by the Phelps Sisters, who will be singing our prayer. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. The Phelps Sisters."
- Phelps Sisters: "We have sung this song many a places, but I feel like this couldn't be the more appropriate place. This is a song of humility, Not My Will Thine Be Done."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. We shall be led in the Pledge today by Mr. Wehrli."
- Wehrli et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. There are no excused absences among House Democrats today."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Who's making the Republican announcement? Mr. Breen is recognized."
- Breen: "Please excuse Representative Bennett for the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

 We have 116 Members answering the roll and do have a quorum.

 The Chair recognizes Mr. Swanson."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed, Sir."

Swanson: "Thank you, Sir. I've got two Honorary Pages here with me today I'd like to introduce to you. The first one is Caden Wilson. He goes to Galesburg High School and he's a junior. He serves on... as a varsity soccer team captain, on track, with a C.A.R.E. Program volunteer, he's a peer tutor for other students. He's in the marching band, concert band, jazz band, German Exchange Program participant. He's on the church worship team at Knox-Galesburg Symphony, Junior High Ministry Team Leader Fellowship of Christian Athletes. He was a 2016 varsity soccer MVP, 2017 team captain, 2017 All-District Orchestra, German National Honor Society and Academic Excellence awards. Caden's father currently serves in the Illinois Air National Guard as a chaplain at the Springfield base. His father is also the pastor at Bethel Baptist Church in Galesburg. So with that, I'd like to welcome Caden Wilson."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thank you very much.

We're happy you're here with us today. Representative Jimenez is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Jimenez: "Thank you. Members of the General Assembly, I want to bring special attention today to one our state workers who left us too soon earlier this year. Bert Weber worked for the Illinois Department on Aging for 37 years as a state employee. He always focused on the needs of older adults and how to best get them needed services. He truly believed in the

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

principles of the Older Americans Act and how it focuses on the needs of serving older adults in Illinois and throughout the nation. Through thick and thin, and during our budget impasses, Bert was one of the toughest advocates at the Illinois Department on Aging to make sure our seniors didn't miss a meal or a necessary service. He was extremely supportive of all those in the field whom he'd always refer to as good folks. And no matter when or where, he always made you feel as if you were the most important person in the aging network. As we all know, the job Bert was doing wasn't really a job at all. These were people he truly cared about. We are joined today by his family and many members of the Department on Aging staff in the gallery, who have taken time off today to honor Bert's memory. Those who worked side by side with him every day knew all too well that the department was Bert's joy. He worked early. He worked late. He worked on weekends from home or the office. He was the one who turned on the light for anyone staying after 5:30 p.m. And for any female coworkers staying late at night Bert, without a word, would casually escort her to her car. Of course, we all knew Bert would never retire. He lived to serve the population he cherished for decades. He made a difference in his little cubicle by the window. He never complained, he was humble and loyal. And we are very thankful for every minute God gave him. Unfortunately, he lost his battle with cancer earlier this year. Even in his last days at the hospital, he was very worried about his unfinished work back at the office. He didn't want to let the seniors down or the people who provide those services in all of our communities. We are joined today

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

by Beth Weber in the gallery, Bert's wife, and his children, Seth and Leah. Thank you very much for sharing your husband and your father with us in the service to the State of Illinois and our seniors. I'd ask the Members to give his family and the staff a moment of silence to signify our appreciation for his service here in Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "The chamber will take a moment of silence. Thank you, Representative. And to the family, thank you. Members may be seated. Representative Gabel is recognized."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Gabel: "So, I rise today and I ask you to join me for a moment to recognize November as National Prematurity Awareness Month. So prematurity is when a baby is born less than 37 weeks, normally a baby is born 40 weeks. When a baby is born prematurely, it means that they have a risk of having cerebral palsy, a risk of blindness, deafness. According to the just released March of Dimes Premature Birth Report Card, the health of babies in Illinois has taken a step backwards for the second year in a row. We can do better than this. The March of Dimes Premature Birth Report Card is a public wake-up call, an urgent call to all of us for action to make sure that our babies in our state are not born premature. Please join me in supporting the youngest Illinoisans among us so they may get the best start possible. If anyone would like a copy of the report, I have copies available. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: Thank you, Representative. Mr. Carroll is recognized. For what reason do you rise?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Carroll: Thank you, Speaker. I'm here to introduce a group of moms that are here today, Moms Demand Action. I'm holding up their shirt here. They are very active in our community which started in the wake of Sandy Hook by mom Shannon Watts, who had enough of the gun violence. They're a large counterweight to the NRA, and they support things like commonsense gun laws and violence... violence prevention legislation. So, I see some of them are up there right now. If we could give them a round of applause."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative."

Carroll: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "And welcome to the House chamber. Thank you for joining us today. Mr. Morrison."

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

Morrison: "Joining me today is our... my Honorary Page, Conner Bolanos, thank you. He is a participant in the Model United Nations at Fremd High School and would you please give him a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Welcome, happy you're here with us. Mr. Sauer is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Sauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ask the Body what President Clinton; President Gerald Ford; First Ladies: Eleanor Roosevelt, Nancy Reagan; Nelson Mandela; John Lennon; Steve Jobs; Dave Thomas at Wendy's; and John Hancock all have in common? They're famous and they're all adopted. They were all adopted. This month, the month of November, is National

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Adoption Month. And all of those famous people were adopted and there are so many countless more that someday will be famous for the families, and for the work, and for all the things that they're going to do in their life. I wanted to recognize two people in this chamber who've been heroes. One is Representative Breen, who's an adopted father. Another is who's working as a foster mom and Representative Wallace. There's so much to be done on the topic of adoption and on foster care. I want to thank the Body for that work. And let's all recognize the adopted parents and the adoptions to happen in Illinois in National Adoption Month. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Leader Durkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Durkin: "Yesterday afternoon, Representative Tom Bennett had to leave Session unexpectedly. He indicated to me that his mother of 93 years was in a... in a bad way. And Tom called me up this morning and his mother did pass away overnight. And 93 years old, but the fact is what a great life. And she can truly say... he can say that she did pass the finish line. So, if we could keep Tom and his family in our thoughts and prayers. And if we have a brief moment of silence, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mrs. Bennett."

Speaker Lang: "Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you, Leader Durkin. Mr. Swanson is recognized."

Swanson: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Swanson: Thank you. At this time I would like to introduce my second Page of the day. Her name is Lauryn Russell. She's from Mercer County Intermediate School in sixth grade. Many activities in school including Girls in Real Life Situations, an organization. She's very involved in music, she's a member of the First Baptist Church of Aledo, she plays a guitar in a praise band, and also gives time of her free will to teach others how to play the guitar. She's nominated to attend the National Pathways to STEM Leadership program at Loyola University, Chicago. What I'd like to bring to your attention is that she's... she has Lyme disease. And with Lyme disease, she's also an awareness advocate. Earlier today, she spoke to Senator Manar and his staff in trying to bring an end to this... this Lyme disease. She's accompanied with her mother, Jennifer, who's also a strong advocate on Lyme disease and also her grandparents are up here in the gallery with us today. Her father, Steve Struble, who's a retired captain from the Illinois State Police and her grandma, Adell Struble. So, if we could all give them a nice warm welcome to Springfield. Thank you."

Spiker Lang: "Thank you and welcome to the House chamber.

Representative Manley is recognized."

Manley: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Manley: "Since we will hopefully be adjourning later today, I want to wish my seatmate, Katie Stuart, a happy birthday which is January 12. So happy... happy... oh, I'm sorry, November 12. I want to move this along, Katie. Happy birthday. She won't

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

tell her age, but I'm sure it's very, very young. Happy birthday."

Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday, and to any Member who has a birthday til we come back. Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Guzzardi: "I want to rise to congratulate everyone who won a victory in yesterday's elections. And I want to... all around the country, and I wanted to highlight in particular a historic thing that happened last night. We will be joined for the first time... one of our colleagues in a State Legislature in this country will be a transgender woman, Danica Roem, who won election in Virginia. She'll be the first openly trans woman Legislator in the history of this country. It's an important, historic milestone. I think she deserves a round of applause from the Body. And history was made elsewhere in the country as well. St. Paul, Minnesota elected its first African-American mayor. Charlotte, North Carolina, in my home state, elected its first Africa-American woman mayor. It was a historic night in many ways. And I want to congratulate all those that participated in the democratic process."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Bellock: "I'd just like to welcome everyone to join us. Theresa Mah, Kathleen Willis, and I, and Julie Morrison were part of a National Women in Government Task Force on Diabetes. And

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

then we have a lot of other Members of the Diabetes Caucus and we're all going to be downtown in Chicago on November 14 at 11:30 for a press conference to introduce the state's Diabetes action plan. So, we'd like to have everybody... anybody who would like to, to join us. And this month everybody is making Diabetes Awareness today downstairs. As Representative Willis announced yesterday, there is a whole setup of different things about diabetes. And we'd like all of you, again, to go down there and if you can, possibly, next week join us. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Leader Durkin."

- Durkin: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm here... I'm pleased to introduce a Page for the day, who's come from LaGrange, Illinois. He's to my left, his name is Genaro Giovingo-Mino. He is a sophomore at Lyons Township High School which happens to be where my daughter goes and happens to be a sophomore as well. And she's not dating anybody either. So, but anyway, I wanted to welcome him here. His mother, Jen, is in the gallery. And if we could extend them a warm Springfield welcome, I'd appreciate it."
- Speaker Lang: "Glad to have you with us on floor. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 88, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Wednesday, November 08, 2017, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 16, 2018, in perfunctory session; and

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Friday, January 19, 2018, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Monday, January 22, 2018, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 23, 2018, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 24, 2018, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Friday, January 26, 2018, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 30, 2018, or until the call of the Speaker; and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, November 09, 2017, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 10, 2018, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 17, 2018, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 24, 2018, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 30, 2018, or until the call of the President."

- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of... Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution.

 Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk,

 Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on January 08, 2017: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 84, and Senate Joint Resolution 36. Representative

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on November 08, 2017: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 351; and recommends be adopted is House Resolution 662. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on November 08, 2017: recommends to be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 171. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on November 08, 2017: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 193."

Speaker Lang: "Page 5 of the Calendar. Senate Bills-Second Reading.

Senate Bill 1936, Mr. Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1936, a Bill for an Act concerning State

Government. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous

day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered

by Representative Davis."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1936. Senate Bill 1936 as was introduced and came over from the Senate, represents the work of the Budgeting for Results Commission that I have been a part of and Representative Harris... David Harris is a part of as well. We are on the Mandates Committee and what the committee generally does is reaches out to all the state agencies to ask them if they have any outdated, unused acts or statutes that can be... we tried to, in one Bill, try to remove. We have passed these types of Bills before, and this

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Bill represents the latest effort. But after review by our staff, they felt that some of the Acts and the mandates that we wanted to originally take out may need more conversation about before the commission simply makes that request. And so, the Amendment restores a number of the Acts and mandates that we were originally... we were originally trying to take out to allow them for more discussion which may be still be removed at some point in the future. But we're restoring these so that those conversations can take place and the only thing that it does actually eliminate is the requirement for the Department of Aging to create what was a community care program. Be more than happy to... first of all, ask for the adoption of the Amendment or we can take questions now Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, can we move it to Third."

Breen: "Well, I'd like to know just what... The underlining Bill came to us from the Senate looks pretty good. What it... it looks like there's some monetary provisions that are put back in by the Amendment. And I'm just wondering if the Representative can clarify the... particularly the expense points. Places where there's money being spent."

Davis: "Well, Representative, if I may. So again, the original Bill removed a number of what we thought were obsolete Acts, mandates as well as some funds that have no money in them or have never been used. The Amendment does not add back... the Amendment adds back Acts and mandates to allow for additional discussions. The funds, I'm being told, are still being removed."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Breen: "And so, what you're saying is your underlining Bill has a number of changes. I believe there are roughly 80 of them. You are with your Amendment merely removing a few of the 80. Or are you actually changing substantive laws? Are you taking the 80 down to 75 or 70?"

Davis: "I guess that would be a great way to characterize it, yes."

Breen: "That is correct then?"

Davis: "Yes."

Breen: "So that's what your Amendment is doing. Thank you."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1936, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis, have you already explained the Bill?" Davis: "Absolutely."

Speaker Lang: "Seeing no debate, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourself, Members. Andrade. Connor. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions. And no, we're not finished."

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 688, offered by Representative Olsen. House Resolution 689, offered by Representative Lang. House Resolution 690, offered by

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Representative Pritchard. House Resolution 691, offered by Representative Breen. House Resolution 692, offered by Representative Mah."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie, moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Page 5 of the Calendar under the Concurrence, House Bill 171, Representative Moeller. Please proceed on your Motion."

Moeller: "Make a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lang: "Please explain what the Amendment does, Representative."

Moeller: "Okay. Senate Amendment #1 simply codifies the practice of county board chairmen, who are elected via popular vote, the ability to create standing committees, appoint members and chairpersons with the advice and consent of the majority of the county board. This change only applies to counties with a population between 300 thousand and 900 thousand where the chairman, as I mentioned, is elected by the voters of the county. Currently, McHenry and Kane Counties meet these requirements. However, if the chairman of either Will County or Lake County were to be elected by the voters, they too will be subject to this requirement. I know of no opposition to this vote and request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I... I see in my analysis that the Township Officials of Illinois are opposed to your Bill. So, was that..."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Moeller: "I think they were... they were opposed to the underlying Bill. This... this change is a gut and replace. And so, I... I am not aware of any opposition to this Amendment."
- Breen: "And it appears it came out of committee on partisan lines. Well, Senate Amendment 1 recommended be adopted by a committee 4 to 3. So, obviously there was some objection to this Bill, at least, here in the House. I guess my first question is, why... why is this Bill limited to counties having a population between 300 thousand and 900 thousand?"
- Moeller: "Because these are the counties currently that have... that meet... that fit the criteria of having a county board chairman who is elected by the voters."
- Breen: "But why... why wouldn't you allow every county board chairman to have the same power to create standing committees..."

Moeller: "And currently..."

Breen: "...and appoint members to standing committees?"

- Moeller: "Sure. It's my understanding that this is current practice. This just merely codifies the ability of these county board chairmen to do this."
- Breen: "But again, I'm just not sure. Why wouldn't you... why are you limiting the applicability when... if it's a good Bill then? You know we've had lots... we've had lots of initiatives where when you... oh wait, we're exempting Chicago. Oh well, we're exempting these guys. Oh, we're only going to apply it to... to DuPage or to Kane. If it's good practice, why are we not doing it across the state?"

Moeller: "Sorry, did you have a question? What was your question?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Breen: "If you were listening to the debate, which I believe you're in the midst of, why is it that this is limited to 2 counties out of 102?"
- Moeller: "Well, as I mentioned, this would be counties such as Will and Lake. An additional two would be eligible, would fit this criteria were they to change their... the process for selecting county board chairmen. And I as mentioned before, county board chairmen currently can follow this process. They have the ability to under current statute. This Bill would make it a requirement in these specified counties."
- Breen: "To the Concurrence Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, look there are plenty of counties besides those two and at least the one I come from, DuPage County, where if this is a good idea it should be the law there too. This is yet another attempt where we sit there and exempt... I mean, Cook County is exempt, DuPage is exempt, it only applies to 2 counties. Doesn't mention anything about Lake County and other counties as well that may go to elected chairman by their... by the laws. If this is a good idea, it should apply across the state. If it's not a good idea then it should be defeated. So again, Ladies and Gentlemen, I recommend a 'no' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard, I'm going to use the two minute clock on all remaining speakers. Mr. Pritchard, for two minutes."

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

 Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."
- Pritchard: "Representative, in our analysis it talks about giving the county board chairman the right with consent of the majority of the Body to make appointments and committee chairs. Isn't that already the process?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Moeller: "Yes, it is the process if the county... if any county board wants to engage in that process. This Bill merely makes it a requirement in the specified counties in this Bill."
- Pritchard: "So is there a reason that again just these two counties are given that right or authority?"
- Moeller: "Everybody... every county board chairman currently has that right. This just makes it a requirement. So, that county..."
- Pritchard: "But why not require it of others?"
- Moeller: "So that county boards cannot usurp the... the ability of the county board chairman to make these types of appointment."
- Pritchard: "No. My point is, why not require this of the other counties that have a chief elected official?"
- Moeller: "The downstate county board chairmen already have this ability as I mentioned they can currently..."
- Pritchard: "No. It's not the ability; it's the requirement, you said. So if we're making it a requirement, why not make it a requirement of all of the counties that have chief elected officials?"
- Moeller: "It's my understanding that the reason it applies to these counties is because the chairmen are elected by popular vote, not by the board... not by the county board."
- Pritchard: "But there are other counties that's that the case."
- Moeller: "It's my understanding that county board chairman in those counties can appoint without the advice and consent of their boards. This would be diminishing their ability. And so, I'm assuming that they wouldn't want that requirement placed on them. The counties that are included in this Bill all are supportive... the chairmen are all supportive of this Bill. In

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

reference to a comment that was made regarding DuPage County, DuPage County did not want to be included in this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Your time has expired, Sir. Please complete your remarks."

Pritchard: "So I would just go to the second area I was going to ask questions about. And that's in the area where... where it was mentioned earlier that we're raising questions... we're raising questions about the ability of consolidation and not giving voters the right in any other county besides these two. Is there a reason that again that it is limited to these two?"

Moeller: "Is there... I'm sorry can you repeat that last?"

Pritchard: "Why we're allowing this consolidation by citizens in just these two counties?"

Moeller: "This doesn't address that issue. This doesn't address how the county board chairmen are elected in those counties."

Pritchard: "But I thought that was one of the primary reasons for this Amendment..."

Moeller: "No this only applies..."

Pritchard: "...and that's why the township officials are opposed to it."

Moeller: "The township officials were opposed to the underlying Bill not to this Amendment."

Pritchard: "Thank you."

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

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the Bill. There's a little history that needs to be put in place here. About five years ago, McHenry County voted down a referendum to create a county executive form of government. After that, what happened was

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

we put on the ballot a move to have a popularly elected county board chairman. What we have now is a county board chairman, who was the Sponsor of that Bill, who is now the county board chairman, who wants now to turn the county board chairman job which is limited in its authority to the very things that the people of McHenry County have wanted them to do. He wants to turn this into another... in effect, a county executive form of government. So, I think if there is going to be any kind of effort made to change the relationship between the county board chairman and the people of McHenry County, I believe it should be done at the local level. It should be done by referendum within McHenry County. Let the people of McHenry County decide what is they want in the form of county government, and not have the State of Illinois put... put its stamp of approval upon something that is... has already been turned down by the people of McHenry County. This is a second bite at the apple. If you are going to bite the apple, do it at the county level. I will vote 'no' on this Bill. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Walsh: "So this was brought forth to committee today in Counties & Townships. And let's just clarify what's going on. For right now, every county board chairman that has a... whether its chairman is elected by its fellow board members or if they're elected county wide by a popular vote determine the standing committees and appoint those members and chair persons to those standing committees, correct?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Moeller: "Correct. They have the ability to do that. Yes."

Walsh: "So right now, each and every one of them do except for one. Would that be correct in saying?"

Moeller: "That's my understanding."

Walsh: "And right... the way the language is written, it's for populations between 300 thousand and 900 thousand. Which would only affect four counties. Will County is an executive form of government, so it doesn't apply. I think Lake County, they already do this if I'm not mistaken."

Moeller: "I believe in Lake County, the chairman is elected by the board."

Walsh: "By the board?"

Moeller: "By the board. But they... if they change where the..."

Walsh: "They would be able to follow this."

Moeller: "Yes."

Walsh: "And then Kane County..."

Moeller: "And they do support this Bill."

Walsh: "...already practices this. And this is just codifying the practice that they currently do across the state under the county chairman forms of government."

Moeller: "Exactly. Exactly."

Walsh: "I mean it's pretty simple Bill. All it's doing is codifying an already existing practice. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler for two minutes."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I was a McHenry County Board member for ten years and each year we were able to adopt our own rules. This is what... I've heard from many county board members. Unlike what the Sponsor said, they are not all in favor of this. I can't speak for Kane, but I know

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

McHenry is really struggling. They are one of the largest county boards in McHenry County with 24 members. And now with the new change that was supported by one of our former colleagues to create a county board... county wide seat. Not an executive, that's not what was voted on. So the rules that Representative Walsh was referring to was how Will County does it. They have a county executive. That's not what McHenry County voted on, so you can't change the rules necessarily on the people who voted for the countywide. We now have 24-board members and a county board chairman, which is in my mind is far too big of a county board. Having said that, though, they place the rules because the 24 board members wanted to make sure that they created their committee members and elected their chair. This is what they asked for. This is what the voters knew they were getting into. This is what I ask that you continue and maintain. Please, vote 'no'."

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

Welter: "Mr. Speaker to the Bill. As a former county board chairman coming to this General Assembly, I have to agree with many of my colleagues and their statement on this side. This really seems like a local issue where a chairman may not be agreeable with their board when it comes to the committees. I think that the current practice is probably good. It's a local practice, more local control. I would encourage a 'no' vote on this Bill. I don't believe that it's a good Bill and that's all I have to say."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Davidsmeyer: "So currently... in the past... in the past... let's say in the past ten years, how have they, McHenry County, how have they done their rules in the past? Has the state told them what their rules are supposed to be?"
- Moeller: "They follow whatever, you know, whatever is allowed by statute. Representative... the representative from McHenry County who spoke previously would have more intimate knowledge of how their board created their rules. But under current statute, the county board chairman has the ability to name the chairs of each of the standing committees and create the standing committees. But for whatever reason, it's been thwarted by that board. This would require that the process be followed as it's followed in most counties."

Davidsmeyer: "So, how do... how does the General Assembly do its rules? How does the House of Representatives do its rules?"

Moeller: "We... we adopt our rules of our chamber."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Moeller: "But counties are an instrument of the state as are other local governments and are subject to state statute and state rules... State Law."

Davidsmeyer: "But the state statute currently allows them to do their own rules in this process, correct? It currently allows them to."

Moeller: "Yes, it currently allows them to."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So..."

Moeller: "It currently allows the county board chairman to name the chairs of the standing committees. However, as I mentioned, for whatever reason, he's not..."

Davidsmeyer: "Unless the local government makes a rule..."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Moeller: "...been given that ability by his own board."

Davidsmeyer: "...differing that. If it's in statute then why do we need to change it?"

Moeller: "I've mentioned it a couple of times. Because it's not being followed or granted to the county board chairman in this particular county."

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

Davidsmeyer: "So... I'll get some extra time yielded to me."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jesiel will give you two additional minutes."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So it sounds to me like that they are violating statute as is. If we change statute and they violate it again, what are you going to do? Is that what they're doing? Are they currently violating statute? Is that what you're saying?"

Moeller: "I'm sorry, who is they?"

Davidsmeyer: "McHenry County."

Moeller: "They have... it's not mandated, but the county chairman has the ability to."

Davidsmeyer: "So, it's not in statute. They're not violating statute. They made their own rules. So, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think we've got a situation where a former colleague of ours created a county-wide position, rose to power into that position, is trying to consolidate power into different committees and what not. And so, you have a power grab. This is not a dictatorship. He's not rising to power over everybody. This is still an elected board that can make their own rules and I think you have to think about this. What if the Federal Government stepped in and did the same

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

thing to us? I know that we're not... I know that we technically created the Federal Government, but there are a lot of people that believe it's the opposite. So, I think we have to think long and hard about this. Every time one of your former colleagues comes back and doesn't get their way at the county level, are we going to change the rules so that your former colleague can use their clout here to move forward their personal agenda? We've got a major issue here and he was friend to many of ours, but this is not the right thing to do. Think about it, this is not the right thing to do. Think about it, this is not the right thing to do. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller to close."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've had an extensive debate on this. Contrary to how this is being characterized, this is not creating a dictatorship within the counties that are included in this Bill. It... it... the county board chairman will still have to get the advice and consent of the county board in order to make these appointments. It grants the authority that's already been given to these county board chairmen to craft and staff their standing committees as they see... as they feel best serves the county. This is merely codifying current practices in most of our counties and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "This requires 60 votes. 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And the House does concur and the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

171. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 299, Representative Ammons. Please proceed on your Motion."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for a concurrence with Senate Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 299, which enhances the efficient operations of SURS. No impact to member benefits in this concurrence and I move for an 'aye' vote."

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

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, can you just explain again the changes that you're making to the State University Retirement System again."

Ammons: "Sure. We're just actually codifying some practices that are already in place. They've been long standing, such as requiring that a person cannot backdate their disability retirement annuities, they can't backdate them after they've been terminated for instance. They codify long standing practice of SURS in which participants disability benefits are discontinued upon failure to provide an earnings verification, a statement necessary to determine eligibility of their benefits. It corrects the definition of service to reflect the enactment of Public Act 99-0897 which is already in place, but the correction of the definition of service needed to be done. And this Amendment does that."

Breen: "So it looks like it's protecting the... the funds in the retirement system. So that..."

Ammons: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay, fair enough. Thank you."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- 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? Please record yourselves. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting present. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 299. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 2 of the Calendar. House Bills. Third Reading. House Bill 1262. Leader Currie. Please read the Bill. Lady wishes to move the Bill to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. Please do that, Mr. Clerk, and read the Bill in order of Second Reading."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1262, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill is read for a second time previously.

 Amendment #1 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on the Amendment."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move for an adoption of Amendment and then I will discuss the Bill on Third."
- Speaker Lang: "Without objection, those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1262, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the Bill dealing with the school waiver process that we created

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

when we did the Education Funding Reform Bill. And I'm in favor of a streamlined waiver process, but I think something slipped through accidentally. And that is, that it is possible for a local school district to request a waiver that would mean an increase in local property taxes. Unless we adopt House Bill 1262, there's a possibility that that could happen without us having any say-so. We created all kinds of laws about what the tax rate can be, how high things can go at the local school district level. And I think it would be a mistake for us not to stand behind the decisions that we have made in those respects. I think it would be a mistake for us to allow a school district to raise property taxes without our authority... without our giving them that authority. So, I would be happy to answer your questions and I'd be grateful for your support."

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

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

Pritchard: "And Representative, I appreciate the fact that you've amended this Bill to narrow it down to one of the issues that the underlying Bill had listed. And the fact that I think a number of the Members on our side of the aisle would have concerns as well about a school district having the authority to raise its own property taxes without oversight from the Legislature. I initially had concerns that this is weakening, if you will, the streamline waiver process and I appreciate your assurance that this is not that attempt, that this is just, one, trying to close a loophole that I think a majority

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

of us would support. So, I would encourage support for the Leader's Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4096, Representative Greg Harris. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 40..."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record. Sorry, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 1252, Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk." Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1252, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, I rise today to present House Bill 1252. House Bill 1252... House Bill 1252 will promote civic education and engagement... engagement among youth by ensuring all elementary school students learn the basics of civic education. This may be better, thank you. At a very young age, students develop an excitement about elections and understanding of government institutions, and gains a sense of their rights and responsibilities as a participant in our democracy. This process is not inherent, but rather a product of a... our conscious cultivating it... learning in our classrooms. All of us stand here today in this chamber, we are living examples of the importance of civic education. Implementing civic

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

education in elementary schools is an investment in our state. An investment in state for our good future in the State of Illinois. If we educate students in civics from a young age, they are more likely to engage with government at all levels. A more engaged citizenry will hold government accountable and help ensure its function to the best of its ability. Sadly, only 25 percent of the U.S. citizens reach... U.S. students reach the proficiency standards of the NEA... NAEP Civic Assessment. This must change. I believe it is time, and it is the right time to bring civic education to our elementary classrooms. The infrastructure for civic, professional development is in place and already privately funded. I will implore the General Assembly to vote 'yes' on House Bill 1252 and vote 'yes' for a more engaged citizenry. Thank you for your consideration. I'll take any questions. And if there's no questions, I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I've got in my notes... the analysis. The Sponsor agreed to work on the language to make the utilization of private funds more prevalent and it doesn't look like there's private funds here."

Lilly: "Yes. We have worked with the MacArthur Foundation and currently there's over a million dollars that have been allocated. And our schools... our elementary and middle class and... middle school, excuse me, students will be accessing those dollars."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Breen: "And as I understand it, and I think someone else can speak to it, we did a high school civics program that was supported by the school districts, it was negotiated, and it was a broad-based approach. This doesn't necessarily... doesn't appear to be the same sort of matter. Why is there not concurrence from the school districts on your Bill?"
- Lilly: "It's my understanding that they are thinking of it is to be a Home Rule matter."
- Breen: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentleman, there is no dispute that civics education is important. The problem is, this is a very significant mandate on every junior high school in the state. It was not done in collaboration with the school districts like our prior civics work had been done. For that reason, this Bill is not ready to go. It's certainly not something that we should be considering in this very compressed schedule of a Veto Session. Again, this is something again, may be a good idea but not in this format. And certainly not over the very strong objections of the school districts. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

- Pritchard: "Representative, I appreciate your concern for the citizen... the future citizens of our state to have an understanding of government, but isn't the civics course that were teaching in high school sufficient?"
- Lilly: "At this... at this time, I don't believe so. The student has the ability to have or is required to have civic education within the four years of their high school, and they may

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

choose their senior year. With what's going on in our state, what's going on in our country, their civic responsibility is urgent. And to understand what your role is and how you can participate and engage to make sure that the future of our state is bright. Our young people need to gain that knowledge and understanding of their civic responsibility earlier than their senior year in high school."

Pritchard: "So, don't we already require junior high students to take the Constitution test and to study the Constitutions of the State of Illinois and of the United States?"

Lilly: "Yes."

Pritchard: "Shouldn't that be considered civics?"

Lilly: "It's... at this point in our country, it's not enough. As I'm..."

Pritchard: "Well, how much is enough?"

Lilly: "...it doesn't discuss current issues. Twenty-five percent of the U.S. students are not proficient in the standards of the NAEP, 25 percent."

Pritchard: "Well if you'll... Madam, I'm running out of time. If you look up our state tests for the... for PARCC, you'll find out that only 38 percent of the students or there about can read a grade level or do math at grade level. To me it seems like we were giving enough civics in junior high. We ought to rely on our requirement and funding that's available for high school students. This is really overreaching and I don't think we can afford it right now. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Lilly: "As I mentioned..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. When we recently passed the Bill to create citizens education as part of high school, when we first as a Body saw that Bill, it was much the same way that I see it presented to the elementary districts in House Bill 1252 before us. That Bill simply said you have to teach a semester of civics. The problem when we saw that the first time with the high school Bill is that leaves those schools with the questionable, but what do we have to drop because there are all these other mandates: Math, English, Science, etc. In the end, by negotiating what we said is okay there are two years of social studies, let's make one semester of that for civics. That was something everyone could get behind, the schools could get behind, it was clear how it was going to be presented to the students within the school day. As I said, the Bill before us, much like that original Bill dealing with high school civics, doesn't provide the necessary guidance for what in their programs does this replace. Because we're not changing the number of hours in the school day. Therefore, a semester of civics will have to replace a semester of something else in the sixth, seventh, or eighth grades as this is written. What I think we need to do is we need to get together and say, what is the right way to fit that in. Civics education is important, but let's make sure we identify how does that fit into the school day for the three years that are identified in this Bill. I think this Bill is not ready yet, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Wallace: "And so, to the point of the previous speaker. The discussion is where does those this fit in and that we haven't provide enough guidance. Do you have suggestions as to how this could fit into the overall curriculum?"
- Lilly: "Yes. And we've had that discussion with many of the people who are opposing this legislation. And many of the discussions that we've had with the social studies teachers and their professional standards, they are wrapping it around existing services or existing programs and education in the classroom. It does not extend the day. The books and the curriculum is at no cost to the student and the teachers. And as I mentioned, the professional development for the teachers covered by the MacArthur Foundation."
- Wallace: "So, I'll speak... thank you very much. I'll speak to the Bill. I think that there are many of us in this chamber, several of us in this chamber, who have either been K through 12 educators or post-secondary educators and I think we understand the concept of academic freedom. I believe that our educators have enough expertise and wherewithal to understand how to intertwine and weave this type of curriculum into their existing curriculum. I can see how civics lessons could fit within what we think of typical government courses or social science courses. Some of these lessons could fit within what's considered English or literary courses. I don't think it's very hard for the experts in our state, who have already been charged to educate our students, to figure out how to take upon this free curriculum that's being offered to them and interweave it into their existing curriculum. And

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

for that, I am asking everyone for an 'aye' vote. Allow the educators to be the educators."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stuart."

Stuart: "Thank you. I just wanted to speak to the question of, if we're doing this in a high school, do we really still need this in the middle school? And I can give you a resounding, yes. Education relies on repetition. I've taught at the middle school level. I've taught at the high school level. When I taught sixth, seventh, and eighth graders geometry, we were teaching formulas for area of a circle, and perimeter of a parallelogram, and things of that nature. And then when you teach high school students and those topics come up in their geometry class, in typically tenth grade, when you start to talk about the area of a circle not every student pulls that right out of their memory. Not every student has that deep understanding of where Area=Pi r squared comes from. And it gives you a better chance to give that deep meaningful connection to the material. And so I think the repetition in this is really important. I don't think we can deny the importance of understanding our civic system. So, I thank you for bringing this Bill forward and I think it's a great idea."

Speaker Lang: "Under the rules of Standard Debate, there are three on each side who are allowed to speak. There have been three in opposition and two in support. I'm assuming that none of the lights on are people in support. Representative Olsen, are you speaking in support of the Bill?"

Olsen: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Then you may speak."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Olsen: "Representative Lilly, what mandates do we have currently for civics education in K to 12 schools?"

Lilly: "High school is required."

Olsen: "So, we do not have a mandate for civics education in middle school. Is that correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Olsen: "So this would be a new Bill. This Bill here would introduce that requirement in schools from... in middle school that civics education must be taught."

Lilly: "In sixth, seventh, or eighth grade."

Olsen: "I think that is... that's the critical point here. I think civics education is critical to the foundation of students. For people who are going to be participating in democracy, this is foundational. So, I think this is a very important piece of legislation. I think it's important that we have civics throughout. I think we should continue to work with schools and do this in a way that they can manage within their current curricula. But we also need to insure at the state level that civics is being taught, and that's fundamental. So I do support your Bill and I thank you for bringing it."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly to close."

Lilly: "I'd like thank my colleagues for standing in support and asking the questions of your concern. I'll ask for your 'aye' vote."

Breen: "Point of Order."

Speaker Lang: "What is your point of order, Sir?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Breen: "Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the rules of Standard Debate nor the rules of Short Debate were followed. I have a colleague who would like to make a short address and should be allowed that to be done there. You can't put us on a two-minute timer which is Short Debate. Standard Debate is a five-minute timer. If we know were on Standard Debate..."

Speaker Lang: "Nobody... nobody was cutoff, Sir. Everybody got to speak their piece."

Breen: "I've got a colleague who wants to make a statement."

Speaker Lang: "The rules of Standard Debate are three on each side.

But..."

Breen: "At five minutes per."

Speaker Lang: "How... how..."

Breen: "At five minutes per."

Speaker Lang: "Except I didn't cut anybody off. But to... but... but since it is important to you, we'll acknowledge your other two speakers that wish to speak."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Fair enough, Sir?"

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "All right. Representative Ives is recognized."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We heard from the other side that educators should be allowed to educate and that's what I agree with. So, you'd have to suspend all belief that educators aren't doing their job if you're going to vote for this Bill. Because according to the Illinois learning standards for Social Science grades sixth through eighth, which is on ISBE's website, and this is... was updated May 2017. This is what's required for civics and political

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

institutions. After you read this list, you tell me if there's anything that needs to be added. Because if you do want to add something and if you're telling me this isn't done already, you're telling me that teachers aren't doing their jobs and neither are superintendents. Here's what's already required: identify roles played by citizens. Examples: voters, jurors, taxpayers, military, protestors, and office holders; describe the origin, purposes, and impact of constitutions, laws, treaties and international agreements; describe the roles of political, civil, and economic organizations in shaping people's lives; explains origins, function, structure of government with reference to U.S. Constitution, Illinois Constitution, and other systems of government; evaluate the powers and responsibilities of citizens, political parties, interest groups, and the media; analyze the power and limits of government, public officials, and bureaucracies at different levels of the United States and other countries. Those are the standards right now. Those are supposed enforced right now. We already have civics education at the sixth through eighth grade levels. So I'm wondering, are you accusing teachers, superintendents, schools, school boards of not following state law and not actually teaching these standards? Because we already have civic standards in this... in middle school. These are the standards already there. This Bill middle school duplicative. It's another unfunded mandate. And it needs to be shut down."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays is recognized."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Who among us have not talked to an administrator or a teacher or a member of your local board of education and have not had them say for love of goodness, do not send me down one more unfunded mandate. I would be willing to bet that every single Member in this chamber gets that message repeatedly, almost poking you in the chest, saying you have to quit doing this. I appreciate that the Sponsor believes civics are important, I do too. But I find it hard to believe there's a single board of education, in the State of Illinois that is not fully capable of making these decisions on their own. This is a local decision by those who were duly elected in your own community to set the curriculum in conjunction with the administration of the district and that's where it should stay. Vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly, I'll give you a chance to close a second time now that others have spoken if you wish."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is so important that our elementary school-age youth understand the importance of engagement in our civic societal responsibility. And once they know that they can participate and be a part of change, they're empowered to work at every level of government. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves 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 67 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr.

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Clerk, House Resolution 629, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Mr. Clerk, will you read a portion of the Resolution?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 629, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 100th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we congratulate Jacksonville Middle School golfer Brady Kaufman on his IESA State Championship win and wish him continued success."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of House. I'd like to you look behind me. There's a young man back here, Brady Kaufman, standing up. He rises as the State Golf Championship... Champion for Elementary... for Middle School, actually. He's a.m. he's a heck of a golfer. He's joined here today by his dad, Joe, his mom, Beth, Rachel and Brianne. If you guys want to stand up and give a guick wave. His dad was the coach. He's going to stay on for another year and help... help... hopefully, lead another one to state as well. Brady is, like I said, he's a great golfer. I'm going to ask him for golf lessons after this. But I think he got more birdies in his last match than I have ever gotten in my life. So, there's going to be a great... a great future for this young man moving forward in golf. And golf is one those sports that we all know you can play as you get older. I still enjoy playing because I don't take it seriously, because I'm not very good at it. But I want to welcome, I want everyone to rise and give a standing ovation for the state championship golfer from Jacksonville Middle School, Brady Kaufman."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations. We're all proud of you. Thank you for joining us today you and your family. Chair recognizes Representative Willis. For what reason do you rise?"

Willis: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Willis: "In the gallery..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative, could you just hold one second?"

Willis: "Yes, I can."

Speaker Lang: "On the previous matter, we need to adopt the Resolution. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Once again, thank you. Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker. In the gallery, you will see over 150 men and women all dressed in red shirts. Please stand up so we can all see y'all. This is a coalition that has come down today to talk to many of my colleagues to show support for gun dealer license. This is Moms Demand Action, this is Every Town, this is a group called Our One Job. Our One Job is to protect our children and our communities. I want to thank these women and men that have been working tirelessly and I know many of you have been... seen them in your offices and many of you are saying, when are they going stop? Well, they're not going to stop until we pass gun dealer licensing. And so, I want to thank these men and women for coming down today and sharing their voice with all of us. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you for your advocacy."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading.

 House Bill 4118, Representative Hammond. Mr. Clerk, please
 read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4118, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4118, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."
- Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4118 would amend the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act to extend the TIF district for Table Grove, Illinois from 23 years to 35 years. The village of Table Grove is a village of 416 people in my district. They're seeking the extension in order to complete some projects that are in the works including a project for their fire protection district. And I appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are a 110 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2394, Representative Hernandez. Representative Hernandez. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2394, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Hernandez."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Bear with me, Speaker. Thank you, Speaker. So Members of the General Assembly, with the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2, House Bill 2394 provides for all Illinois nine public universities as well the Illinois Student Assistance Commission that an undocumented student who meets all requirements for in-state tuition is eligible to be considered for any student aid or benefit with the exception of MAP funded or administered by the state. This may include but is not limited to scholarships, grants, awards, stipends, room & board, tuition waivers, or any other financial or inkind assistance."

Speaker Lang: "Representative, can I ask you to suspend for a moment? There seems to be confusion about what Amendment you want and don't want. So, the board says Amendment 1. Is this the… an Amendment you want?"

Hernandez: "No"

Speaker Lang: "You want to withdraw Amendment 1. Amendment 1 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of Amendment 2 say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2394, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Now, Representative Hernandez as amended."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker for that. So, I just wanted to make clear that we're adopting House Bill... Amendment... #2394 that really actually places the Bill to original form when I first introduced it. And before I continue, I want to thank all the Members of the Black Caucus for working closely with me. We were working on a different version of an Amendment that is of great important... importance to all our communities. However, it has become clear that we need to conduct further research to ensure that any Amendment we put forward will help, not harm the communities we seek to support. It is a priority for me to work in close collaboration with Members representing our impacted communities of color. And I am committed to continue to work to improve the lives of black and brown communities. The students covered in HB2394 are the exact same population that we, in a strong bipartisan manner, already agreed to support in the pursuit of higher education through the Illinois DREAM Act. This Bill does not expand the category of students. Let me repeat that, it does not expand the category of students. Members of the General Assembly, from both sides of the aisle, came together to pass the Illinois DREAM Act recognizing that young people who have grown up, studied, and graduated from high schools in Illinois should be given an opportunity to access higher education. House Bill 2394 does not expand this category. This Bill

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

simply removes additional barriers these students face currently. House Bill 2394 is not a mandate or an entitlement, it simply allows universities allows... allows universities to open up their institutional aid to support undocumented students who were admitted based on academic merit and... and are enrolled. It is estimated that if signed into Law, House Bill 2394 would benefit approximately one percent of students enrolled in public universities. Let me highlight that every single public university in Illinois is either in support or neutral to House Bill 2394. Why are we doing this? 1996 Federal Law, 196... 1996 Federal Law says, a state may provide a person not lawfully present in the United States, any state or local public higher education benefit for which such a person would otherwise be eligible. That is why, because through this enactment of a State Law affirmatively providing such eligibility. That's why. But who are these individuals? To be an American, it is to grasp so importantly what Lincoln meant about the better angles of our nature. We are an empathetic people. We are a welcoming people. We are a compassionate people. I ask, I implore your vote in support House Bill 2394."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair will remove this from Short Debate, put this on the Order of Standard Debate. Mr. Breen for five minutes. I would ask Members to be as brief as possible."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I want to make sure that we're very, very clear about what the Bill does. It appears that you are amending each State University Act in Illinois. So, our

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

universities... you are saying that folks who are not here legally, but who meet the requirements for... that they are residents, though not here legally, they will now get all student aid benefits, scholarships, grants, awards, stipends, room and board, tuition waivers, everything else without regard to the fact that they are not citizens or legally resident in the country."

Hernandez: "Representative, what it does it just merely gives universities the authority. In it no way does it mandate it. It just offers the university to be able to do so. It just gives them authorization."

Breen: "But I just... to be clear, what this now does is allows folks who are not citizens or legally resident in the country to get scholarships, to get room and board assistance, stipends, and all of that. That's what you're doing, right, very specifically those folks?"

Hernandez: "Yes."

Breen: "Okay. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a... it's a very simple Bill. Are you either you're going to be for it or you're going to be against it? The issue is, is folks who are not citizens or who are not legally resident in the country, should they get student aid benefits such as scholarships, grants, awards, stipends, room and board, tuition waivers, and other assistance from our state universities. That is a... it is a very controversial issue. It is a deeply personal and emotional issue for a lot of folks. But it is something that, with all due respect, I understand that the Sponsor said that there is no monetary cost, it depends. The question is should those benefits of the state

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

university, provided out of the tax dollars of the people of state, be extended in this way. So, there is a cost, but it is a cost of reallocation instead of maybe an increase in cost altogether. We don't know for sure. It depends on how each university extends themselves. If they would extend new grants, so as to ensure that folks who are citizens of the State of Illinois would not lose their grants. That is a question that still remains outstanding. And so for those reasons and the other uncertainties surrounding the Bill, I would respectfully urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "Thank you, Representative Hernandez, for your opening remarks. But I do have a question about the Amendment that you decided not to adopt. Would you be willing to speak to that for us so the Body has a clear understanding as to the difference between the Bill as it is on the board and what the Amendment would have done?"

Hernandez: "Yes, Representative, of course. So, the version that we were trying to work with and I think many of the Members are aware that I was working in an additional version that dealt with the criminal justice component that is of concern in particular with the Black Caucus, but I think it is truly a black and brown issue. And really in that sense, it's... it really aims at trying to access higher ed for all. Regardless of your status or a... infraction... that one may have had in their history that prevents them to pursue their education. What I have found... yeah?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Wallace: "I'm sorry, go ahead."

Hernandez: "What I have found was that it is very much real. The issue of students who are trying to pursue their education and may have a criminal background or a record, we have to do some work... continued work to open a pathway for these individuals that have come across some barriers to keeping them from pursuing their education."

Wallace: "Okay, thank you. I'm going to go to the Bill. Because I'm very conflicted about this Bill to be quite honest. If we're talking about providing access to everyone then we need to make that the case. We live in a state where the unemployment rate of African Americans is one of the highest, I believe, if not the highest in the entire country. We also know that African-American men with degrees are equally or just as likely to get a job as a white man without a degree. We know that black and Latino men are overrepresented in our prison population. And they are also overrepresented in the convictions of non-violent offenses, and those are the very offenses that make you ineligible for financial aid. So if we understand that all these disparate statistics exist, and all of this disproportionality exists then why are we not adopting the Amendment to this Bill for a true opportunity for real access for everyone? An opportunity to move toward real criminal justice reform. I want to remind everyone, those of us who've been on college campuses, who either went to them ourselves or have our children there already. There are people who are walking around those college campuses who may have had violent offenses, served their time, and now are eligible for financial aid so they can go and complete their degree

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

and return to our society, and hopefully be the rehabilitated individuals we claimed they should be after coming out IDOC. But the same 16-year-old kid, who might have got caught with marijuana and had high hopes and great grades, cannot apply for and receive financial aid in many of these institutions, because of some of the federal mandates and what the school policies are placing in place as a result of their interpretation of those federal guidelines. And if you ask me that's a problem. So yesterday, we spent a lot of time talking about sexual harassment, violence against women, sexism, all of these things. Well, the same people who might be perpetrating sexual assault, domestic violence, robbing people, doing who knows what, may go to prison become rehabilitate, hopefully, and still come and apply for financial aid, but we will not allow for..."

Speaker Lang: "Can you bring your remarks to a close?"

Wallace: "But we won't allow for the individuals who have those petty or non-violent offenses that I talked about before to receive that financial aid. And this Bill was an opportunity or that Amendment was an opportunity to do that. And so I'm very conflicted and I'm very disappointed that we, as a Body, are not going to address that disparity. We have to be as intentional with the policies that we make to undo the disparities as we are... or as we were intentional about the policies that created the disparities. So for that, I'm asking people to really consider what their voice... their vote is going to be. I'm asking the Sponsor to please commit to addressing that criminal justice issue. And I honestly can't even ask you which way you should vote because again I am

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

very conflicted. And I think that if you were listening, you should also be conflicted as to how you will proceed with your vote on this particular matter. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Pritchard: "Representative, I thank you for champion an issue that has conflicted this Body for a number of years. You've been trying to deal with two very controversial issues: One, undocumented students; the other, students that have a criminal record. Both very difficult issues. I appreciate the fact that you're separating these issues and today we're dealing with one part of them. It makes the discussion a little bit easier. You issued the fact that these students would be eligible for the financial grants that are given by the university. Confirm the fact that this is private donations rather than public money."

Hernandez: "So, it would allow for also public dollars within the universities. So, we're talking about the grants, the scholarships, the waivers that the university may offer including private dollars, obviously."

Pritchard: "But not necessarily state dollars?"

Hernandez: "Not necessarily state dollars. Let me repeat that, this does not include MAP grant."

Pritchard: "And that was the point I was going to ask to clarify. So, this also deals with their ability to apply for these kinds of scholarships and grants, correct? It doesn't give them a right or give them that financial support."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Hernandez: "That's correct. Am I... and I... may I just add that it just simply means that they can apply, it does not mean that they will receive."

Pritchard: "And just to reaffirm the fact, current State Law allows undocumented students to go to high school, to receive a degree, to go to our universities, and pay in-state tuition. And therefore, they're incurring the same kind of expenses that all of the other documented students are incurring with no possibility for any kind financial assistance."

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Pritchard: "So, what we're trying to do is level the playing field a little bit for individuals who are here, oftentimes not from their choice. Individuals that are locked in a national discussion about undocumented citizens and how they can become naturalized citizens. We're dealing with students that have a future. If they receive these kinds of scholarships they do it because of merit, they do it because they are better than other students. So why wouldn't we want to help these kinds of students? Ladies and Gentlemen, I would ask for your consideration that this is a controversial issue, but the Sponsor has tried to limit its scope, has tried to deal with students that are here that are doing very well, and I know from personal experience at Northern Illinois University some of the best students that receive our 9/11 and other types of scholarships are the ones that are undocumented, and they want to do this. They are receiving the funds because they're solely private. This would broaden that horizon a little bit. But I would urge your consideration

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

of the students, of their future, and of the contributions they're going to make Illinois and to our nation. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Jones: "Representative, when you started your conversation, you made the comment that this Bill would help black and brown students, correct?"

Hernandez: "Yes."

Jones: "So, do you feel that the Bill on the board now will help black and brown students?"

Hernandez: "I do."

Jones: "So, you heard a discussion about the way that this Bill's taken two divergent paths. One is looking at undocumented students and the other looking at students who have criminal records and financial aid. Do you feel that this Bill will accomplish what you have on the board, it will accomplish helping those students?"

Hernandez: "Not at all. My work is not done, Representative. It is just a piece that I find that I have to continue researching and doing the work. There has been a variety of Amendments that I have tried to work with to come to a... a level of agreement, and I can't seem to get there. This is telling of the issue is very alive. It is very real. We have to continue working on making sure that these students with criminal backgrounds get their second chance. I'm all about that. But what I am finding out is that the... I still need... it needs to work. I'm not there yet."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Jones: "So, Representative, Amendment 4 dealt with some of the concerns of my colleagues in the Black Caucus and some of the issues that we've been negotiating with."

Hernandez: "Yes."

Jones: "Why... can you speak to the Amendment, the language specifically in the Amendment that was dropped and why you did not seek having the Bill having Amendment #4?"

Hernandez: "I, first of all, it's not that I don't want to seek, I am absolutely going to continue working on it. But the language that we... the 4th Amendment, the language that we did come up was based on work that we had worked on over the summer, advocate groups, many state collars involved in the discussion. And that what we found is that we came across some language. The two previous Amendments that I had submitted regarding the criminal justice component dealt with drug convictions and it narrowed it down to a point where it actually... with unintended consequences actually created restriction. And..."

Jones: "So..."

Hernandez: "...it did the reverse of what was intended. I did take the advice of one of our colleagues that I had to take a better look because it was restricting. And so, we did that over the summer and we did come up with language..."

Jones: "Representative, I have limited time. So, I have two more questions because part of the unintended consequences are you're helping one group but you're hurting another group and two wrongs don't make a right. And Representative, we negotiated in good faith, so there's no notes to describe what the fiscal impact would be of this Bill. Can you speak

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

to what the fiscal impact, because there is a fiscal impact? You cannot say that there is not a fiscal impact to universities and to the students who would benefit. So, can you estimate what the fiscal impact would be?"

- Hernandez: "Okay. So it would be limited to what the universities can allow. So again, the original Bill when it comes... you know, I would say that it's neutral. It's financially neutral. Why? Because it's up to university if they even want to offer any scholarships. It does not mandate. So, if universities can't afford this, they won't do it. It just simply opens the door for some universities to do so. I... last Session, introduced a DACA student here at the floor. And to my surprise, this young woman received a scholarship from Illinois College as an undocumented, not even a DACA student... DACA recipient yet. So, it's being done. It's just... this... all this is going to do is going to leave it up to the university if they can handle it. It will be up to them."
- Jones: "Representative, is it possible to take this Bill out of the record and continue our negotiation? This Bill is not soup yet. And right now, Representative, you're hurting a group of students that we care about as well. And this Bill, unfairly, doesn't allow us to address that."
- Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."
- Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, is it possible for you to take this Bill out of the record and work on this over the summer... over winter?"
- Hernandez: "Representative, I have pulled this Bill out before to work on the piece that we are talk... that we have been talking about, about the criminal justice. I am committed to continue

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

to working on this piece. But what I find is how is it that I am keeping these students, and mind you the immigrant piece also applies to black and brown. Please understand that."

Jones: "Representative, you said that black and brown and I have to conclude my remarks. Black and brown includes black students as well. This Bill does not do that, Representative. I will urge you to take it out. And I would urge my colleagues to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mah."

Mah: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank Representative Hernandez for putting forth this Bill. It is an issue that I have worked on. I've been on the task force, working on this Bill for the past two years, even before I joined the General Assembly. It is an issue that is important to me as well as many of my constituents. It simply allows undocumented students to be eligible to apply for institutional aid that may be available at the university. And this is important because many of these students are ... well, all of these students are shut out and not eligible for any other form of financial aid be it student loans, be it federal-student aid or state-student aid. And I have a story from my own experience with two young sisters whose DACA application I assisted with. These two students were brought to the United States, and they're Asian-immigrant students by the way, and when we're talking about undocumented students we're talking about students from a whole range of countries. They're not all Latino, many of them are from Asia, Africa, Europe, all over the world. But these two young women had dreams of pursuing their education here in the United States. They

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

graduated from a local high school in my district and when it came time for college their parents, who were working class immigrants, could only help to support one of the two sisters. And the sister who was not chosen to receive parental help, she was distraught. Her dream was to pursue an education get through college and help support the family, contribute back to her community. She ended up doing her best to attend community college but had to pay for her own tuition by working several jobs, including one that took her out to the suburbs, an hour away, where she was essentially exploited. She was... she was working for the entire day, because she was dependent on the owner for transportation to that job. And she had to stay well past when her shift ended so that she could get a ride back to her neighborhood. And this severely impacted her ability to do well in school; it was quite a struggle for her. Her dream was to attend... to transfer from community college to UIC. The provisions of this Bill would allow someone like that to be eligible, at least apply for institutional aid and to make it easier so that she would be able to pursue her education, you know, without all these barriers against her. You know, there are countless students in this situation in my district who are here not because of anything they did, they came with their families. And they're just as American as any of us but for their status. Many of them are DACA recipients, who have gone through a process of vetting that includes multiple screenings. I think that, you know, as a country that is, you know, known to be welcoming to immigrants and to be a place where these opportunities are found where education is a stepping stone to the American

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

dream. You know, these are students who deserve our help. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple items. One, if this should receive the requisite number of votes I'd like a verification of that vote."

Speaker Lang: "Acknowledged."

Ives: "Next, what would be that vote limit?"

Speaker Lang: "This Bill requires 60 votes."

Ives: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I'm standing here on behalf of taxpayers. I'm standing here on behalf of students who have left the State of Illinois because they cannot afford to go to school in State of Illinois. I'm standing here before... before you in support of kids who have worked very, very, very hard in high school to receive the ability to have academic scholarships, whether it's in-state or out-of-state. And I'm standing here before you asking you desperately to not vote for this Bill. We have sanctuary cities. We are a sanctuary state. And now, we want to provide taxpayer funding for illegal immigrants for higher education. When every single year, our student population that graduates from high school chooses another school out of state, because it's more affordable. That is a travesty. My son is one of those people. My son worked very hard in high school, he had a great ACT score, sufficient enough to receive a full academic and fee tuition... tuition-free scholarship at a college out of state. We couldn't afford to keep him at University of Illinois as many other parents cannot afford the same. And yet you are sitting here and asking state

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

taxpayers, whose overall burden from 2009 to 2016 has gone from \$29 thousand in state taxpayer burden for our debt and liabilities to now over a \$50 thousand which is a 72 percent increase over that timeframe. That is their taxpayer burden for our debt and liabilities. You're asking them now to come in and support illegal immigrants and allow them to get higher education, when their own kids cannot afford to go to school in state. I find that appalling. Today, we reached a record high in our unpaid Bills, it's over \$16.6 billion sitting at the Comptroller's site. You can look it up yourself. And yet you want to take hard-earned taxpayer dollars and send it to illegal immigrants for higher education. I don't know why anyone in this chamber would vote for that. Listen, when your state is broke and you're a fiscal-basket case, you cannot afford to be generous with other people's money. And that's exactly what this Bill does. You are being... taking other people's money, you're being... you're allowing... you're asking for them for your special interests, to pay for things that they cannot afford for their own children. I'm shocked we're even having this debate, quite frankly. I can't believe that this Bill is on this floor at this time. And once again, it's one other Federal Law that we are trying to circumvent. Federal Law does not allow for federal money and state money, unless you pass a law like this, to be used on illegal immigrants for this type of benefit. Additionally, what we also know is that the standards for getting this money seem to be only related to perhaps financial status, other than very, very low metrics in terms of your grade point average, in terms of your ACT score, there's no super score. Unlike

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

other states when they offer a tuition and fee benefit, many other states post it right on their website and say look, you get a 30 ACT, we're going to give you this much off; you get a 32 ACT, you're going to get this much off; you get a 36, you get this. This Bill doesn't do anything like that. It doesn't... it's not performance based to be begin with. And again, this is the last thing the State of Illinois... Illinois... should do. The last thing we should do. Please vote 'no'."

- Speaker Lang: "We've had the requisite number of speakers on this Bill. Representative Hernandez to close."
- Hernandez: "I am proud to bring House Bill 2394 to the House Floor because I believe it represents a real opportunity for undocumented students, who consider themselves every bit as American as you and I, to begin down that pathway to meaningful and productive citizenship. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. Reminder that Representative Ives has asked for verification. So members will be in their own chairs and vote their own switches. Those... 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? Please record yourselves. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 40 voting 'yes', 57 voting 'no', 3 voting fails. 'present'. And the Bill Chair recognizes Representative Gordon-Booth, for what reason do you rise?"
- Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My intention was to speak to the previous Bill. I think that one of the things that we

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

have to mindful of down here is that we all come down here in order to try to do all that we can for our communities. And if there is an opportunity for us to work together to help that cross geographic regions, that cross communities religions, that cross maybe color bounds, we have to do that. And I will say that the Sponsor has worked on the previous Bill that did not pass, but she's worked Bill for three... for about three years and I've been working with her for two and a half years. I must say that I was surprised by the pull of the Amendment. But I will say that I believe that the desire increase access for individuals that marginalized and disenfranchised to give them a greater opportunity at receiving a higher education rather they be an immigrant individual, whether they be someone who was caught with an... a dime bag of marijuana fifteen years ago that is the work that we must continue to do. We have to continue that work together as we embark in this space in the area of criminal justice reform. Criminal justice reform doesn't mean much if we're not going to give people the tools in order to live truly successful lives. Most of us in here has had the ability to go and receive a higher education rather it be a Bachelor's, Master's, a law degree, even Doctorate's. The fact of the matter of it is that our constituents deserve the very same thing. So, my hope is that we can continue in this path and working together in a spirit of being our brother's and sister's keeper."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

following committee action taken on November 08, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 453."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia is recognized."

Chapa LaVia: "Point... point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. I'd like to piggy back on Leader Jehan's message to us. Working together and not being divisive. It's important that we move forward and not backward. I mean we've spent too many days in the backwards mode. So, immigrants pay taxes too, okay. You act... people act like they're just taking up space in our state. Well, they're hardworking people as well and they deserve the benefit of the doubt. And if you look very closely our General Assembly scholarships that we're moved from us, quite a few undocumented people got those too. So, you know their... our state is a better place when educate everyone. So, thank you for your indulgence."

Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill-Second Reading, page... on the Calendar. Senate Bill 403, Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 403, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Yingling."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling."

Yingling: "Yes, I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #2. Floor
Amendment #2 incorporates Senate Amendment #3 and Floor
Amendment #1 and makes some technical changes. The Amendment
will become the Bill. And I would like to debate it on Third."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 403, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill.

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling."

Yingling: "Thank you. This summer, my district and surrounding areas endured... endured historic flooding. As the waters rose and began filling basements and destroying homes, it also ruined the first floors of our schools, businesses, and residential homes. A hospital was evacuated and roads were closed. The Red Cross opened up a shelter at Magee Middle School in Round Lake in my district to help families who were displaced by the rising waters. Lake County declared a state of emergency. Other counties including Carroll, Cook, Henry, Jo Daviess, Kane, Lee, McHenry, Ogle, Rock Island, Stevenson, and Whiteside were declared disaster areas. It will take the Federal Government sometime to determine whether area residents impacted by the flooding are eligible for addition... additional federal aid. But with the Flood Victim Tax Credit, our constituents will not have to wait. This Flood Victim Tax Credit is needed now to provide homeowners and small businesses impacted by the historic flooding with immediate relief this tax year. The Bill will provide up to a \$750 income tax credit to help eligible homeowners and small businesses who sustained and reported property damage. The Flood Victim Tax Credit provides immediate tax relief for

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

this year for families and small businesses who are rebuilding their lives and their livelihoods. I urge an 'aye' vote and happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I know this Amendment was an improvement over the initial Amendment that you offered to this Bill and I recognize the damage that was done, of course, up in your area. Do you have an estimate of what the cost might be in terms of general revenue?"

Yingling: "Sure. The... the Department of Revenue is anticipating the tax credits will be roughly 4.4 million."

Harris, D.: "Say again?"

Yingling: "Roughly 4.4 million."

Harris, D.: "4.4 million. And is there a reason why you chose a...
an income tax credit versus perhaps an assessment... the
assessor doing a property damage action?"

Yingling: "Sure. So under the current law, you can get a disaster exemption for property. So, that's already in place. So, anyone who has applied for a disaster reassessment on their... on their property themselves will not qualify for this."

Harris, D.: "All right. And then lastly, it says that the property shall not be considered damaged unless the taxpayer has reported the property damage to the appropriate governing authority working in conjunction with IEMA or FEMA or has applied for disaster relief with FEMA for that property as a result of natural disaster. Okay, got it. But what constitutes

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- damage? I mean are we talking about, I lost a couple of shingles on my home, or you know, I had a minor amount of water in my basement, or my whole ground floor was damaged? How does... how is it determined of the amount of damage?"
- Yingling: "So, the damage levels were determined with the counties working directly with IEMA. IEMA, I believe, has a schedule of levels of damage that have to meet a certain standard before it's considered damaged."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, just very briefly to the Bill. And Mr. Speaker, may I ask that this Bill be put on Standard Debate?"
- Speaker Lang: "Bill will be put in the Order of Standard Debate.

 Proceed, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "And then just... thank you and just to close my remarks.

 The Sponsor did a good job in terms of coming up with a better

 Bill than what he had before."
- Speaker Lang: "Please complete your remarks."
- Harris, D.: "I believe it could tighter. I'd urge you to look at this Bill very closely. They do need some assistance up there. This may or not be the right approach. So, I'd suggest looking at this Bill very closely. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I just want to get some clarity on some of terms here. This is a credit against income tax liability, so state income tax liability, correct?"

Yingling: "That is correct."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Breen: "Okay. And then there is no provision in here for offsetting in case you have an insurance policy that's already paid you back the money. We give you the credit either way."

Yingling: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. And then, we do already have in law a credit when you lose the entire house, don't we? It's my understanding we already have that."

Yingling: "I'm not familiar if we do."

Breen: "Or an exemption?"

Yingling: "Yeah, that's for property taxes."

Breen: "Right. But it's my understanding that we already have the exemption if there is a full loss. So, this is only for partial losses."

Yingling: "I'm sorry, you're talking about the property tax exemption? The disaster reassessment?"

Breen: "It is the property tax exemption."

Yingling: "Right. So, under the current... under current law, you can get a disaster reassessment through your local or county assessor."

Breen: "Okay."

Yingling: "There's also a natural disaster exemption to protect your EAV against any increases if you have to rebuild after a disaster."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is obvious... it's obvious that some assistance... some assistance needs to be provided here. However, this is a Bill that is addressing a single instance that occurred. Many of us have had instances that have occurred in our districts and we've not necessarily had a tax credit allowed. There are

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

grave concerns as well that this Bill does not allow for seniors, who have fixed incomes, who are getting retirement income who have no state income tax liability. They're not helped by this at all. And there is no means of recovering these funds from the State Treasury, and so... that is also a concern here that we're dealing with. And that a homeowner could fully get reimbursed for all of their losses under their home insurance policy and then they would get an extra \$750 back from the state when we're already providing other credits. And again, they've already been made whole, we would be making them even more whole. And so, respectively, while there is good intent behind this, this is not necessarily something that is... that is required at this point to address the July flooding from this year. When... with all of these questions outstanding, with several million dollars of tax funds on the line, when we are already out of balance in our budget. I'd like to yield the balance of my time to Representative Reick."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick, has his own five minutes available. Mr. Reick."

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

Reick: "Sam, questions. This Bill says that there's a credit available for up to \$750 for losses sustained as defined under Section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code which deals with casualty losses. I don't see in the Bill how you define the loss. It could be a loss at the top of the form, which says that I had a damage of \$200 thousand, or it could be at the bottom of the form, which takes into account percentages of

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

which takes into account aross income, insurance reimbursements, a small amount for non-deductible expense. I don't see anywhere in here how that loss, for purposes of putting it on an Illinois Income Tax Return and claiming a credit for it, is defined. And I will preface this by saying, I do several hundred tax returns a year and have for many, many years. I can see ... I can see a regulatory and compliance nightmare coming up here without full definition of this. I'm not against what you're trying to do, but I really have a problem with the way this in which Bill is drafted, and it's not tight enough. Can you explain to me how you're going to get from where you are now to how I'm going to have deal with this when I do a tax return in January?"

Yingling: "So, all... Representative, all of this language was provided directly from the Department of Revenue."

Reick: "From the Department of Revenue?"

Yingling: "Correct."

Reick: "Who has given you a... some sort of a worksheet or something by which you can say this is how this credit will be... will be... for instance, it doesn't say anywhere in here that the \$750 credit is taken from or... if I have a deductible loss on my personal income... my Federal Income Tax Return for casualty of a thousand dollars that after all the calculations are made and I have a thousand dollar deduction, is my credit then \$750 of that \$1,000? Or is it a calculation based upon the tax rate applied to the deductible portion of that loss?"

Yingling: "It's based on the damage, Representative."

Reick: "I understand that it's 750 or the deduction. So, what you're doing is you're taking a federal... federal deduction

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

and turning it into a state credit. A deduction is applied based upon the... using the tax rate that the person has. A credit is a dollar-for-dollar reduction in tax. So what you're doing, and again, I'm not criticizing the theory and the intent behind this Bill, I really have a problem with how it is done. I would... I would really like this Bill to be taken out of consideration and redone, because I think I know what you're trying to accomplish here. I don't disagree with it, but I really have issues with how this is going to work in practice. Can you... can you move this forward there, please?"

Yingling: "I'm sorry, didn't hear what the last thing you said?"

- Reick: "I said I don't have a problem with how... what you're trying to accomplish, I have a real problem with how it is going to be accomplished. And I would ask that you please lead us forward into telling me how I go from a thousand dollar deductible loss on my federal return to a \$750 credit on my State Income Tax Return. How does... how do those things come together?"
- Yingling: "This... this is strictly on the state returns. This has nothing to do with your federal returns."
- Reick: "Yeah, but you're loss is defined under Section 165 of the internal revenue code and that is Federal Law. So, I need to know are you actually using the loss, the deductible loss itself as the credit amount?"
- Yingling: "That just... that Section just refers to how it's calculated. I think you're kind of comparing apples to oranges."
- Reick: "I still have problems with transferring a Federal Deductible Loss."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Yingling: "We're not."

Reick: "I understand that, but it's calculated on the basis of that. So..."

Yingling: "By using that formula. But it's not a transfer off the Federal..."

Reick: "Of course, it is."

Yingling: "Income."

Reick: "Of course, it is. Because what you're doing is you're saying you have a deductible loss on your Federal Tax Return, which is... not a... not an above the line loss, it's a below the line loss. Therefore, that loss has got be translated somehow into state... into a state calculation for the amount... for a credit. Again, how do you do that?"

Yingling: "Representative, again you're comparing apples to oranges here. The... this is... this is strictly on the State side and it's just the formula... the formula... it just outlines what formula is used on the state side. So, when you're talking about the Federal Tax Return, the State Tax Return, Federal Tax Return isn't... it's not applicable in this sense."

Speaker Lang: "Please complete your answer. And then Mr. Reick, please complete your remarks."

Reick: "Thank you, Sir. Sam..."

Yingling: "Yeah, go ahead. Go ahead."

Reick: "Okay. Yes it does, Sam. Because I cannot begin to calculate the credit without knowing what that federal deduction is. They are inextricably bound together. And I don't understand, by reading this Bill, how that will be done. The Department of Revenue may have given you the language for this, but they certainly didn't walk you through how it was going to be done.

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

And I and a number of other tax preparers in McHenry and Lake and wherever other counties are going to have to deal with this this year. And we're not going... this does not provide us with guidance. This provides us with means by which we can... unscrupulous tax preparers can make a claim for a credit without having anything to back it up."

Yingling: "That is totally inaccurate. That is not accurate. But I know that time has expired, but that is not accurate."

Reick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. SB403 has touched all four counties of my district, and I can tell you with how this came about is we didn't hit the threshold for disasters. And these folks are not being made whole as you would like to think with your insurance. With the property and casualty background, I can tell you the insurance doesn't always make whole, especially with depreciation, your deductibles. So, this is a very important Bill to give just a little bit of relief to families that have been devastated and have not been able to been... to be helped, not only by the Federal Government, by the State Government, or their own local communities. It's just a little bit ... just to get them by. So, please consider very strongly supporting this Bill. It's... I feel that this is the least that we can do to be good neighbors in our state. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. This is a modest proposal. It's \$750. It's very limited scope. This is a narrowly drawn. And I just want to

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

paint a picture as someone who was there watching the flood waters rise this summer. These are homeowners that can't stop rising flood waters. These are homeowners that not only the cost of clean-up, but the time, labor, inconvenience, health issues. So, I just urge an 'aye' vote. I urge that people look at these homeowners and these limited counties compassionately. This is only \$750. There's not that many homeowners that are affected by this. It doesn't have a huge scope on the state finances. I urge that we just look and we live a summer in their shoes. And I urge an 'aye' vote on this very limited and narrowly drawn proposal."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm just going to repeat my remarks from the last debate. You can't afford to be generous with other people's money when your state is broke. So, I want to know how much this is going to cost and where the money is going to come from. If you can't answer those questions, then it's a 'no'. This is what happens, you lose all flexibility when you're indebted to the hill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bryant: "Question of the Sponsor. Although I applaud you're trying to take care your district in this flooding, do you... is there money in this Bill for Wolf Lake, Illinois and their flooding?"

Yingling: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear that last part. Is it for what?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Bryant: "Wolf Lake in Union County. Is there money in this for Union County and their flooding with the Mississippi floods that happened just previous to the flooding in your district?"

Yingling: "So this... this addresses the counties that were declared a disaster area by the Governor in the summer of 2017. From that flood went through there at that time."

Bryant: "From the flood that happened in your district, correct?"

Yingling: "Well, it happened across the Northern part of the state and it affected about a dozen different counties."

Bryant: "Union County would be included in that?"

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

Bryant: "Union County would be included in that?"

Yingling: "Union County, with the information I have, was not declared a disaster area by the Governor. Was it declared a disaster area by the Governor?"

Bryant: "We believe so."

Yingling: "Oh, okay. If it was declared a disaster area by the Governor, it would be included."

Bryant: "Okay. What about the tornado areas that were also devastated just a few weeks before that?"

Yingling: "So, this is only as it pertains to flooding disasters."

Bryant: "Okay. And where's the money coming from?"

Yingling: "So, it's a tax credit. So, it just is less amount of income tax that would be paid by a taxpayer."

Bryant: "So, it would be coming out of GRF, basically. This is money that's is not going in there."

Yingling: "Yeah, it would have to be something that we'd have to look at during the appropriations process next year."

Bryant: "Okay, thank you."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Yingling: "Sure."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling to close."

Yingling: "Thank you very much. This Bill is so terribly important to so many victims who were displaced, left homeless, lost everything in this flood. They really need an 'aye' vote, and I hope that you can help us out and support this Bill. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. This Bill requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Dlease record yourselves. Burke. Evans. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 4 of the Calendar. Senate Bill-Second Reading. Senate Bill 851, Representative Mussman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 851, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1, 2, and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Mussman."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman on Amendment 1."

Mussman: "So, we would like to withdraw Amendment 1."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 1 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Mussman has been approved consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "We would like to withdraw Amendment 2."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 2 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman on Amendment 3."

Mussman: "So, we would like to adopt Amendment 3 and then debate that on Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris, your light was on. May we move this to Third Reading? 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 this Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 851, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of the Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. So, we're here today on Senate Bill 851, which continues a vital ongoing conversation about property tax relief in the State of Illinois. I'm sure for many of you, and I know in my own District, the heavy weight of property taxes is the biggest concern that I hear about house to house to house. It is a story that we hear in the media every day. How the State of Illinois has near to the highest property tax rates in the entire nation. It has been a conversation the Governor has made a cornerstone of his turnaround agenda, and we're here today to offer another opportunity for variation on relief in a variety of ways to try an ease up that pressure on our residents. So the Bill, the first part, applies the increased exemptions that the Governor approved for the Cook County, statewide, which increases the Homestead Exemption to \$10

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

thousand and the Senior Citizen's Exemption to \$8 thousand. creates a statewide, long-term, homeowner occupancy exemption for homeowners with a household income of less than a \$100 thousand who have lived in their homes for a minimum of eight years and the value of that exemption increases the longer they have stayed in their home and supported those home communities. For the counties of Cook, Lake, McHenry, Kane, DuPage, and Will, this Bill imposes a mandatory zero percent levy, sometimes referred to as a freeze. For the levy years of 2017 and 2018, the voters can choose by referendum to allow their taxing bodies to levy above the zero percent levy and not adhere to the freeze. All other counties can choose to place the option for the freeze on the ballot during the 2018 Primary or General Election, and if approved, that zero percent levy would apply to taxing years 2018 and 2019. School districts can be exempt from the freeze if they are classified as being on the Financial Watch or Financial Early Warning List by ISBE and the report issued in the same year as that levy. This report, this year, indicates that about 66 schools would qualify for this exemption. So, this is a combination of increased exemptions for every homeowner across the state and increased exemptions for seniors, who are experiencing the most distress many of whom are on fixed incomes, and answers the Governor's request for a freeze component. I think this is an important step forward, I'm happy to answer questions. I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Breen: "Representative, I just wanted to... I had a question come in about how and who will check the income the level and the residency time for the new statewide, longtime occupant homestead exemption that you've added in Floor Amendment 3."

Mussman: "Sure. So, actually that particular portion of the Bill does not go into effect until 2018. That delay was specifically built in to allow them time to get up speed and this is process that they already serve when checking seniors for their income level regarding their freeze."

Breen: "And when you said 2018, you mean..."

Mussman: "Tax Year 2018..."

Breen: "Tax Year 2018."

Mussman: "...which means Annual Year 2019."

Breen: "Fair enough. And then you are raising the homestead exemption and senior exemption as we... I believe it was Representative Martwick that did it earlier."

Mussman: "Right, we are applying that statewide for parity and fairness."

Breen: "Okay, so that will have the effect of possibly lowering residential property taxes and raising commercial property taxes because they do not have a similar exemption, correct?"

Mussman: "That is correct."

Breen: "Okay. Now, who is your Senate Sponsor for this Bill?"

Mussman: "I do not have a Sponsor, yet."

Breen: "Wow, okay. What a surprise. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we all know that we need... oh, we are on... I believe we're on Standard Debate or not."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is not on Standard Debate, but I'm not going to stop Debate on this Bill. So, proceed."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is yet, I believe it is the eighteenth vote on property tax relief which a significant number of us support. But again, it's all being done apparently for reelection tricks because there's no chance that this will actually get acted... will actually be acted upon in the Illinois Senate. So really, we almost... I don't know if there's any point in debating because this Bill is going to die whether it passes this chamber or not. I'll be supporting it, but boy, I'm skeptical and cynical just like I started the day. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, let me understand. Amendment #2
 although it was withdrawn, but that did not go through
 committee, correct?"

Mussman: "I'm sorry, could you repeat that?"

Harris, D.: "Amendment #2 was withdrawn, but Amendment #2 did not go through committee, correct?"

Mussman: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Floor Amendment... Amendment #1 did go through committee, correct?"

Mussman: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay, Amendment #3 did not go through committee either, correct? Brought directly to the floor, right?"

Mussman: "Correct"

Harris, D.: "Okay, but Amendment #3 includes the items in Amendment
#2, correct?"

Mussman: "Yes. Which are technical Amendments to #1."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Harris, D.: "Yeah, they're technical Amendments to a point, all right. But Amendment #1 is the only one that went through committee, all right. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I may, there are two issues that I have with this Bill. Number one, it's a process issue. It is now 2:57 in the afternoon and in three minutes we are supposed to be, those of us who want to, are supposed to be attending our sexual harassment training. I'd venture to say that may be delayed a bit. But here we are dealing with a major property tax Bill, and presumably we have just a few minutes to do it. Amendment #3 did not go through committee. Amendment #1 did go through committee and I voted for Amendment #1. So, I'm okay with the process on Amendment #1. I'm not okay with the process on Amendment #2 or Amendment #3 because it didn't go through committee, and even though you say the changes are technical, there is a... an impact here. So I have a process problem with the Bill. I also have a concern that when we voted... I believe it was Senate Bill 454 in the property tax Bill back in the spring, we had a four-year limitation, correct, versus... this is just a two-year limitation. Is that correct? Yes?"

Mussman: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "And it seems to me that if we're going to go with Property Tax Limitation Bill, we ought to go with four years. Now, I voted for two... Amendment #1 which had a two-year property tax extension limitation, preferring four. But there's an issue there that those of us on this side of the aisle I think presumably would prefer four, if we're going with a property tax limitation. If we're going to bite this bullet, let's bite the bullet and do it for four years.

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

There's a concern, obviously, with... with property tax limitations to begin with. Certainly on the part of our school districts and now on the part of our municipalities, who have already done their budgets and will probably have to redo budgets if this Bill should pass. So, as... as supportive as I am of property tax limitations, because that's the issue that our constituents write and call us most... most notably about, as sensitive as I am to that, I have concern with the way this Bill is being handled. And it is a major, major Bill that deserves, I think, more attention than it's getting here right at the end of Session on... on just a couple of minutes debate. So, do what you will on the Bill, but... I don't think it's being handled properly and I offer that for the House's consideration. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields"

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative, I just got a message from one of my county board members back home asking a question about Amendment 3, with respect to the proof of the length of residency for this new exemption. Is that something that will be handled by the Assessor's Office locally then? Is that... are they going to be required to track that... that particular parameter?"

Mussman: "Yes. And that's another reason why we've delayed that for a year to give them time to work through those issues.

And... And I would also point out, remember this is a mirror of the exact same homeowner's... long-term homeowner's exemption that we already in the House voted on in House Bill 156. So,

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

this is... this is not a new proposal that you had not seen before. This is information that you had already voted on previously."

Wheeler: "I understand that. Every time we do something down here though, it triggers the response in the local governments and they have a right to ask the question. So, I'm asking you and I'm..."

Mussman: "Absolutely."

Wheeler: "...I'm grateful for the answer. I just want to make sure we recognize the fact that we are impacting a lot of people just with the discussions we have here. Because even if we don't accomplish this today, and that looks pretty unlikely as far as getting done in this Session, they still have to prepare for things like this. And that's why I really want is to just speak to the Bill for a second. This is such an important issue in my district and in many districts around mine. The property tax issue is not going away, it's something that is becoming more and more inflamed. And I look at the board and I see this Bill, this has... this has some great stuff in this Bill and I'm probably going to vote 'yes' for this Bill. But here we are with no time left as my colleague already mentioned. I see three Democrats on the board together, this should be a bipartisan Bill. This is what we should be collaborating on. I know there's bipartisan components of it, but why not discuss it more inclusively ahead of time, build more support for it, get it done earlier, and let's get it out in a way that we can actually accomplish something for the taxpayers of the state that want this so desperately. Property tax reform is an absolute requirement

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

of ours and we're not getting it done. It's not appropriate that we do it this way. I'm so frustrated about this part of it. Ladies and Gentlemen, please let's take a more thoughtful approach, a more balanced approach to how we deal with property taxes in this state. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reick: "First issue I have with this is the fact that if what you do is freeze taxes to certain people, you're going to switch the tax liability over to others. The tax liability of the county or whatever is not going to go down, it's just going to get shifted over to businesses and renters and people like that. Another issue I have with this, and can you explain this to me, please, is when this Bill or if this Bill were to pass and municipalities and counties are looking at this Bill saying, uh oh, we got a two year tax freeze coming up, but we have contract escalators, we have all sorts of things that are going to go into effect within the next two years that are required to be paid. And pensions and debt are excluded from this, we're going to go out and borrow some money. And how do you answer to your constituents, when your taxing bodies are going out on a... on a borrowing spree, simply because we have told them they cannot extend their levies or increase their levies?"

Mussman: "That is something those taxing bodies need to take up with their residents. They need to explain why it is that they did not make other modifications in their spending. And honestly, this is something the state has to contend with

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

every single year also. Our own expenses, all those expenses those taxing bodies will list as a burden, the increases in pension and health care costs, and salaries, and the cost of gasoline, anything else that causes their expenses to go up, goes up for the state also. And we do not have any sort of automatic cost of living increase in any of our taxing forms. Not the income tax, not the gas tax, not the sales tax that helps us keep pace and we're expected to manage that within our own budget. Now, I know we that have not been role models for good budgeting over the last couple of years, but I still indicate that is those taxing bodies being answerable to those members. And you're right, this particular Bill does not inhibit their ability to go out to debt if they feel that's the best way that they could be serving the needs of their residents."

Reick: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, before we go on, can I ask how many votes this Bill will take to be enacted, please."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill will require 71 votes, Sir."

Reick: "If this Bill is voted upon, can I ask for a verification of the vote, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Acknowledged."

Reick: "Thank you, Sir. To the Bill. We stand here broke. We stand here... we just passed a... an unfunded mandate on schools. We just raised the price of education or the cost of education because we passed an unfunded mandate onto schools. And now what we're doing is we're saying, well, you can't raise any more money or extend your levy in... in order to pay for that, you're going to have to find some other way to do it. And I'm... and... and I agree with you that taxing bodies need to go

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

back to their people... their their constituents and say, here's why we need to borrow money, but unfortunately, that is not the case. What... what we're looking at here is shifting the burden of taxes. Taxes are not going to go down, taxes are going to be shifted. They're going to be shifted away from property tax owners. And believe me, folks, believe me, I want to make this part of the record. I am the one... I strongly am in favor of lowering property taxes, but we do it through reform. We don't do it through gimmicks like freezes that only last for two years, and just then, the problem comes back and there is absolutely nothing to say about it. I was not in favor of the extension of the Bill that we passed in the summer because of the fact that it didn't ... homestead exemption and senior exemption, because it didn't apply to my county. I wasn't given that. Now, I'm being given it, but I'm being told on the other hand, I'm going to take this away from you to make your taxes... you're going freeze your taxes. And so, what you're doing is hamstringing local governments in ways that we have no business hamstringing local governments. I would strongly urge that this Bill be withdrawn as my colleagues have said on the floor. Let's withdraw this thing; let's rethink it. Let's make a Bill that we can all live with that will cut property taxes statewide. This is not the Bill to do it. This is gotcha politics, this is a gotcha Bill, and anybody who thinks otherwise is wrong. We need tax reform in this state, we do not need gimmicks especially going into a political year. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Body. I'd like to introduce you to the eighteenth vote over the last two years to freeze property taxes in the State of Illinois. And yet, property taxes are not frozen. Why? Because it is a political pandering piece of garbage that is sitting before us, just like the other Bills, they were never meant to pass. Let's talk about HB156, which the Sponsor spoke about, which was her Bill back in the spring. That Bill went to the Senate and nothing happened. As you heard her talk today, she does not have a Senate Sponsor for this Bill. This is Bill is not going anywhere and she knows it. If this Bill were to go somewhere, I'll tell you what, it does not freeze property taxes. Everybody knows that pension and debt is outside of this limit, which means that you can't guarantee every... any individual property tax owner that you are going to freeze their property taxes. It's simply untrue. This Bill's a lie. Now, after she did pass her HB156, The Daily Herald came out strongly about... with information, as did The Illinois Manufacturers and other business groups, saying that all that her Bill did was increase costs on the business community. And that's exactly what this Bill does. Speaking to the \$10 thousand Homeowner Exemption that she's included in this Bill, why wasn't it included when you did first Bill for Chicago that had up their homeowner exemption in a previous Bill that we just passed from 8 thousand to 10 thousand? Why were we excluded then? Why was Chicago the favored son? Why were they always either included or excluded from legislation specifically for them? Now, you're trying to play catch-up and leave everybody the same thing Chicago got a few months

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

ago. That's ridiculous. Additionally, schools on the Watch List are among those that are obviously the most mismanaged and deserve... and their taxpayers deserve probably the most protection from an increasing, escalating property tax when they are actually still on the school board that are mismanaged. Let's look at Chicago. Chicago is massively over their... their debt limit. By 37 percent, they're over their debt limit. And yet, they're going to be exempted from this and their taxpayers are not going to feel the protections. Most importantly, this does nothing to affect the cost drivers of... of higher and escalating property taxes. It does nothing about government contracts that continue to dole increasing salaries and benefits to workers. It does nothing about the local pension costs that continue to balloon. It does nothing about the Unions that continue to bargain with the same power they've always had. It does nothing about unfunded mandates that continue to pile up costs in local governments. Illinoisans that continue the most for local units of government in the nation, community colleges that continue to grow their expensive administrations, and public construction cost that remain at a premium. It does nothing about the cost drivers of higher and escalating property taxes. So again, you know what, this will be our eighteenth time... I like to remember anybody who's listening, our eighteenth time at a minimum that we have voted in the last two years to freeze your property taxes and they're still not frozen. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman to close."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Mussman: "So, I'd like to make a couple of corrections. I'd like to actually correct my earlier statement. President... Senate... Senate President Cullerton is actually the Sponsor in the Senate and they are in Session tomorrow, I'd remind you. There is no reason to believe that this Bill will go nowhere. There is absolutely the possibility for this Bill to do something. As Representative Ives mentioned, the exemptions for the seniors and for the homestead that was included in House Bill 156. Not to the same level that Martwick's Bill was, but I absolutely included those statewide exemption increases in that earlier Bill. Martwick's Bill passed; and therefore again, we are creating parity across the state to make sure that they do match Cook County. And that Chicago and Cook does not get some sort of privilege that the rest of the state is not entitled to. Yes, this is the eighteenth vote on property taxes, but I was not aware that the Governor had taken the property tax freeze off of his agenda. understanding is that's something that he was pushing for and I believe one of your earlier colleagues alluded to the idea that the two year freeze wasn't even enough that they wanted a four year freeze or a permanent freeze. So again, for some people to say that a freeze is doing damage it shouldn't be doing and other people to say that we need a whole lot more freeze is a bit confusing. I would say a two-year freeze is a good way to introduce this topic and see how we feel it is impacting the communities and whether or not it is something that should be extended. We are attempting to compromise with the Governor, and we are attempting to meet the demands of our residents that their property taxes are too high. If they

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

do not feel they are getting relief within their own communities and with their own taxing bodies, they are demanding that we, as their State Representatives, take action in the way that the state can take action. You asked for reform, this is a method of reform. We can increase their exemptions, we can freeze their taxes. We're not the ones setting the levies, and we're not the ones collecting the money. This is what we can do. I certainly encourage you to support this Bill in an effort to support your residents who are crying out for relief."

Speaker Lang: "Lady has moved passage of the Bill. This Bill requires 71 votes. Please be reminded that Mr. Reick has asked for a verification should this reach the requisite number. So you will please be in your own chairs and vote your own switches. 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? Please record yourselves. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and Mr. Reick has asked for a verification. And Mr. Reick withdraws his verification request. 75 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In all of the excitement that took place, I want to record myself as voting 'no' on the previous measure, 851, instead of present."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Mr. Sauer is recognized."
- Sauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My intention was to vote 'yes' on the previous Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Mr. Long is recognized."
- Long: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that I meant to vote 'yes' on that previous Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Republicans are going to Caucus immediately in Room 118. And the House will... going to 114, I apologize. The Republicans are going to Caucus in Room 114. And the House will be in recess till the hour of 4:45, at which time we are coming back to the floor at 4:45. The House is in recess."
- Speaker Currie: "The House will come to order. Representative Currie in the Chair. On page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 61. Representative... Clerk... Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 61, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Andersson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Andersson."
- Andersson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 61 is... am I talking on the Amendment, yes?"

Speaker Currie: "Yes."

Andersson: "Okay, so..."

Speaker Currie: "If you want to... maybe you want to offer the Amendment and discuss the Bill on Third."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Andersson: "Very good, that's exactly what I'd like to do.

Amendment 1 is a gut and replace, accelerating the effective date of Public Act 100-520, which I'd be happy to describe on Third."

Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments..."

Clerk Hollman: "No..."

Speaker Currie: "Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 61, a Bill for an Act concerning civil

law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 61 now does one thing. It makes the effective date of Public Act 100-520 effective January 1, 2018, until six months later in 2018. Going back to what the Public Act actually did. We passed this earlier in the year, but after May 31, thus delaying the effective date. It's a cleanup Bill related to the Marital and Dissolution Act. All of the effects are technical. One of which is the requirement for publications of notice in adoption cases, requiring that the notice be published to making certain that there is a notice to a parent of an adopted child in the case of a name change. And third, it adjusts the maintenance schedule to avoid what are called, 20 Percent Clips, to spread it out over a more appropriate time period for the twenty years of potential marriages. Be happy to answer any questions."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Speaker Currie: "Thank you. Is there any discussion? Representative Andersson moves for passage of Senate Bill 61.

 Is there any discussion? Representative Parkhurst."
- Parkhurst: "Thank you. I'd just like to say thank you for passing this Bill. As a family law practitioner, there was a big dichotomy between year five of a marriage and year six, just one day could create a financial hardship on a spouse... a divorcing spouse. So, this is a good Bill, and I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 61 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Demmer, you are recognized for?"
- Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Morrison is excused for the day."
- Speaker Currie: "Thank you. The record will so reflect. Senate Bill 444. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 444, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1, 2, and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Davis."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Madam Chair, I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #1."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Speaker Currie: "Amendment 1 is withdrawn."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative

Davis. It has been approved for consideration."

Davis: "Madam Chair, I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Currie: "You may. Withdrawn on Amendment 2."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Davis."

Davis: "I'd like to... I'd like to move to adopt Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 444. Essentially, what we are offering is some cleanup language to the Education Funding Reform Bill. Specifically that addresses a couple issues regarding EAV where under the ... one of the issues that's involving the PTELL EAV issue where general state aid provided an adjustment to districts, subject to tax caps or the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law. PTELL limits extension growth to the lessor of the consumer price index or five percent. When EAV growth exceeded CPI or extension growth that forces a reduction in the property... excuse me... in property tax rates. Districts are subject to PTELL in two ways. 1) By referendum in the district and 2) designated statutorily in law via the standard PTELL adjustment. In FY18 there are four districts subject to the alternative adjustment compared to more... more than 450 subject to the standard PTELL adjustment. Public Act 100-0465 includes language that states each type of adjustment is only to be made for districts that have increased their limiting rate via the alternative method is not applied to those subject to the standard PTELL adjustment. The old funding formula applied the adjustment to both, the alternate and standard method. The change sought by the State Board of

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Education would continue the status quo and apply the adjustment to both meth... methods. What... what the State Board of Education has done is that in 1947 they model this adjustment, as well as an adjustment for regular EAV, and so these changes are put in place to provide the language to allow for the adjustments that they... that they have made. And with regard to the EAV adjustments, general state aid required the deduction of four types of adjustments to the equalize assessment evaluation for school districts. Department of Revenue reports original EAV amounts to the State Board of Education. Those values are converted to real adjusted EAV amounts by deducting adjustments for general ... excuse me, adjustments for general authority abatements, enterprise zone abatements, property tax appeal board decisions, and certificates of error. For the general authority abatement and the enterprise zone abatements, the adjustment is dependent on the rate used in GSA calculations to determine local resources. The language appears on page 360... 364 as part of... as part B in Public Act 100-0465. That language is sunset with the conclusion of FY 2017 and is not included in the new distribution system. The changes sought by Board of Education would again continue the status quo and continue the adjustment in the new school funding formula. Try to answer any questions."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you. Representative Pritchard for discussion."

Pritchard: "Are we going to adopt the Amendment first?"

Speaker Currie: "If... if that suits you, we'll do that. All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes'

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- have it. The Amendment is adopted. And before we move on to the Third Reading, I would like to call on Representative Turner for an announcement."
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Chair. This should have been done earlier, but can you please excuse Representative Kifowit for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Currie: "Clerk, would you read... the Bill now goes to Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 444, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Davis moves passage of Senate Bill 444 and on that is there any discussion. Representative Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "He will."
- Pritchard: "Representative, this whole issue came up because the State Board of Education discovered that there were a number of omissions or call them errors in 1947. Were these two issues that you've identified in Amendment 3, the summation of what they found or were there other issues?"
- Davis: "There was one more issue that they identified that we are not attempting to address at this moment. And that's with regard to pre-K... pre-K EL students."
- Pritchard: "And why wasn't that... what you really had in Amendment 2, why aren't we acting on Amendment 2?"
- Davis: "All right. And I forgot to add to your previous question, also special ed co-ops and ROE school funding as well. Those are... that was the other part of the answer that I should've given you with your previous question."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Pritchard: "So, the state board has identified four, five things that need to be addressed."
- Davis: "At this point… at this point, yes. Again, as we walk into implementation, there's a possibility that other things could happen, but this is what they've identified up to this point. And again, our… our Amendment, which becomes the Bill, is an attempt to make sure that as we move into implementing the school… the new school funding formula that we are ready to move forward with that right away when the dollars become available."
- Pritchard: "Well, but shouldn't all these issues be addressed as quickly as we can?"
- Davis: "Well, I would agree some of the issues, while we have an idea of what the challenges are, I don't think we're ready to speak specifically to how to address those challenges. We know that there are going to be issues, but right now we have identified what appeared to be the most pressing issues that we'd like to attempt to address right now."
- Pritchard: "So, out of these five, six issues that have been identified, we're dealing with two of them. And why are we just dealing with these two?"
- Davis: "These... these two in particular have been modeled as a part of the original school funding Bill. And this will allow us to get those dollars out the door as quickly as possible."
- Pritchard: "So, I is... as I understand it, the other issues really weren't including in the models that have been run to date?

 Is that correct?"

Davis: "Correct."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Pritchard: "So, what we're trying to do is deal with known information and the rest of these will be dealt with hopefully in the next three or four months?"

Davis: "Absolutely or as soon as we return in the spring. And ISBE you know assures us that we'll be able to get that stuff taken care of and then make the adjustments on the funding side as we move forward."

Pritchard: "And these two issues that we're addressing, are they significant issues to school districts if we don't address this issue?"

Davis: "Absolutely."

Pritchard: "I mean we're talking about thousands, millions of dollars?"

Davis: "I would say millions of dollars."

Pritchard: "So, it is significant to our school districts that we get this right before we come out with a new funding model.

And I think it's appropriate that we move as quickly as we can on all six of these issues. And I look forward to working with you on those and for these two, I would urge the Body to support this Amendment."

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Does the Speaker yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Crespo: "Representative, you had mentioned that there was four or five issues that ISBE identified, one of them being the special ed co-ops. Now, the Bill that passed the Appropriations Committee only addressed three, right?"

Davis: "I'm sorry?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Crespo: "The Bill that passed your... your Appropriations Committee only addressed three of the issues. You had mentioned that there were four or five other issues that at some point we need to address?"

Davis: "The prev... previous Amendment did address three issues."

Crespo: "Just three issues."

Davis: "Yes."

Crespo: "So... so, special Ed co-ops and some of the others were not addressed in the original legislation. Now, you had mentioned that the one that was taken out had to do with Pre-K EL population. Why was that one taken out?"

Speaker Currie: "Are you finished, Representative?"

Davis: "Well, we feel..."

Crespo: "No, I'm asking a question, so."

Davis: "...we feel that that particular change, we'd like to include that with other similar changes that we are... that we are still working on... on refining exactly what those additional changes are. And again, the two changes that we made with EAV and PTELL EAV were already modeled as part of SB1947. And so, we are ready to move forward with that and we'd like to make the change to Pre-K EL as well as potentially a couple of other changes all at the same time moving forward. And ISBE assures us that will be able to make the necessary adjustments to the dollars in the... next year. They'll... assure us that they will be able to make the necessary adjustments. I'm sorry, this school year."

Crespo: "Okay. But that one point, the EL Pre-K, did pass committee unanimously, correct?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Davis: "I believe... well, I knew it passed. If you tell me it was unanimously, then yes, it was."

Crespo: "Okay, but for some reason..."

Davis: "Yeah... yeah, it was unanimous... it was leave. That's absolutely correct"

Crespo: "ISBE had made the recommendation that that be included in that these legislation but for some reason it was taken out."

Davis: "Yes."

Crespo: "Okay. And I've had a conversation with ISBE and Advanced Illinois and we've met before on this as well. And let me just wear my Latino kosher hat for a bit. There's some concerns, and I appreciate all the good intentions from ISBE and others, that this will be addressed when we come back in the spring Session. My concern is there might other pressing issues that we're going to have to address. The dynamic might be different. So, there asking the Latino Caucus, 'cause mostly 80 percent or more of this population are Latino, to take a leap of faith and hope they will address this. I can tell you that for my... one of my school districts, the U-46 Elgin school district, this is going to impact close to a thousand students in U-46. Whether we address it or not, I don't know, I know its good intentions. I just want to make sure that for the record, we're very clear that were not very happy that this was taken out. We see no reason why this should be taken out. My understanding is that the Senate Sponsor has some concerns that this was included for this or for a part of this Bill that you might have a hard time passing it in the Senate, correct?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Davis: "I believe that is what he shared with you when you spoke with him."

Crespo: "Yeah. And unfortunately because of political issue, right? 'Cause people are going to say, well, if you leave that part there, it becomes a Chicago bailout. It is not. It was supposed to be a part of the original Bill. So, we're not asking for a favor, we're just saying, hey, make sure that we take the corrective measure that we need to take to make sure this is included the way it should be. The total cost for this would be approximately \$70 million and the aggregate. If you were to divvy that up in 10 years like we did the other funding, it may be \$3 to \$5 million, it's not that much. But I have to say on behave of my school district, U-46, they're not happy. They're very concerned. We're asking them to take the leap of faith as well and wait to see if this is going to be addressed later on. U-46 was very, very active in passing the school funding reform Bill. They feel that somehow they were left out. It was something that happened by mistake, I know ISBE was bringing different models and somehow they inadvertently left this piece out. So, I wish we would include this. I understand the Senate has some concerns and did ask you to please leave this out, and I just hope that moving forward, we address this in the spring and that people keep their word and hope you will have the votes to make this correction. Thank you."

Davis: "Well, I can appreciate, Representative, what you're saying about Members keeping their word. We know that that population of students is as important as any other population of students as well. I do want to add that because of the work

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

that you and others put into the original funding Bill, the bilingual education dollars are... we... we fulfilled our obligation that we never filled before with regards of bilingual education. So therefore, districts will not lose any dollars as a result of not including this. This is about the additional dollars that they will receive moving forward. We want those students to receive those dollars. We want school districts like U-46 to receive the additional dollars, which is why you've had the commitment of myself as well as the Senate Sponsor of this to address that issue as soon as we get back in the spring, so that others like yourself and those that represent, you know, other populations that would otherwise be affected by this. We want to make sure that we fulfill our obligation to you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Reick."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Reick: "I'd like to just to clarify that these changes all they do is affect the local capacity target for these particular districts?"

Davis: "Yes."

Reick: "Do you have any idea yet as to whether or not this is going to move any of the school districts up or down within the tier structure? Have you received any word on that?"

Davis: "Well, again, I stated earlier that ISBE already modeled for these changes in the funding Bill. So the way the dollars are distributed that we are already aware of by passage of the Bill, it will not change."

Reick: "Okay. Thank you, that's all."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Davis, do you want to close or just go to a vote?"

Davis: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Members of the chamber. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Currie: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 444 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, 107 voting 'yes'... Clerk, take the record. On this question, 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This measure, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar under Total Vetoes, we have Senate Bill 1714. Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Members of the Body, I move that the House pass Senate Bill 1714, notwithstanding the Governor's Veto. Senate Bill 1714 passed unanimously earlier this year through the House and the Senate. It builds upon existing efforts to increase utilization of minority-, female-, disabled-owned businesses with respect to all Illinois public pension funds. It provides additional disclosures from consultants as it relates to economic interest of the consultant and existing or recommended investment managers. Specifically, it provides an increased transparency on the consultant's financial reports and what they are doing to identify minority-owned firms, female-owned firms, and firms owned by individuals with disabilities. I'd ask for the Body's support... continued support on this measure. Thank you."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Speaker Currie: "For... for discussion, Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just for the record, if we could excuse Representative Batinick for the remainder of the day."

Speaker Currie: "Record will so reflect."

Breen: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Carroll..."

Breen: "Well, I had to..."

Speaker Currie: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Breen: "If... if the Sponsor will yield."

Speaker Currie: "Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Representative, I just wanted to make sure we... we had fully considered the Governor's Veto message. And so he had said that this blanket requirement... and I'm reading from his message. The blanket requirement is necessary to produce some... there's no showing the blanket requirement is necessary to produce some tangible benefit. Nothing is currently preventing us from making this demand of these boards. What's your answer to his critique of this particular Bill?"

Turner: "Well, I think that's just the thing. This is something that could have been done that can be done, but hasn't been done. And the issue for me is transparency and getting this information out there so that we can have the discussion. So, since it hasn't been done, we're taking action through legislation."

Breen: "And then I know on the veto message it said that we should immediately ask all the retirement systems, pensions funds, and investment boards to invest and be held accountable for guidelines. In the spirit of the Bill, have any of those

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

entities implemented or taken any steps to go towards this in the intervening time?"

Turner: "They have not... they have not, Representative. I'm glad you asked that, but they are all... none of them are opposed to what we're suggesting here. They think that there's something they can do and should be implemented."

Breen: "Okay. But again, there are no opponents within the... those various boards."

Turner: "No, Sir. There are no opponents."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. I supported it the first time, plan on supporting it again."

Turner: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Breen: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion, Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Thapedi: "Leader Turner, how many votes did this get in the House?"

Turner: "115 votes in the House."

Thapedi: "How many did it get in the Senate?"

Turner: "52 votes yesterday, no 'noes'... zero opponents yesterday in the Senate."

Thapedi: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Turner: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Seeing none. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 14... 1714 pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor?' All in favor... favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted the

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- record. On this measure, there are 109 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this measure having... I'm sorry. Representative Carroll. Did we leave, did we... never mind, okay. Having received the appropriate number of votes passes, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Representative Carroll."
- Carroll: "Yes, thank you. Just wanted to change my vote on Senate Bill 851. Should have been a 'yes' vote, not a 'present' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Record will so reflect. Representative Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Madam Chair, I'd ask that the record reflect on SB851, I would like to be recorded as a 'no'."
- Speaker Currie: "The record will so reflect. All right, Senate Bill 521, on page... on page 3 of the Calendar. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 521, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Ammons, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Ammons."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I move the adoption of Floor Amendment 2."
- Speaker Currie: "Do you want to explain the Amendment or do you want to..."
- Ammons: "Sure."
- Speaker Currie: "...try to explain it on Third Reading?"
- Ammons: "Sure. Floor Amendment 2 is the Amendment to the Eastern Illinois Economic Development Authority Act to increase the

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

bonding authority available under the Act from 250 million to 500 million for a project that's just south of Champaign-Urbana."

Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment... I'm sorry. For discussion, Representative Harris. No? Representative Hays. Okay. Let's go ahead and adopt the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments."

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

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 521, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you... thank you, Madam Chair. This Bill represents simplifying a conduit authority to issue bonds. And there's no liability to the State of Illinois in the case of the default of any of these bonds. This is to continue a project that started about four years ago. And I ask the Body to authorize the increase of the bond authorization."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Ammons moves passage of the Senate Bill 521. And on that Motion is there any discussion? Representative Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Madam Chair. To the Bill. I strongly support this Bill. Representative Ammons, I appreciate you bringing it as well as Representative Halbrook. This is a extraordinarily large project, commonly known as Cronus. As you probably have noted, this will bring 2 thousand construction jobs. It's a project in Tuscola, Illinois on an extraordinarily large scale which is the reason for the

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

necessity of increasing the bonding authority. I would sincerely appreciate a 'yes' vote as this project in the east central part of Illinois is as big a project as we've had in many, many years. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Speaker. And a question to the Sponsor." Speaker Currie: "He will. He responds to questions."

Harris, D.: "Representative, this increases the bonding authority for the Eastern Illinois Economic Development Authority, by \$250 million, correct?"

Ammons: "That's correct."

Harris, D.: "And that bonding authority, though, does not fall to the State of Illinois, so there's no… no liability to the State of Illinois. This rests strictly with the development authority, right?"

Ammons: "That's correct."

Harris, D.: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's got to be a mistake. It's got to be an error. There's got to be something wrong with this Bill... something wrong with this Bill, because it's brining jobs to Illinois. Now, we know that every job in Illinois is going to Indiana. Indiana is right-to-work. Indiana has lower income taxes. Indiana has lower workers compensation. Every... every job in the state is going to Indiana, so they can't possibly be bringing jobs to Illinois. Can't possibly, right? Look folks, let me read to you from... just a quick quote from Crain's earlier this year, 'In the seven county Chicago region, employment dropped from 3.5 million in 2009 to under 3.2 million by early 2010. But the region has gained almost 400 thousand jobs since then and

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

hit a record... a record high of just under 3,600,000 last year.' Jobs are coming to Illinois. Now, I will tell you it goes on to say, 'Chicago is well past its previous employment peak, but downstate is still 56 thousand behind what they were at the peak in 2009.' So, what does this job... what does this Bill do? It brings jobs to eastern Illinois. That's what it does. Good paying jobs coming to Illinois not going to Indiana, not going to Wisconsin, not going anywhere else, they're coming to Illinois. We have a state that can support those kind of jobs. We have the infrastructure that deserves those kind of jobs. And that's why they're coming to Illinois. This Bill should fly out of here without a single 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion. Representative Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to urge a 'yes' vote of this today. This is... this is good legislation. This is good for the district of east central Illinois. Many... hundreds of jobs, great potential to grow in our part of the country. And I'm looking for a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "No further discussion. Representative Ammons to close."

Ammons: "Thank you. Thank you to all the Speakers, certainly. I love the animation about getting jobs in Illinois. And east central Illinois certainly can use a few more. So, I'd urge a hundred, and how many of us, eight 'yes' votes. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 521 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 95 voting 'yes' 12, voting 'no'. And this Bill, having achieved a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Feigenholtz, for what reason do you rise?"

Feigenholtz: "I rise on a point of personal privilege, Madam Chair. It's so nice to say that by the way. Madam Chair. Tomorrow, one of our star staffers, a woman who started as an intern with me when she was a student at DePaul University, is going to have a birthday. Let's all wish our dear Tiffany Moy a happy birthday."

Speaker Currie: "Happy birthday, Tiffany. Representative McCombie."

McCombie: "Madam Chair, please have the record show I meant to vote 'yes' for SB521."

Speaker Currie: "Record will reflect your wishes. Thank you."

McCombie: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Senate Bill 772. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 772, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Soto, has been approved for consideration."

Currie: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll handle the Amendment. It takes the content of Senate Bill 1607 related to PMP and puts it on Senate Bill 772. I'm happy to explain the Bill on Third Reading."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Clerk, read the Bill... on Third."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 772, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Madam Speaker, I apologize. Senate Bill 772 is initiative that would require providers to check the PMP before prescribing an opioid. This is a Bill that would prevent opioid addiction and abuse. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Any discussion? Representative Breen."

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

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Breen: "Sure. And Representative, I just want to make clear that this Bill is supported by the Medical Society for Illinois."

Zalewski: "With an Amendment adopted in May. Yes."

Breen: "Right. And what this does is addresses the opioid crisis, to attempt to insure that doctors are not inadvertently, duplicatively, or... or overprescribing opioids to individual patients."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. And then, this'll use the PMP and require them to reflect in the medical record that they have checked the PMP before distributing those opioids."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Breen: "Great. Thank you so much. It's a great Bill. Please vote 'yes'."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Speaker Currie: "Seeing no further discussion. The question is,
 'Shall Senate Bill 772 pass?' Vote... all in favor vote... in
 favor vote 'aye'; oppose vote 'no'. Clerk, the voting is open.
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
 voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this
 measure, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting
 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional
 Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1103. Clerk,
 please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1103, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Davidsmeyer... Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1103, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Davidsmeyer."
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, I want to thank members of our staff for dealing with the hounding that I did through this Bill. And I want to thank the Speaker's staff for working with us to find an Amendment to find the proper descriptions of the properties. What we're trying to do on this Bill is we're swapping two properties that are side-by-side along the Illinois River. One is better for development the way it's positioned on Illinois River for barge traffic, so we want to make sure it's safety... we're swapping a scenic overlook from one spot to the other spot. The values of the property are very close and whatever the lack of value in the

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

property will be made up in the first month with jobs. We are looking at about a \$300 million initial investment in the property with a second phase of another a \$300 million investment. Once again, we are looking at an opportunity to create jobs in the State of Illinois. So, I hope you'll join me. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Davidsmeyer, moves passage of Senate Bill 1103. On that question, are there any discussion? Representative Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Riley: "C.D., how... explain the transfer to me. Is it just... it's says by quitclaim deed, but is it development's rights transfer or just parcel-for-parcel? Sort of explain, you know, the intricacies of the transfer."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah, it allows for 60 days. The company that's purchasing the one property and swapping for the scenic overlook is... they have... already have the right to the land. They just have to go through the paperwork process. So, basically it's just a clean swap and that's where it is moving forward."

Riley: "Okay, thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion, Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Thapedi: "Representative, just out of curiosity, what is a scenic easement? I'm familiar with prescriptive easements, I've never heard of a scenic easement. What is that?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Davidsmeyer: "So, the purpose of it is, basically, to say that it can't be developed. So, what they're doing is they're taking one area that's the same type of land and transferring that over so we're not losing a scenic overlook we're just moving it to different property and the property is... the property that this group will be purchasing. So nobody's losing out, everybody's amicable. It's just basically, you know, the trees along the river they can't... can't develop in that area."

Thapedi: "Who owns the land?"

Davidsmeyer: "DNR."

Thapedi: "Thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion, Representative Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a simple land swap. It's good for the state, it's good for IDNR, and I recommend a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Davidsmeyer to close."

Davidsmeyer: "Once again, of great opportunity for us to create jobs in the State of Illinois and I appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1103 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 106 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The next Bill is Senate Bill 1607. Clerk, please read the Bill."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1607, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill is read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments, Floor Amendments 1, 2, and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment 1 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Gordon-Booth."
- Gordon-Booth: "Yes, Madam Chair. I'd like to move for the adoption of both Amendments and debate them. Oh, I'm sorry. That's... that's for the wrong Bill. So, withdraw Amendment 1 and we want to adopt Amendment 2 and 3."
- Speaker Currie: "1 is withdrawn and now we move on to Amendments 2 and 3."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Gordon-Booth and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "And the Representative moves for adoption of both Amendment 2 and 3. And if it's all right with the Body, she'd like to discuss the Bill on Third Reading. All in favor of the adoption of these two Amendments vote... say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendments are adopted. Clerk, Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1607, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Gordon-Booth."
- Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Senate Bill 1607 is a bipartisan Bill that came out of committee unanimously. For decades the debate on criminal justice reform has pitted the goals of public safety against the goals of reduced incarceration. The goal of the Criminal Justice Reform Best Practices Act is to build upon the great work that this Body

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

has already done and has embarked upon. This Bill speaks to the need to work on an integrated and holistic community solution to reintegration, employment services, housing, survivors, and victims' assistance through reentry and planning. The legislation does a lot in the areas of looking to ensure that as we're dealing with communities with individuals coming back home that they have the ability to actually have housing and deal with the homelessness issue. Surrounding that we're working with IDA, we're working with ICJIA to develop a four-year strategic plan. This Bill has the ability to do some amazing, comprehensive things throughout our community. I'm proud to have bipartisan support. I'm open for any questions that you may have."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Gordon-Booth moves passage of Senate Bill 1607. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1607 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 74 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bellock, for what reason do you rise?"

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. I'd like to ask a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Currie: "On a point of personal privilege, proceed."

Bellock: "I'd just like to ask everybody to wish Patrick Besler a happy birthday today. He's been very hard at work on the

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

hospital assessment and we've had him working 24/7. So, if everybody could give him a round of applause."

Speaker Currie: "Happy birthday, indeed. On page 3 of the Calendar. Senate Bill 1667. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1667, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Madam Chairperson, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1667 is a Bill regarding title insurance. It makes two changes to the Title Insurance Act. It allows a title insurance company to obtain reinsurance for any or all of its liability under one or more of its title insurance policies from a qualified insurer by removing 50 percent... removing the 50 percent limitation, currently in effect. And it mandates that the title insurance company if the Department of Financial and Professional Regulations determines it's necessary and appropriate, to provide a summary describing its professional reinsurance placed outside the title insurance industry. These are two small changes that could have a very good effect on real estate development, allowing title insurance companies to insure bigger projects in Illinois. It's a good thing for business. There are no opponents. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Martwick moves for passage of Senate Bill 1667. And on that is there any discussion? Representative Reick."

Reick: "Thank you, Speaker. I'm not opposed to the Bill, but I am an agent for First American Title; and therefore, I don't think it's appropriate that I vote on this Bill. Thank you."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Speaker Currie: "Thank you. So the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1667 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the appropriate Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1277, on page 3 of the Calendar. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1277, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

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

Speaker Currie: "Representative Conroy."

- Conroy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment allows PANDAS and PANS to be coded under the autoimmune encephalitis code, until there is a code available for PANDAS/PANS."
- Speaker Currie: "You've heard the... the proposed Amendment. All in favor... seeing no discussion, all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Clerk?"

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

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1277, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "The Amendment basically becomes the Bill. And this allows a barrier to be removed from families who are facing some pushback, in terms of having coverage for PANDAS and PANS."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Speaker Currie: "Representative Conroy moves passage of House Bill 1277. And discussion... let's start with Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "She indicates she will."

Breen: "And Representative, you and I have talked about this Bill.

The... the problem we're having is that families are contacting us and despite our prior mandate, they are unable or at least in certain circumstances and very... it's circumstances we can't figure out. They are just not getting coverage for the treatment for PANDAS/PANS."

Conroy: "Correct. What it is, is that PANDAS/PANS falls underneath the autoimmune encephalitis umbrella. And many other things do as well, like Lupus and Kawasaki's disease, they have their own individual codes. PANDAS/PANS, because we're the first state out of the 50 to cover it, does not currently have its own code. Because of that until there is one available, we're going to put it in the State of Illinois under the autoimmune encephalitis code, so that parents... so that families are not facing these barriers."

Breen: "Right. And there are... we've heard from the insurance industry and the others that... there are some objections to doing this code provision in our statutes. We're very much hoping that the code for PANDAS is adopted soon. The problem that you've got is that most physicians appear to be coding it as autoimmune encephalitis and so that's why your Bill does specify a code in the text."

Conroy: "Correct. As the insurance companies would say, this is unprecedented. And I don't disagree with them, it is. But

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

covering PANDAS/PANS, being one of the first... the first in all of the 50 states, is also unprecedented. So, this is... this is an obstacle that we came about and we don't want these families to have to wait any longer. So, until we have that code available from the AMA, this is what we need to do to correct it."

Breen: "And... And to some extent too, I know we're doing something else with the Bill because we're ensuring that the coverage is retroactive to when we passed and the Governor signed the first Bill. That is a little bit... I mean that is a little... it is not normally done..."

Conroy: "Correct."

Breen: "...and so, but that is part of the Bill as well, right?"

Conroy: "Correct."

Breen: "Okay. And... and to some extent, too, that allows the Department of Insurance to... to inject itself if there are further problems by making sure that every policy is covered. So that is the point of that, right?"

Conroy: "Yes. Correct."

Breen: "Okay. So... and... and I... I certainly think that once PANDAS is recognized and everything's good, we could always take these provisions out of the statute in a year or two just so that it's not there."

Conroy: "Absolutely. It just won't be necessary. Because it'll still be coded under autoimmune encephalitis. It'll just have its own individual code below that."

Breen: "Okay. Certainly. So, again, I... I think there are some good faith objections. At the same time, we are in a weird situation where we can't figure out any other way to cover

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

these folks. And so, again, I... I'll be continuing to support this Bill just as we supported the prior one. Thank you."

Conroy: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion, Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. Will the Speaker vield?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Bellock: "Thank you. So, number one, I want to thank Representative Conroy for all of her work that she has done on this Bill. And thank all the parents whose children have the PANDAS because they have been a moving force and a strong advocacy for this Bill. I don't want to be repetitive, because Representative Breen mentioned some of the concerns that we have that we've talked over with... with the insurance companies. And the... the coding issue is definitely out there. And that we hope that in the... moving forward that issue will be solved and that all of these parents will have no difficulty with any denials. And so, thank you again, Representative Conroy. We appreciate everything you've done. And I just wanted to give an extra thank you to all the parents, who have been so active in dealing with this issue."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Two issues. First, please let the record reflect that Representative Phillips is excused for the day. And second..."

Speaker Currie: "Record will so reflect."

Demmer: "Thank you. And second, to the Bill. As my colleagues have mentioned, I think... there's an acknowledgement that we don't have a good... a good way to deal

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

with this situation in the current coding environment. I just encourage the proponents of this, the payers for this, to continue to work to find a long-term solution, which is specific for PANS and PANDAS. Which gives us the kind of information we need to make decision about paying for this, about allocating dollars for research for this, about ensuring that the families, the patients, the payers, everybody in the picture is on the same page as to what the services are, what they're being provided for and how we can make sure that those are covered. I know this is... that's more of a long-term solution. And so, we certainly need to be... remain committed to working on that as we... as we move forward. And I appreciate you bringing the Bill today. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1277 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this
measure, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting
'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 5 of the Calendar,
appears Senate Bill 453. Representative Welch. Clerk, do you
want to tell us where the Bill is? What is its status?"

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 453 is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I actually... can we move this back to Second Reading to..."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Speaker Currie: "We certainly may. I was expecting that very question. The answer is yes. The Bill is now on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 453, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

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

Speaker Currie: "Representative Welch."

- Welch: "Madam Speaker, I ask for approval of Floor Amendment #1 which only changes the effective date to July 1 of 2018."
- Speaker Currie: "Do... all in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

 Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 453, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 453 is a very important piece of legislation. I've had an opportunity to talk with many of my colleagues about this Bill, the last couple of days. If you haven't had a chance to talk to me, you've certainly talked to the folk up in the gallery, from Voices, who have been here working their butts off trying to explain this legislation to as many of us as possible. This is a bipartisan Bill that has had an... gone through an extensive process to get to where we are today. We are working with our local school districts and giving them local control. I want to emphasize that Senate Bill 453 creates a voluntary program that only the school districts who wish to participate, may apply. It's voluntary. Senate Bill 453 is

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

about the creation of a voluntary, subject to appropriations program that would give the tools and control to local school districts to provide more targeted resources that focus on restorative justice programs and other alternatives to involve... other alternatives to involving school resource officers. This Bill targets the use of using school psychologists, school social workers, and other mental and behavioral health specialists, and other strategies for creating safe and healthy learning environments to address the root causes of problems facing our students. The question I ask all of you when we consider this Bill is, should someone who is addicted to heroin and other opiates be arrested and expelled from school? Or should that person get the treatment that they need, and be given a second chance and a chance at succeeding in life? If you believe that that person deserves a chance to get the help that they need, this the type of policy we need to pass. And I would ask that Senate Bill 453 be passed into law... passed today. And the Senate concurs with it. It's a Bill that several groups have worked on. And I ask for an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 453."

Speaker Currie: "Representative moves passage of Senate Bill 453.

And for discussion on that question, Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Welch: "Sponsor yields."

Speaker Currie: "Yes."

Wehrli: "Thank you. Representative, are the Illinois Chiefs of Police still opposed to this?"

Welch: "I have not spoken to the Illinois Chiefs of Police. And on... on my analysis, I don't have them listed as opponents."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Wehrli: "We do. And that's why I ask. I think there's some question there, if they're still opposed to this or not. So..."

Welch: "That... that's news to me."

Wehrli: "...that's why I'm asking. So, did we just recently pass a new school funding formula?"

Welch: "We did."

Wehrli: "Does... is Chicago getting more money now?"

Welch: "They are."

Wehrli: "Okay. So I'm just kind of wondering, if we should wait for that to sort of titrate out a little bit, before we... we pass this. I mean, I'm not necessarily opposed to this, it's just this seems pretty prompt on the heels of... of new dollars flowing into CP."

Welch: "Well... well actually, Representative, I think this is... this is why this... the timing of this Bill is very good. We've passed the school funding formula. School districts up and down this state will receive more money, and it is completely up to them if they decide that they want to go a step further and apply for a grant like this. And deal with things in a restorative way as opposed to a disciplinary way of kicking kids out onto the street."

Wehrli: "So... you may have just convinced me. Did you just say that this gives local control to the principals?"

Welch: "Yes. The school boards."

Wehrli: "Thank you."

Welch: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "For further discussion, Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. We... we debated this extensively previously and it did not pass the house for

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

good reason. Very clearly in the text of the Bill... first off, these are state dollars that we would've otherwise put to other educational pursuits. But instead, and I'm reading from the Bill now, 'Under this program, selected school districts must reallocate funding for school-based law enforcement personnel.' So they must take the way... the money away from school-based law enforcement personnel. Now, maybe that is a decision that could be made in certain places, but at this point, the reasons... some very important public safety reasons, such that ... so that the Illinois Association of Chiefs Police are opposed, the Illinois Statewide School Management Alliance is opposed. This is yet another mandated program. And while you do have to apply for it, it's taking precious, limited education dollars and moving them into this program. And where are those funds going to come from? There are mandates here for what a school district must do to be eligible for the funds. So that it is not a straight out mandate, but it's a backdoor mandate. And so for that reason, while I understand and certainly if a school district wants to seek to try different things with their... their student discipline and other sorts of law enforcement methods, this is not the way to do it. It is not ... not here. We should not take the funds, the precious funds, the limited funds we have for education and reroute them in this way. So respectfully urge a 'no' vote, again."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion, Representative Stratton."

Stratton: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Stratton: "All right. Thank you. Representative Welch, I just wanted to clarify, I think one of the previous speakers talked about this is subject to the local control of principals."

Welch: "Yes."

Stratton: "And so, can you talk a little bit more about that in terms of how these funds would be available?"

Welch: "Well, I actually think it actually goes to the Gentleman from Lombard's last comment as well. This is a completely voluntary program. If a local school district decides to apply for it, they are saying, we want to move away from more law enforcement involvement in schools to the restorative practice process. It's a decision that local schools are making. They don't have to apply for this grant."

Stratton: "So, only the ones who want access to these funds, to make this decision, would apply for the program?"

Welch: "That is correct."

Stratton: "So, no one is telling a school that they have to do it, it's an option, it's a choice?"

Welch: "That is correct. We're creating an additional choice that will be available to our local school districts."

Stratton: "And it's actually a choice that we are leaving up to the principals to decide that we want to move from a focus that's heavy on law enforcement in our school to one that's more focused on restorative justice. That's the choice that a principal might have, correct?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Stratton: "All right. And then, there was a question about whether... where the funding would come from? Did I hear you say that this would be subject to appropriations?"

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Welch: "This would be subject to appropriation and obviously further discussion."

Stratton: "All right. So, to the Bill. I think that the concerns that have been raised have been answered by the Bill's Sponsor. This is not a mandate. This is something that is optional. It's at the discretion of a principal who decides that he or she wants to change the culture of a school from being one that is overly-reliant on law enforcement in terms of discipline to one that is more focused on restorative justice. This Body has throughout this Session considered legislation that would help create a culture that would keep young people in school that would make sure that young people ... we have said over and over again, we want our young people to be educated. And here is an opportunity to promote such an opportunity... such a... such a message, by saying that we will give principals the opportunity, under this local control option, to decide that they want to change the culture of their school. It's a choice. It's not a mandate. It's an opportunity to apply for grant funds subject appropriation, and I have spoken to the young people who are promoting... who have been advocating for this particular Bill. And they have said, they have lifted their voices, as we encourage them to do, to say that this is a way to help young people stay in school and receive the kind of support that they need to be successful in school. So, for all of us who say we value education, for all of us who say we want our young people to have their needs met, for all of us who recognize that we need resources for social workers, and for psychologists, and for counselors in school, for young people

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

who often are dealing with some very traumatic experiences, here's an opportunity to let the principals decide whether this should be available to them. So, I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion, Representative David Harris."

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

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor will answer your question."

Harris, D.: "Representative, help me follow the money here, for a second. I understand that it's subject through appropriation, but as with one of the former... speakers said, the selected school districts must reallocate funding. So they have to reallocate funding. It is a must. But it says they must reallocate funding for school-based law enforcement personnel. So, in other words, they're reallocating funding not from educational purposes, but the reallocation... reallocating funding for school-based law enforcement personnel. In other words, the school police, right?"

Welch: "That's correct, General. And... and what we're saying is, is if a local school district says, we want to move away from law enforcement, instead of having ten resource officers, we'll go with eight and we'll reallocate the funds from the other two to, for instance, wrap around services or..."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Welch: "...drug treatment..."

Harris, D.: "All right."

Welch: "...they could do that."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Harris, D.: "I just... I just wanted to clarify. I mean we're not taking money away from the education of the student. We're taking money away from... from funds which would go for school-based personnel. When I say take it away, we're shifting it into a different program, but it's not for the education... we're not shifting it out of the education of the student, correct?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Harris, D.: "Right. Sounds reasonable. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion, Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Thapedi: "Representative, I think we heard from the... the Gentleman from Lombard that because you were not successful the last time around, for some reason you should not be successful this time. I think it would be very helpful if you explained what you've done, with respect to understanding the Bill, making Members more aware of the Bill, talking to the stakeholders, what have you done since that time period... get that clarification."

Welch: "I think the biggest thing we've done, Representative, is educate Members on what's actually in the Bill. The last time we had this debate, there was a huge focus on... that this Bill was prohibiting students from being arrested. That was a different version of this Bill. We took out the language regarding a prohibition on school arrests. This Bill does not prohibit arrests of students in schools. I'm going to come back to that at a later date, but this Bill doesn't do that."

Thapedi: "Understood."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Welch: "This Bill specifically talks about the ability to switch funds from law enforcement to social workers and psychologists and... and drug treatment, instead of... taking kids out and getting them arrested."

Thapedi: "So would be fair to say that the Bill that's up on the board right now is a new and improved version of what you ran the last time?"

Welch: "Yes."

Thapedi: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, I urge an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Currie: "And there seeing no more discussion,

Representative Welch to close."

Welch: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Members. As you can see, there is bipartisan support for this Bill. Senate Bill 453 creates a voluntary program. It empowers our local school districts. It's about local control. Think about this, people. It creates the Safe Schools and Healthy Learning Environment Grant, safe schools and healthy learning environment. It's subject to appropriation. This program would allow districts that choose to do so to focus on rehabilitation, restoration, and education, instead incarceration. Do we really believe a student addicted to drugs should be arrested and expelled from school? None of us actually believe that. We believe that that student should be given a chance and provided with the help that they need. Every student deserves a chance to succeed in life. And by voting for this Bill, you're giving them that chance. We tell people every day, they should stand up and speak up. And these students from Voice have come here and shared their voices with us. Let's make sure their voices are heard. Let's give

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

the students a chance. Empower our local school districts to do the right thing. Let's vote for Senate Bill 453. Thank you."

- Speaker Currie: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 453 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open.
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
 voted who wish? Clerk, please take... Clerk, please take the
 record. On this measure, there are 58 voting 'aye', 50 voting
 'no'. And this measure... this Motion, having failed to receive
 a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. We are
 moving to page 6, the Order of Resolutions. House Joint
 Resolution 80. Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution... House Joint Resolution 80 would urge Congress to pass the... United House Resolution 2574, to help insure an adequate number of health care professionals in all areas of health care. And I would urge for the passage. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the... of the... the Lady's Motion vote... say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 524, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm... stand in support of this. This is a Resolution that will go to Washington asking the administration to reappoint the special envoy that did important work at the State Department. Right now, it's vacant. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Seeing no discussion. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted.

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- And now we go to House Resolution 527, Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 527 allows the House Revenue and Finance Committee to undergo property tax assessment practices as it relates to determining the best practices for assessing properties in both Cook County and the State of Illinois. I urge its adoption."
- Speaker Currie: "Seeing no discussion. All in favor of the Motion vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 530. Mr. Clerk, please... yeah..."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative David Harris, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. I ask the adoption of the Amendment, which simply changes one word in the Resolution.

 The word is from foundation to fund."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you. This is a Resolution that encourages individuals and... around the state and actually around the nation to get involved something known as the Wall of Faces Project, which tries to locate photographs of individuals whose names are inscribed on the Vietnam War Memorial Wall in Washington D.C. Many of those photographs were lost due to a

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

fire at the Army Administration Center in St. Louis back in the mid-70s. I think that... I can't imagine there'd be any opposition. I ask for your support."

Speaker Currie: "Any discussion? Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just briefly, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Halpin: "Representative, this is a question I meant to ask in committee, I think. Is there a way for us, as Members, to find out whether any former constituents or their families might be in our areas, so that we can reach out to those communities?"

Harris, D.: "By way of background, the National Newspaper Association, the Illinois Press Association are engaged in this. Your local newspapers... any contact to your local newspapers would be able to put you in touch with any information you might need. There's a website that you can go to simply by Googling Wall of Faces Project, and you'll get the information that you need. You can put it on your website. And I will tell you, since we had the... planned the press conference last week, within the last week, we already located 10 individuals in Illinois that we got photos from."

Halpin: "Wonderful. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Currie: "All right. All in the favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. And the next Resolution is House Resolution 594. Representative Bellock."

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This House Resolution 594 recognizes Mental Illness Awareness week in Illinois. Thank you. I think it's an important Resolution."
- Speaker Currie: "No discussion. All in favor of the Resolution say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 607, Representative Andersson."
- Andersson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 607 requests the Mental Health Committee, our very own Mental Health Committee, to formulate a plan to help improve parity and remove barriers to mental health and addiction coverage by the end of the 100th General Assembly. This is as a result of a report that came out from the Kennedy Forum, indicating that while mental health parity laws exist, the actual practice appears to be not the case. And that we need to substantially track and remove the obstacles to getting that coverage for people who would need them. Happy to answer any questions and would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Seeing no requests for discussion or questions, all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 625, Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker... Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 625 merely encourages all citizens to familiarize themselves with all of the original lyrics of the Star Bangled Banner. And I urge for the passage."
- Speaker Currie: "Seeing no discussion. All in favor of the Resolution say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. And now we're going to Supplemental

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Calendar #1. Senate Bill 351. Clerk, please read the Bill. Clerk, please... please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 351, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. The Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Representative Ives, we're actually not calling the Bill on Third Reading at the moment but Representative Ives."

Ives: "I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Currie: "State your... state your point."

Ives: "I just wanted to remark on HR527, which was just recently passed. And I want to publicly let you know that the language of that task force... for that property task force, I want to acknowledge the very important work that our Naperville Township Assessor, Warren Dixon, did to bring that language to fruition. Warren Dixon was on the Unfunded Mandates and Consolidation Task Force. He understood very deeply how important it was to do property tax assessments correctly around the state. He and I have worked for three years, tirelessly, to bring this topic to everybody's attention. He wrote the language of HR527. We put it in to a Bill format earlier this year. We then moved it to a House Joint Resolution. That language was then taken and put in to HR527 and filed as a Bill under Representative Zalewski, but I think that it's important for people to know that Warren Dixon has worked tirelessly on highlighting the property tax assessment issues around this state. And we do have a deep problem in this issue. And the Property Task... Tax Task Force is very

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

important work and I wish that the Revenue and Finance Committee well as they go forward and try to make sense out of what we're doing statewide in this area. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Continuing on supplemental Calendar #1. House Joint Resolution 84, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 84 simply seeks to acknowledge... to Sergeant Josh Rodgers memory, who was killed in the line of duty, to rename a section of Veterans Parkway in Bloomington in his honor."

Speaker Currie: "A moment of silence in his honor."

Brady: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you, Members. So, back to the Resolution. There's no discussion on House Joint Resolution 84. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this measure, there are 109 voting 'yes', none... yeah. Clerk, take the record. On this measure, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting present. And the Resolution is adopted. And then House Resolution 662, Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And House Resolution 662, I want to thank Representative Willis, Representative Mah, and Senator Morrison. We all worked together on a national task force for diabetes. And we came up with this Resolution to declare November of 2017 as Diabetes and Heart Disease Awareness Month. And as I have mentioned earlier, the press conference to raise the awareness and show the diabetes

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

plan for the State of Illinois is next week on November 14 in Chicago. I appreciate your support."

Speaker Currie: "No discussion. The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 662 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 36, Representative Swanson."

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. SJR36 designates the Illinois Route 78 overpass over Interstate 80 at Annnawan, Illinois as Deputy Adam Streicher and Trooper Chad Wolf Memorial Overpass. Stark County Deputy Streicher graduated from Annawan High School in 1997. He went to work for the Villages Atkinson, Sheffield, and Annawan before accepting employment as a Sheriff's Deputy for Stark County. On 22 March, 2002 Deputy Sheriff Streicher was shot and killed while attempting to serve a warrant on a 60-year-old man for a misdemeanor, failure to appear in Court. After shooting Deputy Streicher, the subject then shot two of his neighbors, whom he had a long standing dispute with and then fled in Deputy Streicher's patrol car. The man was shot and wounded by other officers. He was convicted of Deputy Streicher's murder and sentenced to death. In June 2008, the inmate committed suicide in his prison cell. Deputy Streicher had served with the Stark County Sheriff's Department for one year. He was survived by his parents, brothers, and sister. Michigan State Trooper Chad Wolf also graduated from Annawan High School in 1995. Trooper Wolf went on to serve with the Michigan State Police for seven years. Trooper Wolf was killed when a vehicle struck his motorcycle. He was on his motorcycle patrolling and traveling northbound in the right lane of Dixie

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

Highway and crossing over southbound I-75 when a vehicle towing an empty trailer, traveling in the left lane quickly changed lanes in an attempt to access the I-75 entrance ramp. As the vehicle changed lanes, it struck Trooper Wolf's motorcycle. He was dragged for several miles on I-75 before the driver pulled over at a rest area. The driver of the vehicle then struck Trooper Wolf... excuse me. The driver of the vehicle that struck Trooper Wolf cooperated with the investigation and was released without charges. He was... he is survived by his wife and four children. I ask for approval of this Resolution and invite the entire Body to show your support and sponsor this Resolution."

Speaker Currie: "On Senate Bill... I'm sorry... Senate Joint Resolution 36. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And Senate Joint Resolution 36 is adopted. Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. As we close down the Session today, I'm going to try to be brief, but it's very interesting day for us. Since I came into the General Assembly about five years ago, I've always seen a friendly face on the House Floor. And that's my friend, Russ Kimmons, down here in the corner. You'll see him behind a camera. As many of you may know, Russ has been a friendly face every day in this place when often faces aren't smiling. He gets them smiling, one way or another. He's... he's done a lot of great work here for our side of the aisle. And I think even sometimes stepping

86th Legislative Day

11/8/2017

in when you need pictures on your side of the aisle. He is retiring. This is his... probably his official last Session day unless something comes through in the last minute. But I just want to say how much we're going to miss him, how much we've appreciated having him around, and how much I'll enjoy seeing him back home and around this place, hopefully he still comes back to visit. Thank you, Russ."

- Speaker Currie: "Congratulations, Russ. He does take a fine picture. Clerk, announcements please."
- Clerk Hollman: "A reminder to all Members, the laptops should remain in the chamber. The laptops should remain in the chamber."
- Speaker Currie: "Yeah, the 2018... House Session schedule is being distributed, even as I speak. So be sure to collect your copy before you head for home. And now, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 23, 2018, or to the call of the Speaker. Happy holidays, one and all."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4155, offered by Leader Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4156, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning special council. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."