9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on January 30, 2013: recommends be adopted, referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Resolution 34."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will please be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the pastor of The Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, please turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most precious and sovereign God, the giver of both light and the giver of strength, it is before You that we bow our heads, and humble our hearts, that this august Assembly may reverence You. We realize that this is a day that You have made. Father, we honor it. So we take this moment, we pause before Your most holy presence, and we offer You our hearts, our minds, our lives. We cast upon You all of our cares, all of our worries, all of our weaknesses and ask of You, awesome God, for Your great strength, Your infinite wisdom, Your divine guidance. And for all of this, we humbly offer You thanks. In the name of Your precious Son, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Sandack."
- Sandack et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absences of Representatives Arroyo and Jones."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all of Republicans are present today. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 116 Members present and we do have a quorum. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution #7, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution #9, offered by Representative Cavaletto. House Resolution #10 offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution #11, offered by Representative William Davis. House Resolution #12, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution #13, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution #14, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 15, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 17, offered by Representative D'Amico. House Resolution 18, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 21, offered by Representative Jakobsson. House Resolution 22, offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 23, offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 25, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 26, offered by Representative Marcus Evans. House Resolution 29, offered by Representative Monique Davis. House Resolution #30, offered by Representative

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Mautino. House Resolution #31, offered by Representative Osmond. House Resolution 32, offered by Representative Bellock. House resolution 33, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 35, offered by Representative Leitch. And House Resolution 36, offered by Representative Costello."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 4, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 5, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 6, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 8, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 16, offered by Representative Williams. House Resolution 19, offered by Representative DeLuca. House Resolution 20, offered by Representative McAsey. House Resolution 24, offered by Representative Tracy. House Resolution offered by Representative Cross. House Joint Resolution #1, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Joint Resolution #3, offered by Representative Hays. House Joint Resolution #4, offered by Representative Beiser. Joint Resolution #5, offered by Representative Kay. House Joint Resolution #6, offered by Representative Osmond. These are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair would ask the Members to be in their chairs. On Supplemental Calendar #1, under the Order of

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Resolutions, there appears House Resolution 34. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the chamber. This is the Resolution that will establish the Rules that will govern our practices and procedures during the two years of the... 88th General Assembly. There are a couple of changes that are worth noting. For example, in these Rules we specify the names and the numbers of committees, select and regular, standard committees. So there are some changes from what we had in the last General Assembly to what we will have in this and if you want to have a look at them, you'll find them in the Rules, each of them identified by name and... and secondly we also, under current practice, while we have never quaranteed a right to have a Bill referred to committee in the second year of a two-year term, we have in the first. That's caused just some technical difficult problems for us and so we are removing that provision from this... this set of Rules. And finally, the third... the third major changes, extensive changes to procedure of select investigating and the select disciplinary committee..."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie, could you suspend for a moment?

Ladies and Gentlemen... Ladies and Gentlemen, this a

Resolution that will establish the Rules that this Body
will work under for the next two years. It might be worthy
of a few minutes of your time. So, let's please pay
attention to Leader Currie and those who wish to follow by
asking questions. Leader Currie."

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker, Members of the House. So when it comes to establishing a special investigative committee or a special disciplinary committee, there were several different ways that the establishment of investigating committee could happen under the old Rules. What we've done here is to say that, should three Members sign a petition alleging that charges should be filed against a sitting Member, that will be enough to create the investigating committee. We also made significant changes and streamlined the operations of both the select and the disciplinary committees. The rest of the changes, in my view, are pretty much technical. They came from your staff, from our staff, from the Clerk's Office, from individual Members who pointed out places where things didn't work as smoothly and function as well as they might have done. So, I would appreciate your questions because you... there are plenty of technical changes. I'd be happy to... to answer your questions about them. And I certainly would appreciate your support for these rules. I think under these rules, as we saw in the 97th, the 96th, the 95th, similar rules to this, our operations proceeded fairly. People had opportunity to have their issues heard; their voices were heard. The people they represent were heard in the halls of this House of Representatives and I am confident the same will be true in the 98th General Assembly when we adopt House Resolution 34."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of the Resolution. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Reboletti: "First of all, Mr. Speaker, before I make my Motion, I.m I'm surprised that this whole Body is not listening to the rules and what the Leader is saying. So, the second mo... this is the second most important vote we're going to make in this Session and hardly anybody's paying any attention. I'm not sure if you've already put your press releases out and making... taking your victory lap, but this is very important business. This speaks on behalf of all the 108 thousand people that we represent. And if I'm going to ask questions of Leader Currie, I'd like to know what she's saying first, even though we've already had an earlier conversation at the Rules Committee, but I would appreciate that everybody give their time and attention to each speaker as we move about in this debate. So, on that Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. And under House Rule 18(g), I move for the discharge of Amendment #1 to House Resolution 34 from the House Rules Committee. Under House Rule 54(a)(2), all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of the debate, I've asked for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Rule 49 Article... in Article IV, Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be recorded whenever five Representatives so shall request. There are five Members on my side of the aisle that are asking for that mo... that recordation. And I'm asking that we move to discharge Amendment #1 to House Resolution 34 from the House Rules Committee."

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman's made a Motion to Discharge. This

  Motion requires unanimous consent. The Chair recognizes

  Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I object to the Motion."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady objects to the Motion which requires unanimous consent. Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "You know, I had to file a Motion, Mr. Speaker, that said I needed unanimous consent of this Body to have a hearing on an Amendment that's been dually filed with plenty of notice to this Body, but of course, if one person, the Gentlelady from Hyde Park, doesn't like what I'm about to say, she can simply object and we won't have any recorded vote, God forbid. Many of you talked about transparency, accountability, openness of government and how you wanted things to change, but guess what. Same thing, different day. Based on that, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We specifically request a Roll Call on my Motion pursuant to the rights granted to me in the House Rules in the Illinois Constitution. This breach of Rules should be corrected immediately with a Roll Call vote on my Motion to Discharge."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, the Chair rules that this, under Rule 18, unanimous consent is required. No Roll Call is allowed for under Rule 18 and so your Motion is rejected.

  Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you. We're back then to my Motion on House Resolution 34. I've explained what the rules would do. They're very much the same as the rules we've operated fairly and judiciously under for the last several General

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Assemblies. And I would be more than happy to answer your questions. There are, as I say, a variety of technical changes and there is a listing, a large listing of the new committees, many of them old committees that will be available for participation in this... in this 98th General Assembly."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Fortner: "There are indeed a number of technical changes. I'd like to make sure I understand some of them and perhaps for the benefit of both the Members who have returned from previous General Assemblies and these would be changes as well as, of course, there is a large number of new Members that we see this year that, I think, would also benefit."

Currie: "That would be helpful."

Fortner: "One of the things... and which certainly looks like a technical change is in Rule #9 the part establishing a weekly order has been moved to a later Rule."

Currie: "Right. And if you look, Representative, what you'll see is that we moved back to a later rule. So, now the rule... right. So, the... the whole thing was in three different places which we thought was complicated, made it hard to find out exactly who was who and what was where. So, what we now do under this language is take the... yeah. So, we... we moved all of the Order... Orders of Business issues to Rule 31. But what that does is incorporate portions of old Rule 9 and old Rule 43. So there is no change in the number of votes required to do anything about

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

the… to suspend that Rule. It's the same as it was in the old Rule 9 and the Rule 43."

Fortner: "So, the... the current Rule 31 which become the...

Section(a) of the new Rule 31 would now be subject to the

71-Member vote that I see."

Currie: "Yes."

Fortner: "So, is that a change..."

Currie: "No. It is not a change."

Fortner: "...to the effect of 31?"

Currie: "It is not a change. If you look at old Rule 9 and old Rule 43, you will see what we've done is to put them all together in one place so there isn't so much confusion about what the answer to the question is."

Fortner: "So..."

Currie: "Yes. But it's... it's a change to 31, but it is not a substantive change..."

Fortner: "Okay."

Currie: "...to that description nor to what was happening in old Rule 9 and old Rule 43."

Fortner: "So, Rule 31 had a 71-vote..."

Currie: "Yes."

Fortner: "...requirement previously under a different Rule.'

Currie: "It... it did not under Rule 31. It had that 71-vote requirement for Rule 31 in another Rule. So, in order... in order to make it easy to figure out what the vote requirement is, we combined them and put them in one place instead of three."

Fortner: "One of the substantive Rules that you talked about, Rule changes that you talked about, was the change in the

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

requirement that in the first year of the two years of the General Assembly there would no longer be a requirement that the Rules Committee make an assignment. You said that... I think you described that you had some technical difficulties executing that."

Currie: "But, what I said is that..."

Fortner: "And that Rule has been there and I just wanted to understand what those difficulties were."

Currie: "So, some... the Rule required that within three legislative days an assignment must be made. Sometimes... depending on where people were and where the legislative days fell in the schedule, sometimes it was difficult to make the assignment in a sensible fashion within three days. Our experience with the second year of the two-year term, which we limit the opportunities for Bills to be automatically assigned, it doesn't work very differently from the way the first year of the two-year term does, so it seems sensible just to say that the Chair will have discretion. The Rules Committee will have discretion to make determinations to make assignments in year one as currently we have and have had in year two."

Fortner: "I would have thought..."

Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Mr. Fortner. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to make this request again. If you have to have a conversation, can you move it to the rear of the chamber. This is a very important Resolution and let's have both sides appropriately heard. So, I'm going to ask you to keep the noise level down or move your conversations to the rear of the chamber. Please proceed, Mr. Fortner."

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. So, if the technical difficulty was trying to comply with the three days, it would seem to me a more straight forward fix would have been to extend it to make it five or six days and provide that time if you've been having... rather than..."

Currie: "That... that would have been an alt..."

Fortner: "...now technically treating the first year as if it were the second year. I understand what you were saying about the second year, but now we're saying we're going to officially the Rules treat it that same way rather..."

Currie: "That would have been an..."

Fortner: "...simply provide the relief."

Currie: "...that would have been an alternate way to deal with the difficulty, but my argument is that we assign most Bills in the second year. We'll do the same thing in the first year. We shouldn't be bound by a specific time period. As you know, in the first year, some Bills are sent from the Rules Committee to what one might describe as a parking lot in another substantive committee... I would urge here, with this change, there may be a handful of Bills that don't get assigned to substantive committee. I'd be surprised if it were more than a handful of Bills... and instead we will park them in the Rules Committee whence we can always release them and allow them to drive out and go on their merry way to a different and substantive committee."

Fortner: "If I can take up another point within Rule 18 that changes, I see there is a decrease in the notice

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

requirement from two hours to one hour and what's the motivation on that, if you could."

Currie: "Yeah. If you look back at the Rules, you'll see that when the Rules Committee is reporting out an Amendment or a Motion for joint action for a Floor Amendment, if the Bill whatever is on the floor, it's a requirement. We have had a two hour requirement for making the same Motion to go to committee. I would argue that when you're sending an Amendment or a joint action Motion to the floor, it's possible that a Bill that is so amended could be passed by the General Assembly in one hour and one minute. Committees operate differently and operate more slowly. So one hour is good enough for an Amendment to come to the floor. Surely an hour is good enough to send Amendments to committee. And you know, you've been here Representative and you know that very often toward the end of a Session you're trying to get one final problem resolved with your Bill. You thought you had perfect language and then one of the stakeholders says wait a minute, you've got the comma in the wrong place. You rush to LRB. I want to make sure you have a chance, all the Members have a chance, to have that Bill heard before we adjourn at the end of May."

Fortner: "While I'm on item (g), now I know we saw an example of part of Rule 18 show up earlier with the attempt to discharge the Amendment and I wonder if just a very brief summary, again, we have so many new Members, of how it's intended to get a... an Amendment or a substantive Bill to move from Rules Committee particularly now that we have...

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

that we would have this change in the assignments language that we have already talked about."

Currie: "Okay. My... my guess is that is a practical matter. It'll make very little difference indeed. I anticipate that most Bills will be assigned from Rules Committee to a substantive committee in year one and in year two. If there is a problem with a Bill, then I would encourage Members to come to talk to me as the Chair of the Rules Committee, to the other Members of the Rules Committee. If there's a misunderstanding about a Bill, then we're all available to discuss, to talk. Remember, too, that even if a Bill ends up staying in a Rules Committee, it is always possible to have a subject matter hearing on that or any other topic in a substantive committee. So, I would encourage Members to remind themselves that they have that option. And finally, of course, the Rules Committee, while it takes unanimous consent to discharge the Rules Committee, there is a procedure under which if three-fifths of the Members of each caucus feel that a particular legislative measure is pressing, they can petition the Rules Committee. Should that happen, the Bill will be assigned to a substantive committee."

Fortner: "So, and I understand that, as you pointed out, that there are times when there are changes needed. Now one of the things with a Bill being in Rules Committee is that an Amendment is never in order as long as the Bill is in Rules."

Currie: "Correct."

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Fortner: "And many times what one would like to do is to have a Bill in committee and then be able to file the Amendment so all could see, since we now have a provision whereby the Amendment shows up for public display. It would seem to me that that restriction that it... if it doesn't, for some reason, go there and maybe there really is something technically that needed to be fixed, that Amendment now isn't in order to be filed because the Bill is in Rules. It almost feels like we're caught between two points there."

Currie: "Yeah. Really, three answers. First of all, you can always file a new Bill with the Amendment. Second, there are always shell Bills available to which you can offer the same Amendment. And third, it is not out of the... the realm of possibility for the Rules Committee or some other substantive committee to decide to move a Bill to the... the current Calendar when once that committee has seen the Amendment that you want to offer. For example, it's been past practice to put a lot of shell Bills, Bills that don't actually do anything, in the Executive Committee. When somebody comes along and says here's what I really want to do with the Bill, something substantive then we generally will move that Bill and the Amendment into a substantive committee. There's no reason that cannot happen with the Bill that is parked in the Rules Committee."

Fortner: "Talking about the committees, there's a difference though in terms of discharge from Rules as opposed to discharge from committees, still under these Rules. Is that correct?"

Currie: "That is correct."

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Fortner: "And... and could you, again, just to help with so many new Members on both sides of the aisle, just to clarify for us what that distinction is since now it may come into play more with other change in Rules."

"Okay. So... and the Rules Committee traditionally, Currie: certainly in the two-year term that began in 1995 when the Republicans held the Majority in this House, the Rules then provided, as they do today, that it takes unanimous consent to discharge the Rules Committee from consideration of a legislative matter. In fact, I think at one point I did a little... a little historical research and I think it's possible that that unanimous consent requirement actually preceded the 1995-'96 term. The idea is that the Rules Committee serves as a gatekeeper. The Rules Committee is intended to see to it that we deal in serious measures, serious issues, serious business. It is not the role of this chamber to engage in frivolous partisan debate. It is our job to solve the problem of our almost hundred billion dollar debt to the pension systems, to the 8 or 9 billion dollars in unpaid bills. So the Rules Committee has a function of making sure that we keep our eye on the prize. That we tend to our knitting. That we remember that our job here is not to be a Sunday afternoon debating society. It is to solve real problems facing the real people of the State of Illinois. So the unanimous consent requirement has been there, as I say, at least as far back as 1995. I believe earlier than that. But there is a safety valve. If it turns out that at... a three-fifths Majority of the Members of each caucus think that we are giving short

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

shrift to a really important Bill, a really important measure that will help solve those problems facing the people of the State of Illinois, then by petition that number of signatures is able to release from the Rules Committee that very Bill."

Fortner: "And part of my question was to distinguish that from a discharge from a substantive committee."

Currie: "I think the Rules are the same as they have been and that is that by oral Motion it takes 71 votes to discharge a committee. If you... if the Motion is on the Calendar, I believe it takes 60 votes. It takes a larger number of votes if the committee has voted 'do not pass' on the particular legislative measure."

Fortner: "Okay. I just wanted to, again, make sure everyone was aware of that. Let me turn to, probably, the area where there's the most substantive change just to make sure I understand. We've had a chance, you know, maybe to see what's going on. There's a lot of changes having to do with the special investigative functions of this Body and disciplinary functions of this Body. Could you go into some more detail on what those changes and how they would affect this Body should it be called upon to engage in those activities?"

Currie: "Okay. The first change is that the... under the old Rule that there several different ways to create a special investigative committee and if three Members signed a petition, that wasn't good enough. There were opportunities for the Speaker to intervene and so forth and so on. So, what we've done is say, very clean, very easy, very

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

straightforward, if three Members are prepared to say there are charges that we're... we're ready to file against a sitting Member, that creates a special investigative committee. By and large, the committees, the... the investigating committee and the disciplinary committee are the same. That is, there are six Members of the first, bipartisan, three Members from each Party; 12 Members of the second, again, six from each Party. But we've cleaned up a lot of conflicting language. We have made for a much more... a coherent and streamlined, efficient process. And I think that... that the lawyers who worked on the... the last Session's investigating and disciplinary committee would agree that these changes are going to make life a lot easier should we confront that same kind of petition in the future."

Fortner: "And I have to say I'm not surprised that there were changes since we really had the opportunity to fully exercise those parts of the Rules that rarely, and we would hope would stay rarely, would need exercise. So, I thank you very much for your answers..."

Currie: "Yeah. And I just want to add that..."

Fortner: "...and I look forward to listening to..."

Currie: "Okay."

Fortner: "...further debate."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "She yields."

Sullivan: "Leader Currie, can you explain to the Body in Article VI, Parliamentary Procedure, Rule 51(a)(1)."

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Currie: "Let me first find it. Rule 51, is that what you're asking about?"

Sullivan: "51(a)(1)."

Currie: "Okay. That's the same as in the current Rules. We make no changes to that Rule. So... we don't even see a subsection (1)."

Sullivan: "Oh, it's right here. It's under decorum. It says all Members shall be seated, quiet and vote the way their Leadership shall ask them to. Did you mention that to your side?"

Currie: "I thought the Chair made that point several times during this discussion."

"Well, I mean, it's somewhat injest. I might be a Sullivan: little persnickety right now, but when you look at these Rules, Ladies and Gentlemen, that's exactly what you're doing here. Rule 18(b), you don't even get a chance to put your Bill in a committee. You want transparency? You want to change the way things have been done in the past? How many people ran on that? Rule 18(e), notice requirements for Floor Amendments. We have, under the proposed Rules, less transparency, less time to actually look at Amendment for what you're going to vote on. So I say let's add Rule f... under decorum, Rule 51(a)(1), be seated, be quiet, and vote the way your Leadership wants. Because that's what you're getting under these Rules. And nobody's paying attention to it. Nobody's paying attention to it. You know, there's a couple of people who just came into... as new Members that I think did a good job challenging their Leadership. Where is Representative Drury? Representative

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Drury, you had an incident in your campaign where you didn't like what they did. You didn't like what some of your Leadership did and what they wanted to do in your campaign and you stood up to them. That was very brave, but it showed integrity. It showed that you're not going to run a campaign that you don't want to run. What are you going to do now? What are you going to do on this vote? Are you going to show the same integrity that you showed in your campaign? I commend you for that, but now is the time to figure out how you're going to vote. Representative Yingling, I believe is right here in front of me. You got here on your own. You did a good job in a good campaign. You don't need the ... your Leadership. You're your own man. What're you going to do now? Are you going to stand up to them and say, hey, we need more transparency. We don't have it in these Rules. Ladies and Gentlemen, Leadership are just people like you and I. They're not all powerful. They're not all knowing. They get powerful when you give them that power. Under this vote, you're going to give them that power. But let's see who wants to stand up and say enough is enough. Let's have a new day. Let's have bipartisanship. Let's work together to get things going. We're sitting here talking about less transparency when we had a bond sale that couldn't go through because we were going to get tanked because of what's going on in our state. But here we debate these Rules, here we give more power to... to your Leadership. Who wants to stand up and vote 'no' with our side, then we'll see if you want transparency or not."

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Speaker Lang: "Leader Reboletti, you have spoken in debate. For what reason do you rise?"

Reboletti: "That was on... that was on my Motion to Discharge, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "So the long speech that preceded your Motion was... was not about the Bi... the Resolution."

Reboletti: "Well, I... maybe I have some new material, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "All right. We'll let you proceed, Sir."

Reboletti: "Thank you. And to the Resolution. You know, I had a chance to have this conversation on October 12 with a reporter from the Daily Herald named Chris Placek, with my opponent at the time. And she questioned my ability to get Bills filed and to move Bills through committee, and I simply explained the system here. And if my Bill wasn't something that was a priority of the opposing Party that one person, either Speaker Madigan or the Leader Currie, would object and it would not receive a fair hearing. I did not realize that when I filed Motions to Discharge an income tax change, in changing our income tax structure from five percent to three percent, that was frivolous. Oh, and political. Thank you, Representative Bost. Or that when filed Motions to Discharge pensions that was also frivolous and partisan. Seriously, I can't believe that we're actually going to call it that. This is some debate club. Well, 108 thousand people didn't send me here to be told by Hyde Park how to fix the state. It's that simple. One person can object. I remember Representative Mayfield had a Bill she wanted to get through. I objected. And of

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

course, it was... it failed. It's not a fair system. I will have to then go back to my constituents and explain, I'm sorry. I needed a supermajority of Democrats and a supermajority of Republicans to sign a piece of paper that says, oh, let's debate this Bill. Now, Leader Currie has told me that she promises that all of these Bills will get substantive hearings in committee. I would ask the media to hold them accountable to let's see if all these Bills get up or down hearing in committee. The Rules Committee should be flushing out or fleshing out exactly what is frivolous or what is... has merit. That's for those substantive committees to do. That's what the Members get paid to do, to listen to the Members who bring their Bills forward to try to bring a better day here to the State of Illinois. It is ludicrous that one person can stand up and I can't get a Roll Call vote on any particular measure to try to overrule the Chair. That is not a democracy; that is tyranny."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can please have your attention."

Speaker Lang: "We'll get some order for you, Sir. Ladies and Gentlemen."

Bost: "I'm going to ask, if you would, to go back in your memory who first taught who... who was it that inspired you... that inspired you to first run for public office. Who was it? Go back in your mind. Was it a teacher? Was it a parent? Was it someone who really cared and believed in the process? I ask you... I ask you... Pay attention. Who was it that asked you to come and run for these offices? And did

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

they also ask you to give that power away? Did they? Did they? Because, please, go back and ask that person, if they're still alive, Did you... did you think that government was when you would come here and you'd vote for Rules that said, if I want a Bill that's very important to my district or very important to me, or very important to the state of ... as a whole, to come to this floor. At least, if I got maybe a majority of those people that serve with me regardless of what their Party is, to join with me, we can bring that Bill to the floor for debate. But in these Rules, folks, it says we have to have unanimous consent. Is that what you're constituents want? Is that what your constituents want? How about that person that talked to you and said, you know what, I think you should get involved in politics. I think you should make a difference. Heck, you don't want to make a difference. If you make a vote for this, you don't want to make a difference. There's no way. What... all you want to is give your power away. Folks, if you're not a freshman, if you're a Member that's been here a long time and I know who you are, you've come to me at different times and said, we've got a problem. We need to get it straightened out. Well, at what time do you finally stand up and say that's enough. When? When? Members who have been here a long time, you've suffered under this. Now the... Leader who's presenting the Bill will say, oh, well, in 1995 the Republicans put that in place or it's been around a long time. Well, that doesn't make it right, does it? I was a freshman; I made a wrong vote. Freshmen don't make that wrong vote. Let's get some Rules that we can work

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

with; where we can work together. We... we argue all the time on the campaign trails about how we want to work in a bipartisan manner. We want to cure the problems of the state. Is this is the real issue? I mean... I mean, then ... then why would you put yourself bound by these Rules? I don't even believe the Speaker himself. You know, in 1970, he was here working in drafting the Constitution that we are working under today. And I don't think, as a young attorney that was serving on that committee, he ever had any intention of taking power away from individual Members to the level that these Rules do. Oh, maybe some of you just say, never mind, I've been here long enough and it's a lot easier just to go back and say, boy, I really would've liked to have done that but, you know what, those House Rules and the Speaker, he just wouldn't let me have that happen. Here, let me put it into perspective for you. For this same Rule in the United States House, do you know what it takes? A simple Majority. Ladies and Gentlemen, the... the Resolution that we were proposing to amend this would simply, at least, allow a supermajority. But no, no, no, you're going to make this vote and when you make this vote, you're going to give away your power to one person. So don't listen to me. It really doesn't matter. I hope that the press will report on it, but then I also read a place in the Rules where it says actually the Speaker has control over who can come down on the floor and work in the press box instead of having to be forced up into the gallery. So, I guess, maybe that's why we can't get a hearing in the press either. Wake up. A lot of the problems that exist in

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

the State of Illinois exist because we, as individual Members, don't take back the power that is rightfully ours under the Constitution. Folks, the only true vote here is to vote 'no', and then let's work together on providing Rules that each of us can then have power and have that power that we're supposed to have and each have the same power for the 108 thousand people that we represent. Please, vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. The Rules Durkin: that we're about to vote for today, the ones that every one of us including you new freshman Members, as far as I can see, and I've been here for 14 years, are continually will be diminishing the voices of the Minority Party. Now, there's 47 Members of us and we represent 108 thousand the math on that. We don't have a... people. Do mathematician who was here, Representative Biss, to do the math, but we... that's about 5 million people in the State of Illinois. They pay taxes. They send us down here because they want a voice in government. They want us to be equal partners in this process. These Rules do not allow it. Now, many of you freshmen ran on the whole proposition that you were coming down here to reform government and reform the way Illinois operates. And I'd like to remind a few of you of it, this is a little trick I learned in 1995-'96 from the Speaker up here. But Representative Manley, you stated that I'm deeply concerned about where Illinois is heading and believe we need someone new in Springfield who can help balance the books, get the state's fiscal house in order

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

and push for much needed reforms. This vote doesn't get it done. Representative Scherer, you stated that you want to bring some common sense to the Legislature by working with Members of both Parties to improve public strengthen our schools, restore fiscal balance and create and retain jobs. This vote's not going to get it done. Representative Willis, you said you demand responsibility, to rein in state spending, make government pay its bills, make it be more efficient. Not at all. Representative Conroy, you stated that when you ran that, I will work to reform the way Illinois' budget is crafted to increase transparency and respect taxpayers hard-earned dollars. That means the 5 million people that we represent well. This vote isn't going to get it Representative Yingling, you stated that you're government reformer. You were a government reformer back with the township. These votes and the votes you're about to take today fly in the face of what all of you have ran on over the past year. Think long and hard about what you're voting for. Read these Rules. And if you think that this is fair to the taxpayers of Illinois, I differ with you on so many levels. I would encourage you to vote 'no' and let's get Rules that actually have negotiations between both Parties. Make this a fair process 'cause that's what you all ran on and we'll keep reminding you during the course of the year."

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I appreciate the comments, persnickety or possibly even

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

substantive. Let me say that it has been said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. And I would remind the Members on both sides of this aisle that the Rules we are talking about today, the provisions you focused on, the question, What happens to Bills in the first year of the term? and the unanimous consent rule. They came in in the ninety... in the 89th General Assembly, 1995 and '96 when the GOP was in control of this chamber. Many of you say now that you're sorry you voted for those Rules. Crocodile tears is what I would call that. reality is you did vote for them and let me just tell you that while in that biennium in 1995 and 1996, Democrats did not get a fair share of their opportunities to have their Bills heard. Only nine percent of the Bills that came out of committee were sponsored by Democrats. That has not been true in the times during which this Party has controlled the Chair, the speakership of the Illinois House. Over the last five, six, seven General Assemblies, the Bills that succeed in committee, the Bills that succeed in the House directly proportionate to the Bills that introduced. So, if 55 percent of the Bills are introduced by Democrats, it's about 55 percent of the Bills that come out of committee and the 55 percent of those that pass the House. There is not a disproportion. These Rules only set the framework. Only the framework and each of you knows that there are many countries organized by tyrants who have Constitutions that look terrific on paper. The reality is the paper doesn't tell you how the world will operate. We can and we have been in this chamber bipartisan. We can and

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

we have been fair. We can and we have respected individual Members, respected their rights and their responsibilities. We have done that in General Assemblies past. We will do so in the 98th General Assembly. I believe that these Rules will help us make sure that we treat one another with respect and civility. We will not turn this chamber into an opportunity to run the 2014 election cycle. We will make sure that this chamber focuses on real problems facing real people across the State of Illinois. With your help, with your support and with your 'yes' vote for these Rules, we will get it done. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the adoption of House Resolution 34. Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, first, an announcement. The House Democrats will caucus immediately upon adjournment in Room 114. Repeating, the House Democrats will caucus in Room 114 immediately after Session. Mr. Franks can explain what that is. I also want to remind Members, if you didn't receive the memo or don't read your e-mail, that Session tomorrow has been canceled. Mr. Clerk, under the Order of Resolutions appears HJR7. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is the Resolution that encourages the Governor to come before us and tell us of what he thinks is the state of the state. I would urge your 'aye' vote."

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

Speaker Lang: "There being no one wishing to speak, those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Cavaletto, Mr. Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. And now allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, February 5 at the hour of 12 noon. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned 'til Tuesday, February 5 at 12 noon. Democrats, Room 114 for caucus."

Clerk Bolin: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 1001, offered by Representative Hays, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1002, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1003, offered by Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 1004, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1005, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1006, offered by Representative health. Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1007, offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1008, offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1009, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation, which

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

may be referred to as "Kelsey's Law". House Bill 1010, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law, which may be referred to Law'. Bill 1011, 'Patricia's House offered bv Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1012, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Bill 1013, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning apostilles and certifications. Bill 1014, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1015, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1016, offered by Representative Davis, William, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1017, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1018, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act in relation to House Bill 1019, offered by Representative civil law. Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1020, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1021, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1022, offered Representative Walsh, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1023, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1024, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms. House Bill 1025, offered Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

House Bill 1026, offered by Representative Davis, William, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1027, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1028, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1029, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1030, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. House Bill 1031, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1032, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. House Bill 1033, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1034, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1035, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1036, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1037, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1038, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1039, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1040, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1041, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning civil House Bill 1042, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning public safety (sic- public

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

employee benefits). House Bill 1043, offered Representative Jackson, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1044, offered by Representative Jackson, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1045, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1046, offered by Representative Harris, Greq, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1047, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Bill 1048, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1049, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1050, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. House Bill 1051, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1052, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1053, offered by Representative Sullivan, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1054, offered by Representative Roth, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1055, offered Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1056, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1057, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1058, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1059, offered Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning local

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

government. House Bill 1060, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1061, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1062, offered by Representative Jefferson, a Bill for an Act concerning service. House Bill 1063, offered Representative Jefferson, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1064, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1065, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1066, offered Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1067, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1068, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1069, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1070, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1071, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 1072, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1073, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1074, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1075, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1076, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning alternative treatment for serious diseases

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

causing chronic pain and debilitating conditions. House Bill 1077, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1078, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1079, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1080, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1081, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1082, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1083, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1084, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 1085, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 1086, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1087, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1088, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1089, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1090, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1091, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1092, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1093, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Bill 1094, offered by House Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

elections. House Bill 1095, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning mental health. House Bill 1096, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning mental health. House Bill 1097, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning elections."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1098, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1099, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 10... correction... House Bill 1100, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1101, offered Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1102, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1103, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1104, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 1105, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 1106, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1107, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1108, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1109, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act House Bill 1110, offered by concerning regulation. Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning nursing homes. House Bill 1111, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1112,

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1113, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning civil House Bill 1114, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1115, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for concerning criminal law. House Bill 1116, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal House Bill 1117, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1118, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1119, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1120, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 1121, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1122, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1123, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1124, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1125, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1126, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1127, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. First Reading of these House Bills. First Reading of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #7.

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

WHEREAS, The Ninety-second Congress of the United States of America, at its Second Session, in both houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds, adopted the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America:

#### JOINT RESOLUTION

RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED (TWO-THIRDS OF EACH HOUSE CONCURRING THEREIN), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

#### NEW ARTICLE

- Section 1. Equality of rights under law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex.
- Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article.
- Section 3. This Amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.""; and
- WHEREAS, A Joint Resolution is a resolution adopted by both houses of the General Assembly and does not require the signature of the Governor; a Joint Resolution is sufficient for Illinois' ratification of an amendment to the United States Constitution; and

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

27th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the so-called Madison Amendment, relating to Compensation of Members of Congress; this amendment was proposed 203 years earlier by our First Congress and only recently ratified by three-fourths of the States; the United States Archivist certified the 27th Amendment on May 18, 1992; and WHEREAS, The founders of our nation, James Madison included, did not favor further restrictions to Article V of the

WHEREAS, The United States Congress has recently adopted the

- did not favor further restrictions to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, the amending procedure; the United States Constitution is harder to amend than any other constitution in history; and
- WHEREAS, The restricting time limit for the Equal Rights Amendment ratification is in the resolving clause and is not a part of the amendment proposed by Congress and already ratified by 35 states; and
- WHEREAS, Having passed a time extension for the Equal Rights Amendment on October 20, 1978, Congress has demonstrated that a time limit in a resolving clause can be disregarded if it is not a part of the proposed amendment; and
- WHEREAS, The United States Supreme Court in Coleman v. Miller, 307 U.S. 433, at 456 (1939), recognized that Congress is in a unique position to judge the tenor of the nation, to be aware of the political, social, and economic factors affecting the nation, and to be aware of the importance to the nation of the proposed amendment; and
- WHEREAS, If an amendment to the Constitution of the United States has been proposed by two-thirds of both houses of Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the state

9th Legislative Day

1/30/2013

legislatures, it is for Congress under the principles of Coleman v. Miller to determine the validity of the state ratifications occurring after a time limit in the resolving clause, but not in the amendment itself; and

WHEREAS, Constitutional equality for women and men continues to be timely in the United States and worldwide, and a number of other nations have achieved constitutional equality for their women and men; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America set forth in this resolution is ratified; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Archivist of the United States, the Administrator of General Services of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and each member of the Illinois congressional delegation. This was First Reading of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #7. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."