131st Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "The House should come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Don Castleberry who is with the Pawnee Assembly of God in Pawnee, Illinois. Pastor Castleberry is the guest of Representative Ray Poe. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Castleberry: "Father, we come before You this morning and we ask this morning that You would guide us with Your wisdom and Your direction. I thank You for these incredible men and women who lead us and guide us, God, I pray that they would never be distracted by the murmuring of sidelines, God, while they stand on the frontlines, God, and lead this wonderful state. God I pray this morning that You would give them a protection of safety, Lord, their families would experience, God, Your provision. God, I pray this morning that You would just guide this meeting with Your direction and that everything would be done in Your order, God. In Your name we pray, Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Poe."
- Poe 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 Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie for excused absences."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show there are no excused absences this morning among House Democrats."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

131st Legislative Day

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Anthony is excused on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 115 people responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 15, 2014: approved for consideration, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5379, Floor Amendment 2 to House Bill 6021, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6027, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6057, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6057, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6057, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6071, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6072, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6077, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6084, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6086, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6087, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6132, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6133, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6134, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6139, and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6156."
- Speaker Madigan: "On page 22 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 347. Representative Cloonen, did you wish... did you wish to move the Bill? Did you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 347, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

131st Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading. Senate Bill 644, Mr. Unes. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 644, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 498, Mr. Mautino. Do you wish to move the Bill? 498. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 498, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 728, Mr. Turner. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 728, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 902, Mr. Welch. Mr. Welch, do you wish to move the Bill? 902. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 902, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment...

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 978, Mr. Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 978, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1547, Mr. Lang. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, leave the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 99... Senate Bill 1996, Representative Nekritz. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1996, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2003, Mr. Sandack.
 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2003, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2620, Mr. Rita. Do you wish to move the Bill? 2620. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2620, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2636, Mr. Lang. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2636, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

131st Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Oh, excuse me. The Ord... the Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. The Chair recognizes Mr. Lang for an Amendment."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment makes some changes in the medical cannabis law. I would ask that we adopt the Amendment. We'll debate it on Third."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2694, Mr. Drury. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2694, a Bill for an Act concerning posting of information on an Internet site. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2695, Mr. Unes. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2695, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2730, Representative Nekritz. Do you wish to move the Bill? Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 2744, Mr. David Harris. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2744, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2800, Representative Mayfield. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2800, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2801, Mr. Sims. Do you wish to move the Bill? Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 2802, Mr. Turner. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2802, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Turner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner on the Amendment."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to adopt the Amendment and debate it on Third Reading if possible."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. And no Motions are filed." Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate 2846, Mr. Mautino. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2846, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2928, Representative Osmond. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2928, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2941, Representative Cassidy. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2941, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2958, Representative Feigenholtz. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2958, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2972, Mr. Crespo. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2972, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

131st Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2995, Mr. Turner. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2995, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3014, Representative Osmond. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3014, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3027, Representative Currie. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3027, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Senate Bill 3029... Mr. Clerk, on Senate Bill 3027 put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading. Senate Bill 3029, Mr. Beiser. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3029, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3044, Mr. Rita. Do you wish to move the Bill? 3044. Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 3055, Mr. Fortner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3055, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3076, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3076, a Bill for an Act concerning health care. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3081, Mr. Burke. Do you wish to move the Bill? 3081. Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 3096, Mr. Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3096, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang on the Amendment."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Amendment is a technical one dealing with the calibration of lidar and radar detectors. I would ask that we adopt the Amendment and discuss it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3110, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3110, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3113, Mr. Moffitt.

 Do you wish to move the Bill? Take the Bill out of the record.

 Senate Bill 3137, Mr. Lang. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr.

 Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3137, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3147, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3147, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would like to caucus immediately, if possible."
- Speaker Madigan: "Do you have an estimate of time?"
- Bost: "We're going to... we're going to move as fast as we can. We hope a half hour to an hour, but..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Okay."
- Bost: "...we're going to try to get back as we can. We do want to encourage our Members to move quickly to the caucus."
- Speaker Madigan: "Sure. So, the Republicans will go to caucus. If all Republican Members would please go to the Republican Caucus in Room 118. Democrats will remain at ease. As soon as

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

the Republicans return to the floor, we'll return to business. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we're going to begin on page 25 of the Calendar. First, we'll start with Mr. Clerk."

"Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Clerk Bolin: Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 15, 2014: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #3 for House Bill 6071, Floor Amendment #2 for House Resolution 1023, Floor Amendment #1 for Senate Bill 3109, Floor Amendment #2 for Senate Bill 3283, and Floor Amendment #1 for Senate Bill 3507; approved consideration, referred to Second Reading House Bill 395, House Bill 396, House Bill 397, House Bill 398, House Bill 399, House Bill 400, House Bill 401, House Bill 402, House Bill 403 and House Bill 404."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Bost: "You know, we understand that there may be some heated debate here on the floor today and because of that we brought back someone that we feel would just be appropriate to have here and if everybody would welcome Bill Black back into the chamber."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome back, Representative Black. Members, beginning on page 25 of the Calendar in Senate Bills under Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 3255, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3255, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

131st Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3262, Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino, would you like to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3262, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3234, Representative Zalewski. Representative Evans, would you like to move this Bill? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3234, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Manley, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Manley: "Personal point of privilege, please."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."
- Manley: "I have a special guest up in the gallery today. John, can you stand up. This is John Hicks. Everyone welcome John. He's 17 years old, he interns at my district office. He is a Special Olympian in basketball, volleyball, Bocce Ball, softball and he's on the bowling team. And I want to thank all of my colleagues for signing the certificate for John to congratulate him on all his hard work. He's been with me a whole year. Can we welcome John Hicks and his mother, Angela?"
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Welcome to your Capitol.

 Representative Brauer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

131st Legislative Day

- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, please give a warm welcome to my old football coach, up here in the gallery, Bob Churchill and his wife, Ruth."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And welcome to your Capitol. Senate Bill 3286, Representative Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3286, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3287, Representative Bradley. Representative Bradley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3287, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A fiscal note has been requested and has not been filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Fiscal note? Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 3288, Representative Stewart. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3288, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3314, Representative Cabello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3314, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

131st Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3318, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 30... Senate Bill 3318, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3332, Representative McAsey. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3332, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3334, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3334, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3387, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk... Out of the record. Senate Bill 3398, Representative Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3398, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3409, Representative Fine. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3409, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

131st Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3423... Mr. Clerk...

 Representative Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3423, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3434, Representative Kelly Burke. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3437. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3447, Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3447, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3448, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3448, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3465, Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3465, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Yingling."
- Speaker Turner: "Senate Bill 3460... Excuse me. Representative Yingling for the Floor Amendment #1."
- Yingling: "It just makes a technical change to the underlying language for clarification purposes."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3465. All in favor say 'aye'; all

131st Legislative Day

- opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3441, Representative Pritchard. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3441, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Pritchard."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Floor Amendment is a technical Amendment that adds language from the Attorney General that says nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the authority of the Attorney General. I ask for your support."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3441. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Jones, for what reason do you seek recognition? Senate Bill 3468, Representative Sandack. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3468, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3488, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3488, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3507, Representative Kay. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3522, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3522, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Feigenholtz."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 simply adds some clarifying language to the TASC drug treatment program making it... making clear that low-level meth users are also eligible for the drug treatment program. And I ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3522. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3507, Representative Kay. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3507, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Kay."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

131st Legislative Day

- Kay: "Yeah. On thi... Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'd like to withdraw Amendment #1. I'd like to lay it on the table."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please table Floor... Representative Kay, would like to withdraw Floor Amendment #1."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3574, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3574, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Brady, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Brady: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Brady: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, please welcome my Page today from my district, Harrison Gordon, down in front. Stand up, Harrison, who's here with his father. How about a nice Springfield welcome for Harrison Gordon and his dad."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And welcome to your Capitol.

 Representative Pihos, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I would like the General Assembly to welcome my Page today, Julia Canellis, a sixth grader from Century School in Orland Park, who's here with her parents, George and Melissa, her sister, Joslyn and her brother, Jackson."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And welcome to your Capitol. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills on Third

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Reading, we have House Bill 6021. Mr. Clerk, please put this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Motions pending?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6021, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. 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 Will Davis."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 represents some additional adjustments that were made to some of the spending lines from House Amendment #1. These are recommendations that were made to us by the State Board of Education. So, they represent increases in lines such as diversifying teachers, edu... diversifying educators, truant alternative programs, regional safe school programs, and the assessments line."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6021. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6021, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry. I'm just trying to find my notes from yesterday, but... Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6021 represents the budget for the State Board of Education. Some of the highlights of the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

as we debated yesterday in committee include a \$132,124,740 for general state aid which, based on the Amendment, ups the proration of general state aid to 90 percent... excuse me, to 90 percent. There's an additional \$54 million added to the transportation line which, I believe, yesterday we were reported would take the transportation line to 85 percent proration. That was a mistake. Let me say, that was a mistake, so the actual... the 85 percent was a mistake. The actual proration of general state aid is 83 percent. We have \$11,381,900 for the special education maintenance of effort line. So, we will meet our federal obligation as it relates to maintenance of effort. An additional \$17,200,000 in the assessments line, and then we just added a little more with the adoption of Amendment #2 to the assessments line. And what that will provide for us is that we will do what is federally mandated for us, which means that we'll provide an assessment in grades three through eight and with the adoption of Amendment #2 we will provide two assessments in high school. In addition to that, we are fully funding the ACT. And what I mean by that is, we're going to fund the test; we are going to fund work keys as well as the writing portions of the ACT, which is the same thing we did last year. There's an additional \$24,931,100 in special... excuse me... in early childhood education. So, that was reduced several years ago. There have been efforts to try to bring that back. We're attempting to do that in this Bill. And then also, in bilingual education we'll be adding additional \$12,270,800 in bilingual education. Those are essentially the highlights of the Bill. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. The Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr... Representative Lang. I would just like to make a few brief comments. We have a very long day ahead of us and we're prepared to go to work. But before we get into just want to recognize the people Appropriations staff who have worked tirelessly over the past few months to get us here today. But I also want to recognize the staff on the Majority side of the aisle as well. They've worked extremely hard and I think we all owe them a debt of gratitude for the hard work they put into making this day happen. So, I just want to make sure that that's on the record that people know that we appreciate what they do. But before we get into this... Thank you. I just want to have kind of a general statement and overview of my thoughts and how this process has worked. It's only been since October of last year, upon my election as Minority Leader, I did make a commitment to work in a cooperative, bipartisan manner to address our most important and pressing issues of today... of the day. That was never more evident than the collaborative effort between Speaker Madigan and I in Senate Bill 1, Chicago pension reform, the voting rights Constitutional Amendment and finally, House Joint Resolution 80, the revenue estimate for FY15. In past years, there are many times when there was no agreement on this figure; however, as a sign of good faith and in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation, the House Republicans unanimously approved Representative Bradley's Resolution calling for a revenue number of 34.4 billion for FY15. That is what we agreed on and that is what

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

we all voted for. A few weeks later, following that extremely important vote, the Governor presented his Budget Address and stated that the need to make permanent the temporary tax of 2011. The Speaker and the President quickly sided with the Governor on this proposal. Good faith, what happened? For the past few months, the Appropriation Committees have met, but little progress was made for the obvious reasons. No one is... knows exactly what the revenue number which we're working on, whether it's 38 billion, 34 billion. Difficult to run an Appropriation Committee when that's how it's being run and that's how it's being managed. I just want to state that the House Republicans have consistently stated that we will not support the extension of the temporary tax increase from 2011. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are losing jobs, job creators and families by the second to our surrounding states. They're leaving because of the tax and spending policies thrust upon Illinoisans these many years of one-Party rule. Folks, we agreed upon a revenue number in good faith last month in HJR80, live by it. But today, we are being asked to vote for a budget that realizes the permanency of that 11th hour tax increase in 2011 during that lame duck Session. Remember these statements: we need to pay the bills, we need to pay the bills, we need to fix our structural deficit, this is going to boost our credit rating, this is going to put people back to work. Well, folks, we still have \$5 billion of unpaid bills. What structural deficit has been fixed? Someone needs to explain that to me and also the Members of our caucus. Nothing has been fixed. We've been downgraded more times than I can count since then. And on Tuesday, this past Tuesday of

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

this week, 58 different Appropriation Amendments were filed. In less than 24 hours, approximately \$37 billion in spending was voted out of our Appropriation Committees on a partisan Roll Call. Today, there has been no change in the revenue projections for FY15. It just doesn't seem right. It doesn't seem sincere. It doesn't seem genuine. And why? Because it isn't. We are voting today for an unconstitutional budget, plain and simple. Our caucus stands arm in arm with the working families, the job creators, the small businessmen of the state, the ones who make the state work and make the state great. But I will just say this, a word of caution for those who are watching us, our friends who have visited us today, there will be today... there'll be a lot of charades, some gamesmanship and some gotcha tactics. That's not worthy of this chamber. But I just want people to know that they should not buy into it. For those who want a better Illinois, an Illinois that applauds and encourages success, rest assured, we have your back. Plain and simple, folks, the State of Illinois needs to live within its means and we must stop this reckless pattern of insane spending. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your inquiry, Sir."

Kay: "As we go along today, we're... we're sort of a big corporation here, and I'm wondering if you would allow us to bring in a whiteboard so that we could keep track of the appropriations that are passed so that we know exactly what the upper or lower limits are of our budget and Appropriations Bills passed today?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Lang: "I will direct your inquiry to the Chief of Staff..."

Kay: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "...and we will get back to you, Sir."

Kay: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, there's a number of changes in your second Amendment from what we debated in committee. Can you go through quickly and explain why these changes are occurring at this hour?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I think what you can appreciate, Representative Pritchard, is that even budget Bills are an ever-evolving document. So, even after we had our last workgroup meeting, I had a conversation with the chairman of the Board of Education as well as the State Superintendent and they offered some additional recommendations. I had no issues with those recommendations. They're going back into some of the things that we've already discussed and I would like to think that these are things that we think are important in the education budget. So, again, that includes the assessments line that includes regional safe schools, truant alternative schools and something that they asked for was the diversifying educator line. So, these were, I think, good things that we were able to put some resources in and so, they were included in Amendment #2."

Pritchard: "So, is there any indication how this recruitment of diversified educators is going to be spent, \$700 thousand?"

131st Legislative Day

- Davis, W.: "Hold on a minute. So, according to a book that you have, it says that the mission is to provide funding to support diverse educator candidate recruitment programs in middle schools, high schools and institutions of higher education. Indicates the purpose is to increase the number of teacher candidates from diverse populations, i.e., ethnicity, socioeconomic status, by providing structured programming that introduces students in middle and high school to the work of the teacher and the larger issues in education and schooling. The reimbursement and distribution methods as it's based on criteria established by the Illinois State Board of Education, grants are awarded on a competitive basis through a Request for Proposal process. Districts who wish to partici... wish to partner with institutions of higher education are eligible to participate in this program."
- Pritchard: "So, this certainly sounds like a worthwhile objective, as we look at the diversity of our faculty, but aren't we already spending money on various programs including Grow Your Own, Teach for America, spending millions of dollars in the same general area?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, if you would... if you're trying to argue that we shouldn't be figuring out creative ways to try to recruit minority teachers, I don't know if that's... if that's exactly what you're suggesting, yes, there are dollars being spent in other... other Appropriations Committees to do other ways or have other means or ways of recruiting minority teachers. But I mean, we do contracting in all of our different agencies. We have minority contracting provisions in all of our

131st Legislative Day

- agencies. It's not just limited to one agency or another. So, in that respect..."
- Pritchard: "But this is for a specific purpose and that's all I'm saying is that it's an important purpose, but we're already spending money in this area and we have other priorities that we'd like to spend money on."
- Davis, W.: "Well, maybe... maybe if you're suggesting that maybe we consolidate all of these dollars in one area, okay, I wouldn't necessarily disagree with that, but as it stands right now, you're right, we have Grow Your Own, which is I believe in higher education. We have this program in K through 12 education. While it seems like they have kind of the same premise, I believe there are differences in the programs that speak to the uniqueness of the programs, which is why they're housed in other areas."
- Pritchard: "Well, there's a number of other changes that have been made in your Amendment that I think we ought to look at. I think many of them are meritorious, certainly areas that we had wanted to spend more money. And I would just say for the Body that this is one committee that has been advanced, the budget has been advanced in a very bipartisan fashion. And I compliment the chair of this committee for that openness and the engagement that help us debate and set individual priorities that he's already outlined in the major changes of this Bill. One of the areas though that we talked about that I think the group ought to be aware of is that this budget was predicated on more revenue than what this chamber has passed as anticipated revenue. Thirty-four point five. This budget has been predicated on a much greater number. Do you

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

know exactly what the increase in spending over the not recommended budget is for this particular category or appropriation area?"

- Davis, W.: "Well, I don't know what the percentage is, but at least according to an analysis that we have, if you're talking about from... over FY14, the difference in spending is \$291,285,714."
- Pritchard: "Which is a significant amount of money, I agree. But as we look at the total available money that I think we're going to be dealing with, whether it's 37.3 as we've already heard or whether it's 38 million... billion dollars, which the Governor had recommended, that's a considerable increase. And if we look at the percentage that education has normally gotten out of our expendable revenue, we should be somewhere in the 3.5 billion area or... in education. We should be at several billion dollars or at least over one billion dollars, and we're talking about 291 million. Isn't this a change in the proration that we've used in this chamber?"
- Davis, W.: "I think if you look at it the way you just indicated, then I would agree with you that that is a little different based on our percentage allocations that we have used in the past. Yesterday, in committee, we had a very similar conversation and the question was, is education still a priority? And again, I would argue that while, as you indicated, it's only a \$300 million increase, but I think this increase is still higher than any of the other Appropriations Committees that had other dollars or additional dollars that they could spend. So, I would still argue that, again, we are still a priority. Would I like us

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

to be more of a priority? Absolutely. Tell me... tell me someone in this chamber who doesn't run on some education platform that they support education and want to see it fully funded, for lack of a better word. I think we all agree on that, but I think the reality is that there are always some limitations. We don't have an unlimited pot of resource that we can use, say, in this case for K through 12 education. So, we have some... some realities that we face and some limitation, unfortunately, as you may, you know, would probably argue that this is indeed a limitation. I would just say in comparison to the other committees we are still a priority and we have shown that in this budget."

Pritchard: "Well, certainly, it's a priority, but I come back to the point, and I think the Body ought to be aware, that if we're talking about \$3.5 billion of increased spending over what this chamber has approved, we should use the 39.9 percent allocation to education which would have netted \$1.4 billion of increased spending for education. That would be state money that would allow our local school districts to rely upon state funding rather than the local property tax. And property tax relief is a major issue in our local communities. So, I think if we were to use the right percentage, with the increased revenue that the Majority Party seems to be advancing in these budget Bills, we would be at a much higher number. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think this is an increased budget, but it certainly isn't a fair budget, isn't an appropriate budget and it's shifting, again, the cost of education on to our local level. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sit on the Elementary and Secondary Education Appropriation Committee and I stand in strong support of the Appropriation Bill. I echo the comments made yesterday in committee by Representative Pritchard applauding the bipartisan approach we used to address the education budget. As it should, the budget received a thorough vetting. Good budget principles include working a budget from the ground up based on needs and top down based on revenue pressures. We have done both. As you will agree, education is a priority we all share. It is my priority and it is this state's priority. So, I'm very pleased to see us put our money where our mouth is and increase general state aid, early childhood, special education, transportation, bilingual education and assessment funding. The students of Illinois deserve education to be our top priority and the effort requires that we fund education and we vote for education. question was raised, is voting for this Bill constitutional? Our Constitution states that our revenues need to meet our expenditures. And since budgeting for results, we absolutely must set a revenue ceiling based upon only currently approved funds. A budget oversized does not end complexity, does not happen all at once. It happens over several weeks and in several Bills. We are still in the earlier stages of the fiscal year's budget process; therefore, I plan to support my priority of education and still keep our total spending under the total revenue ceiling I approved. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

131st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Sandack: "Representative, a previous speaker talked about the budget holistically, and certainly you're addressing appropriations with respect to K through 12 spending, so I want to initially talk about that, but then also fit it into the larger context because that's what we have to do here. Year over year, from fiscal '14 to '15, your budget or this Bill spends 291 million more than last year?"
- Davis, W.: "I believe that's what my analysis indicates."
- Sandack: "And obviously, a previous speaker talked about recent Amendments and I think your answer was the budget's ever evolving. Is it going to evolve further in your estimation, today?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, once we take a vote, that's the vote."
- Sandack: "Well, I guess what I'm asking, Will, is we set a revenue projection at 34.4 billion and you voted on it and so did I. How does your Appropriation Bill, this Bill, 6021, fit in to the ceiling we set with respect to spending?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I guess with regard to the Resolution which I believe is nonbinding, correct?"
- Sandack: "So, we shouldn't have done it?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, no. I'm just saying I want to... since we're making clarifications, a Resolution in that respect is nonbinding. And as the previous speaker indicated, it's an estimate. It estimates what our... what our revenues could be or what we could spend."
- Sandack: "You're quite right. Do you think that... you received anything from COGFA or any reliable source to change that estimate from just a couple weeks ago?"

131st Legislative Day

- Davis, W.: "Have I received anything? No."
- Sandack: "Yes, Sir."
- Davis, W.: "No, I have not received anything from them."
- Sandack: "Are you aware of any information that would make the Resolution that we passed on a bipartisan basis void or no longer the correct estimate of projected revenues?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, considering, again, it's an estimate or a projection, I would like to think that there's a possibility it could change, but I'm not on COGFA, not the work that I do. But we crafted a budget based on a number that we were given to craft a budget on and we proceeded with that."
- Sandack: "And certainly. And... and I understand you're looking at this just from the K through 12 education lens, but certainly it has to fit into the overall budget that we're going to spend here, correct?"
- Davis, W.: "Yes."
- Sandack: "And to that end, I think our staff on our side and your staff may agree or maybe there's a little slight disagreement, but of the numerous Amendments that were put in a couple days ago, I think we're looking at over 37.2 billion in total appropriations. Is that what you see as well?"
- Davis, W.: "I don't know what the total number is. Again, I can speak to K through 12, as we've indicated, it's over \$290 million, almost \$300 million, but if you're asking about the total amongst all the Appropriations Committees, unfortunately I can't answer that question."
- Sandack: "Will... does your budget... does this Bill, 6021, anticipate or presume... better word... does it presume that the temporary tax increase goes permanent?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Davis, W.: "No, not necessarily. Now..."

Sandack: "Not necessarily. Tell me how it doesn't fit?"

Davis, W.: "Well... well, again, we were suggested... we were given the opportunity to craft a budget based on a number. Now, I think when we talk revenue, revenue is a large ball, so to speak, and it encompasses a number of things. I believe there is conversation... yes, there's conversation about extending possibly the permanent income... excuse me... the temporary income tax increase and making it permanent. There's conversation about offering a property tax rebates to homeowners. There's conversations about rolling back some of the corporate taxes. So, again, there's a lot that makes up what could be the revenue available for doing this and..."

Sandack: "I agree. So, then what's..."

Davis, W.: "...and we haven't had that conversation in totality."

Sandack: "And why... and why haven't we, Representative? Aren't we putting the cart before the horse? I think your point is well-taken. We're not even talking about revenue, yet we're talking about spending. We're going to have about 70 or so spending Bills here and we don't even know that the revenue to pay for these Bills is. Don't we have it backwards?"

Davis, W.: "No. I wouldn't necessarily say we have it backwards. We have a responsibility to... to move forward with what we would like to see spent here in the State of Illinois. I think we're doing that. Again, these are conversations that are ongoing. Now, if you want to characterize it as cart before the horse, you know, obviously that... that's your choice. As an Appropriations Chair, I'd move for with putting together a budget and that's what we have in front of us."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I certainly don't begrudge the Sponsor trying to spend more on education. It's a priority for many. Spending 290 million more than the year before, but say we don't know how we're going to have to pay for it, I think is entirely inappropriate. We're going to go through this process the rest of the day. A previous speaker talked about putting our mouths where the ... our money where the mouths are. That's a good thing to do after we decide what our revenue's going to be. And actually, that Resolution we passed unanimously, a mere three weeks ago, set that number at 34.4 billion and now we're going to go through this process of spending nearly \$38 billion. It is an illicit facade and we shouldn't do it. We ought to stop this thing right now and concentrate on what matters. Families and businesses do not budget this way and the state shouldn't either. I urge a 'no' vote on this and almost every other Appropriation Bill, in fact, every Appropriation Bill until we have a true and honest process. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, like you, learned many lessons from our parents. One of the first things I can remember my father talking about State Government was Oglesby put in the income tax. My father told me that you do not balance a budget by increasing revenues; you balance a budget by controlling spending. Here we are today, we're looking at ways to go above what we agreed at 34.4 billion, looking ways to justify 38 billion and then saying we need a tax increase to justify all this new spending. You wonder why the people of Illinois are

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

dissatisfied. If you pick up your SJ-R today, there's a George Will article in there about the stark contrast in Illinois politics. He talks about a new Gallup poll that has Illinois the highest percentage, 50 percent of the people in this state want to live elsewhere. Don't you think it's time we start enacting policies that we kept the people of Illinois content with living in our great state? Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a parliamentary inquiry." Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry."

Franks: "It's my understanding that the Constitution of the State of Illinois requires that we have a balanced budget. We did have a revenue estimate that passed this chamber unanimously at a number that was significantly less than the introduced budget that we're asking to vote on. I'm wondering if we can even vote on something that would, on its face, be unconstitutional. When we all took our oaths of office, the one thing we took an oath to do was to uphold the Constitution. So, my inquiry is, can we vote on a Bill when the revenue estimates are over \$4 billion less than the Governor's introduced budget?"

Speaker Lang: "On behalf of the Speaker, the answer to your parliamentary inquiry is yes. Do you have any questions of the Sponsor, Sir?"

Franks: "I have another inquiry."

Speaker Lang: "Sure."

Franks: "A few years ago the Governor signed a law, I believe the name was either Budgeting for Outcomes or Budgeting For Results. At that time, in that Bill, it stated that the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Governor could not introduce a budget that did not match revenues. That was explicit in the law that he could not do that. Are we able to vote on a Bill today that's directly in contrast to the law that we passed? That's my parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Lang: "The answer is yes. Anything further, Mr. Franks?" Franks: "Okay. I'd like to ... I'd like to talk then to the Bill. I appreciate what the Sponsor's done and I'd do the exact same thing if I were him. I would, because we all want to spend money for education. We want to help Greg Harris in what he's doing as well and all of us want to be able to do that, everything. But the fact is, we have a fiduciary obligation to do the right thing. Mr. Speaker, I'm... I'm chairman of the board of a bank. I sit on numerous corporate boards. I'm counsel to numerous businesses. If I ran our businesses like the state is doing here, the state would seize us. They would close us up. This is not sound business practices. Right now, folks, we are on a life raft and we are sinking. And instead of jettisoning the things that are not important, we are taking our flat screen TVs with us. Yesterday, I had a press conference where I highlighted the failings of Northstar, which runs the Illinois Lottery. Let me give you a few highlights. They've downgraded the amounts of money they were supposed to bring into the state by over \$900 million. They're presently in litigation to reduce those amounts by an additional 650 million for a reduction of over \$1.5 billion. In the three years since Northstar has been running this Lottery, they have shortchanged the State of Illinois in profits by their own contractual obligations in excess of

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

\$445 million. Now, instead of firing this underperforming contractor, the Governor, for some reason, continues to protect them. So, as a result, we created an additional \$445 million budget deficit because we have not done the meaningful things we need to do to clean up government and to run it better. So, instead, what we're sitting here today, is we're asking us to spend \$4 billion more than what our revenue estimates indicate. You're asking implicitly and tacitly for a tax increase. So, a vote for this budget is also a for vote a tax increase. Now, if we're going to do that tax increase, let's be honest about it. Let's vote for it today. Let's see if they've got the votes out for it and let's do it. Once we know what the revenues are then we should be talking about the budget. That's what budgeting for results states; that's what our Constitution states. We took an oath to uphold this Constitution. We passed the law for budgeting for results. We should not be voting on this unless we are voting on what the revenue estimates show. So, as a result, I reluctantly have to stand in opposition because nothing would make me happier than to fully fund our schools. But we can't in good conscience do so because of our constitutional requirements. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Davis, we know that in the education appropriation budget there is a \$20 million line figure for targeted initiatives. Do you have that list yet on what those targeted initiatives will be?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Davis, W.: "Well, let me indicate to you that that number is different now. Amendment #2 changed what will be left in the targeted initiative line, so it's about \$12 million now. The targeted initiatives includes after school programs in various parts of the state, dollars for schools in Peoria, capital improvements for schools in the western suburbs."
- Ives: "Okay. So, is it now \$12 million for targeted initiatives?
 Is that what we're looking at?"
- Davis, W.: "It's approximately 12 million. If you give me a minute, I can probably give you an exact number, if that's what you would like."
- Ives: "Do you know exactly where these targeted initiatives are going though, or do you know just in general where they're headed?"
- Davis, W.: "Do I know where they're going? I just..."

Ives: "Yes."

- Davis, W.: "I just mentioned that we have after school programs on the west side of Chicago, schools in Peoria, schools in the western suburbs, school program in the south suburbs."
- Ives: "I don't see that identified in our analysis as a specific
 list. If I could get that list, I'd appreciate it. Is that
 possible to get that list?"
- Davis, W.: "You want... you want me to put on paper what I just said to you?"
- Ives: "Yeah, absolutely. I'd like it in writing to know exactly where these targeted initiatives are going."

Davis, W.: "Okay. I..."

Ives: "This is a \$12 million what I would call..."

Davis, W.: "I will..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Ives: "...a slush fund because I don't know where it's going."
Davis, W.: "Well..."

Ives: "Unless you tell me where it's going, why would anybody in this area vote for \$12 million where they don't know where it's going? It's not \$12 thousand; it's \$12 million."

Davis, W.: "And as I've indicated in committee also, Representative, these dollars will also work with the Senate because we've asked the Senate to provide us what some of their spending priorities are. Unfortunately, we have yet to receive those. And so, that number may change again once we hear from the Senate, but if you would like me to put on paper what I just shared with you, I'll be more than happy to do so."

Ives: "Thank you. I'd like that. Other Members, to the Bill. The problem here is that everybody when you're in Education Committee and I sit on that committee, we all talk about the need to fully fund GSA, because it's the most flexible amount that we can give our school districts to do what they need to do in their individual school districts, When we're... we're adding 2... almost \$300 million to the education budget with this budgeting Bill, and yet, we're only funding GSA at 90 percent. Instead we're funding a multitude of programs that my districts will never see in a grant line. Yet, they could stand to use the GSA money instead. We should be fully funding GSA instead of all these different grant lines, all these targeted initiatives, that we don't know where the money goes or how it's tracked. It's the wrong idea. The best control's at the local level and let the locals decide where that money goes and not on these individual slush fund lines, which is

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

all this is. I urge you to vote 'no' because we don't know where this money's going. We don't know where a substantial portion, millions of dollars' worth, are going. And if you vote for this budget, you're voting... you're vol... voting blindly. That's exactly what you're doing. Just keep that in mind when you press that button. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if you had an answer
yet about the whiteboard."

Speaker Lang: "I've been told that you will not receive permission..."

Kay: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "...to bring a whiteboard to the floor, Sir."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you. Would you be tallying the appropriations passed and be reading that out as we go along today..."

Speaker Lang: "We could..."

Kay: "...so that we know what the aggregate amount of money spent
will be?"

Speaker Lang: "Staff would be happy to provide you a legal pad and a pen, Sir."

Kay: "Thank you. I've got the legal pad. I... I'll do that. Inquiry...
inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Kay: "Is it your intention to abide by Article VIII Section 2 of the Constitution today as we go through these Appropriations Bills?"

Speaker Lang: "The Chair has full intentions of complying with the Constitution of the State of Illinois, Sir."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Kay: "Well, that's curious because I serve on two Appropriations Committees and not yet have I heard a revenue estimate that we firmly agree on. So, how can that be?"

Speaker Lang: "We're not adjourning today, Sir. This is several Bills, spending Bills, this is not... for the revenue portion of it. I'm certain we will get to that."

Kay: "Well, Leader, have you read the State Finance Section of
the Constitution?"

Speaker Lang: "I'm in the Chair, Sir. I'm not here to debate you on the finer points of the Constitution."

Kay: "All right. I'll debate it. Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you."

Kay: "Let me have a question of the Sponsor while I'm here then.
Are you familiar with the State Finance Act?"

Davis, W.: "No, Sir."

Kay: "Let me just read a little bit to you here. I hate to bore you with these details, but this is the law. This is the law of the State of Illinois. And it says, the budget shall set forth indebtedness and contingent liabilities of the state and such other information as be... may be required by law. Proposed expenditures shall not exceed funds estimated to be available for the fiscal year as shown in the budget. I reiterate my comment to the Speaker and now to you. Not one committee that I have sat in, two Appropriations Committees, have I heard a firm number. I don't know what the revenue number is. Do you, Sir?"

Davis, W.: "The overall revenue number is?"

Kay: "The revenue number for your committee that you anticipate."
Davis, W.: "I'm not quite sure I understand what you mean."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Kay: "Let me just ask you this. Do you know what the firm number
 that this House agreed upon?"
- Davis, W.: "The firm number of the House agreement?"
- Kay: "Yes, the revenue agreement that we passed back in probably
 February."
- Davis, W.: "Are you referring to the Resolution that was passed?"
- Kay: "I'm referring to the number that we agreed upon in this House as a number that we would use as an estimate to move forward in compliance with the Constitution."
- Davis, W.: "I've... I've heard some Members say that number before.

 I don't recall what that..."
- Kay: "And what was that number?"
- Davis, W.: "I don't recall what they said."
- Kay: "Thirty-four point five?"
- Davis, W.: "Again, Sir, I don't know... Some Members have referred to a number based on the Resolution that was passed. I don't remember what they said."
- Kay: "Okay. Well, I'm going to go through this as long as I have to today because someone needs to understand what our Constitution says because it is the law of this state and although we don't like it, we need to abide by it. So, I'm going to go through this step by step and we need to challenge every number to find out how you're going to pay for it. How are you going to pay for your part of the budget?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, Sir, as I think the Chair has indicated, I'm sure there will be discussions about the revenue that will be used to help deal with these budgets. My job is just simply to present a budget and that's what I'm trying to do."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Kay: "Understand that except somebody said you had the cart before the horse. I'd say you're upside down because that's not what the Constitution says you have to do. It says you do it in reverse order. So, my question to you is, Sir, do you think what we're doing today is constitutional?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I'm not a constitutional scholar, Sir."
- Kay: "I see. That would probably be... What would your guess be?"
- Davis, W.: "What will my guess be in terms of I think we're proceeding appropriately."
- Kay: "Based on the 34.5 million... billion, I'm sorry."
- Davis, W.: "And what number is that again?"
- Kay: "Thirty-four point five billion."
- Davis, W.: "And what number is that?"
- Kay: "That's the number that came out of the House Resolution."
- Davis, W.: "You mean, the nonbinding Resolution that talks about the estimate, correct?"
- Kay: "It was a Resolution that we agreed upon as moving forward as the number we would use to base appropriations and expenditures on for '15."
- Davis, W.: "So, what you would like to see is a new Resolution, then?"
- Kay: "No. What I'd like to see... Well, maybe so. I'd like to see
 us abide by the law."
- Davis, W.: "Well, Sir, I assume that if anything that we were doing is unconstitutional, we would know that by now."
- Kay: "Well, we're going to find that out by the end of the day.

 I... I'm going to pursue this line with every... I guess, every

 Appropriations Bill we hear today, but it's about time we

 stop in our tracks. Representative Franks had it right. This

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

thing is not the cart before the horse. It's completely upside down. It's wrong and it's not... it's not even close to being legal. So, let's get on with business. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a difficult process. It's a difficult process and I just want to compliment the chair and the Members of the committee for the work they've done. And whether you agree with it or you disagree with it, they have worked very hard on this issue and their first and foremost concern are the children of the State of Illinois. So, Chairman Davis, regardless of what people think, I think it's important that someone get up and recognize the work that's gone in to putting together something to give to the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the start of the process, so we'll make some comments at the beginning and then the votes will probably be fairly similar throughout all of these Appropriations Bills. But I'd ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to think about what we're doing here and why it violates what we have done for the past several years. The Sponsor of this Bill talks about a nonbinding Resolution and he's right, Resolutions are nonbinding. But what process have we used for the past three years in determining our budget? It's a process that was set up by the Speaker of the House and quite frankly, it was an excellent process. He came out and he said this is what we're going to do beginning in FY12. We're going to, first of all,

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

determine what our revenues are and then from those revenues we will build our budget. Guess what? For the past three years it has worked pretty darn well. Now, some folks say, well, the revenue estimates should be higher, thus allowing us more spending authority, but we held for the most part to those budgets. Even last year when we didn't have an agreement between the two sides of the aisle as to what the spending parameters should be, we agreed on a budget number and in the end, in the end, the amount of appropriations that we passed was very close to the budget number that was adopted ... excuse me... to the revenue number that was adopted early on. Now, we passed in this House, House Joint Resolution 80 earlier this year. House Joint Resolution 80 said that our revenues for FY15, based on the law as it exists, would be \$34,495,000,000. 112 Members of this House voted for that Resolution, not a single dissent came from this House. It passed, it was a House Joint Resolution and it passed overwhelmingly in the Senate. So, both Bodies have said our revenues based on the law for FY15 will be \$34,495,000,000. Now, COGFA has raised that a little bit, but nonetheless, it's right around that \$35 billion estimate. Guess what? That's the way most families budget; that's the way most businesses budget. How many... how much revenue are we going to get in... based on how much revenue we're going to get in then we determine how much we're going to spend. We've got this backwards. We've got the cart well before the horse. We're saying here, this is how much we're going to spend and oh, by the way, we hope... we hope we're going to be constitutional and before we adjourn we're going to pass a revenue Bill that matches our spending. We hope. We

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

may or we may not. But what we're doing here violates the process, which was an excellent process established by the Speaker of this House in conjunction with the Minority Leader four years ago that has worked well. If we revert to the kind of process that we're engaged in right now, just starting to spend money willy-nilly not knowing where it's coming from, we're never going to get out of the financial situation... the difficult financial situation that this state is in. So, my quess is, most of these Appropriation Bills are going to pass. It is unfortunate because it tears asunder that great process that has been put together and was put together three years ago which this Body held to and passed budgets that worked for the past three years. So, it's unfortunate that we're moving down this path. I understand what we're doing, but we're way out of line in terms of the entire appropriations process this year. I'd stand up and say let's vote 'no'. That's the right vote to get the process back on track. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I stated yesterday in committee that this is, in fact, an upside down and backwards process. The Constitution is very clear. The General Assembly, by law, shall make appropriations for all expenditures and public funds by the state. Appropriations for a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during the year. I don't know of another entity on planet earth that would even pretend to be debating an endeavor related to budget without the revenue number being reconciled. Who would do that? Would an

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

individual do that with their own budget at home? The answer is no. Would a family do that anywhere in any corner of this great state? The answer is no. Would any business, large or small, even pretend to have a debate on a subject matter this serious without knowing what the revenue number is? The answer is no. Would any not-for-profit organization go down this path, having no earthly idea what the revenue number is? The answer is no. Would any other private or public organization of any kind endeavor to talk about a budget without having any idea what the revenue number is? The answer is no. This process is not worthy of this chamber. We can disagree on what the ultimate revenue number will be, but you simply cannot go down this path without knowing what the number is. The answer to this process is no. I was a mayor of a community for eight years and I'm proud to tell you, eight consecutive times we balanced the budget without exception, but never was the process in the neighborhood of this ridiculous process. Always we knew what the revenue expectation would be and always we lived within the means. I call Springfield increasingly the Land of Oz. I drive over to a place where the rules of engagement and the rules of society seem to be different. So, I took these figures to a second-grade class in my district and I asked them to run the numbers. And the numbers that we have today 37.2 billion, and I believe that number is going north as we speak, versus the 34.4 billion number that we agreed upon earlier in this Session and the second graders, the seven-year-olds, to a person said no, Representative, that concept is not in balance. It simply does not the pass the second grader's smell test. It doesn't.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Then I read the Constitution to them, the portion that I just read, the portion that appreciating speaker read, and I said, it's pretty simple language, these are appropriations, this is the revenue that is expected. Does this balance? Is this within the purview of the Constitution? And again, the seven... seven-year-old said, it in fact, is not. When we talk about education, that's something that's near and dear to my heart, in my district despite spending more money this fiscal year than in any year in Illinois history and that's an important nuance. The spending in this state is not going south. The General Revenue spending in this state in fiscal 2010 was \$27 billion, 27 billion in 2010. This year it will be north of 36 billion. And now we're talking about a figure that, when it's all said and done, will be in the neighborhood of 38 billion. We're spending more money than in any time in history and the question is, where's the money? 'Cause it's doggone sure is not in education. Yes, there's a small increase here, but we're nowhere near the fund... the foundation funding level for our schools: 11 percent less than foundation last year, 11 percent less than foundation the year before, 30 percent less on transportation in my rural district. My rural district has roads that are so rough that we buy our buses used from the suburban district because they don't have as much wear and tear and you send me 30 percent less. Are you kidding? Where is the money? This process doesn't add up. This process, frankly, is insulting to the good people across the State of Illinois. I worked for many, many years in health care at a hospital that had to make excruciatingly difficult decisions.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Decisions based on what lines of business could we remain in? What lines of business were imperative to our community? What lines of business do we have to do at a substantial loss because no one else in the community could pick that up? What were lines of business that could be shared somewhere else? When the question was asked in the Appropriation Committee that I sit on, how do you make that determination which programs are working? The answer was, well, we manage that by the data. When the follow-up question was, can you name me at least one program, one, that isn't working and we made the decision to discontinue it, there was no answer. Couldn't name a single program that wasn't working that we were going to do something in the alternative because the taxpayers weren't getting enough bang for their buck. I yield the rest of my time to Jack Franks. Jack, I think you hit it right on the head."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's become quite clear that for the rest of the day there's going to be a disagreement about what should come first. So, I want to focus my comments on something different. I want to talk about trust. When I started in public service about 10 years ago, I was given a speech that has stuck with me for the ensuing 10 years that I've been doing this. It was a speech about trust and what we're doing as public servants anywhere in government. When we stand up on behalf of the State of Illinois and we say stuff and people believe us, which has become less and less likely in Illinois, it's not because I'm Scott Drury and saying something that's Scott Drury, it's

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

because I'm Scott Drury saying it on behalf of the State of Illinois and I'm borrowing from a reservoir of trust that has been built up before us. When I was with the U.S. Attorney's Office, we were given the same lecture. When we stand up before a jury and we say on behalf of the United States of America. I'm not asking them to believe me I'm asking them to believe the United States and it's based on a reservoir of trust. And our only job as public servants is to leave that reservoir more full than we found it. It's a simple job, but it's a big burden that we carry. And unfortunately, when we engage in acts like we're engaging today and it's not to disrespect anyone who's worked very hard on all these issues and I'm on Appropriations Committees as well, the reservoir of trust in Illinois is empty. It's a desert. And we need to take actions that build the trust, build the trust of the public so that we can then take the hard actions and they believe that we're... what we're doing is in their best interest. And it saddens me that we continually take actions that do the opposite. So, I've asked today that when we have these debates, we think about what the public thinks about this and thinks about how what we're doing is going to build trust or reduce trust and that we vote in favor of trust. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "I just wanted to comment, I didn't have my light on... on the previous speaker. You know what, this is about trust. And

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

many of you three years ago voted for a temporary income tax and told the people of Illinois to trust us. We're going to spend our money wisely, we're going to pay down our bills, and we're going to let this expire in four years. So, don't stand up and lecture us about trust."

Davis, W.: "Is there a question?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also wanted to commend not only Chairman Davis but all of the Appropriation chairmen and all of the staff and Minority folks who worked on the budgets, in many instances that we'll hear today. The ... the items that ... and a lot of the arguments that you'll hear, this is not an easy process, but it is process driven. We have zero Senate appropriations on this side of the building. Our staff has and all staffs have worked to put together budgets and they've talked about items and spending. And in the course of the argument you hear how bad things are in the State of Illinois and I... I want to remind and also commend the Body on the things we've done the past five years. If you look at passage of the Capital Bill, after a decade without it, in the year we passed that there was about \$40 billion in capital work that was authorized in 2009. Of the 40 billion nationally, 31 was in Illinois. When you look at the Medicaid reforms and changes that we did, the structure in this House was a bipartisan Bill that got together and reduced real liability by \$2.7 billion. In passing the changes to workmen's compensation, again, done in a bipartisan fashion. We had a reduction to the businesses in the State of Illinois, recommended reduction in the comp rates

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

of over 13 percent. Additionally, if you look at the unemployment insurance trust fund, which was going to cost billions to the State of Illinois, we once again, got together and provided the businesses in the State of Illinois with essentially a 16 percent rate cut. More than half of the business saw reductions in what they were going to do. As a Body, we have taken responsible steps and the bond houses lately have looked at that. In the course of the past few years, we have made more and stronger stabilization ventures towards our pension fund than any other state in the union. If those are upheld or changed to receive any savings, it makes future budgeting a lot easier. That is going to recognize by the bond houses who did not downgrade, who said stability is what we're going to have to be... what they're looking for. And they're also talking about stability of revenues for the old bills. Now, to the subject of old bills, when we passed the ... extend the increase in the income tax, and I voted for that and many other Members did as well, one of our promises was to pay down old bills. And though the bonding Bill that accompanied that did not pass, the Revenue Committees under the Leadership of Representatives Bradley, all of the committee Members, the Republican spokesman, Mr. Harris as well, made sure that we paid down at least a billion dollars each year. We have paid down... and your numbers earlier were incorrect... over \$5 billion in bills. Had we not taken those combined actions that we did these past five years, then we would be looking at a state where advancement had stalled, we stepped forward and this budget now is the first step in that process. I support the work that they have done.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

I support the chairman. We have a long ways to go. We have negotiations yet to do to the question of setting the level of spending. I think it's appropriate that we're doing each individual agency like we did years ago and I think that should continue. I rise in support of the Gentleman's budget. I appreciate his knowledge and his work. And I think that with the… as we move forward, we will receive a budget that will be constitutional. We'll talk about the spending. We will also talk about the revenue, none of this is easy. But today is day one and I commend the Gentleman and all those who serve on appropriations. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal Gordon-Booth: privilege. Excuse me. A comment more than a question. I would just want to simply thank the chairman of K through 12 appropriations. The budget that we're passing today does a lot for the central Illinois community, specifically the primary school district in my community in my district. It's Peoria School District 150. Without the budget that's being presented today, we would lose \$635 per child in Peoria School District 150. I have a number of school districts because we have many one unit school districts, in my community, we would lose over \$800 per kid. That's a lot of money in central Illinois. And at a time when we need to be reinvesting in early childhood education, K through 12 education, higher education, we need to be making the investments in our young people to ensure that they are equipped and ready for jobs of the 21st century. So, I just simply want to stand and thank

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

the chairman of K through 12 education for producing a budget that allows us to continue to make the investments in children that we need to be making. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "Thank you... thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly want to thank all the Members on this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle for their comments. Nothing about this process is easy. If it is, then obviously we wouldn't be going through all of these debates and statements and things of that nature. We all indicate that K through 12 education is an important part of what we do. And I would argue, while some have suggested that this is backwards, upside down, cart before the horse, when it comes to investing in our kids, I think we should put a high number out there and figure out how we're going to get to that number because that's what we need to be doing in order to make sure schools have adequate resource so they can educate our children. Or maybe this is the ... maybe this is a conspiracy as it relates to education that we really don't really want to fund it adequately and appropriately because we'd rather see young people in all of our communities winding up in the prison system. I can guarantee you if there was a need for more money for the corrections department, I don't think we'd be having this debate. We would figure out ... you had your turn to speak... we would figure out how to get to that number, but when it comes to education we always seem to have some challenges as it relates to that. So, I can appreciate those that will disagree in terms of the overall process, that's your right to do so, but what I can tell you

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

about the K through 12 committee is that we work together. We met, we met several times and when wo... when we were presented the opportunity to increase in certain areas, no one shied away from that conversation. We sat together. We worked. We determined what our priorities are and we worked to fund those priorities. And I can appreciate that kind of effort. The revenue conversation is one that we will have and I'm hoping that we have it very soon because we need to fund these budgets at the appropriate level to make sure that we are providing the services, not only at K through 12 but higher ed, general services, public safety and especially human services. Those are the things that we need to do. We have a responsibility as others have indicated as Representatives here in the State of Illinois to take care of our citizens. That is our responsibility. This is the first of many Appropriations Bills to come and we are setting the tone... the tone for taking care of citizens here in the State of Illinois. I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that I should have excused Representative Kelly Burke this morning."

Speaker Lang: "Record will reflect that. Mr. Mitchell."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Mitchell, B.: "The State of Illinois, we're fortunate in the 51st District to have a great State Senator called Senator Chapin Rose. I'm very fortunate to have some great Pages today and they're standing right here, Chapin's kids, Jack and Annie Rose. So, give Senator Rose's children a big House welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Happy you're with us today. Thank you, Representative. Representative Wheeler."

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

Wheeler: "This morning Representative Ann Williams and I hosted a breakfast for Awareness in Education for Human Trafficking. There are remainders of the bagels and muffins in Ed Sullivan's office along with some coffee and juice. And I hope that you're able to speak with Executive Director Frank Massolini who has lots of great information about ending human trafficking and helping victims of human trafficking. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Beiser: "I am also am very, very fortunate to have two excellent Pages today, Myleigh Mabe, who is the daughter of Patty in my office here in Springfield and Alexis Williams, whose mother is my coordinator and my legislative aide down in Alton. So, I'd like for everybody to welcome Myleigh and Alexis and

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

please, if you need anything, let them know. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Thank you for being with us. Mr. Rosenthal."

Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Rosenthal: "As our Members know, Ron Stephens one of our prior Members, has been a big supporter of Wounded Warrior Project. And Ron, once again, is walking for that and he... and we're collecting donations for him. Last year he walked 339 miles, \$100 for every mile that he walked, that we pledged. He's got matching pledges from a corporate sponsor, so we'd appreciate the support of Ron again in our Wounded Warrior Project. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. House Bill 6022, Mr. Davis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6022, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

Davis, W.: "Thank you... thank you very..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6022 represents the budget for the Illinois Education Labor Relations Board. The budget is funded out of Other State Funds particularly PBRT. It represents a slight increase of a little over \$36 thousand from the previous year and that is to respond to a lawsuit that was filed in which they had to

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

rehire an employee. So, that's in the personnel line. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "And on that question, we have Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Will, obviously, lots of the questions are going to be applicable to the previous Bill. In this one, it's just a slight appropriation increase over fiscal year '14, nevertheless, how is it that the state's going to pay for this additional obligation?"

Davis, W.: "I think, as was stated before, I think there's an ensuing revenue conversation that we will have in order to address... well, you mentioned the previous Bill, as well as this and 50 or 60 others that are to come, so we anticipate that revenue conversation."

Sandack: "Again, we're still putting spending Appropriation Bills out there without any idea of how much money it's going to take to meet those obligations. In this instance, it's just \$36 thousand, but over the last what... the previous Bill was 291 million, so we're... we're getting up there. And we still don't know how much money the state's going to have."

Davis, W.: "Well... well, if you want to talk about this particular Bill, Representative, this is not GRF money."

Sandack: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "This is Other State Funds..."

Sandack: "We still..."

Davis, W.: "...with regard to this."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Sandack: "With this Bill, we're still spending more than we're bringing in though, aren't we?"

Davis, W.: "We're still... Well, we don't know the answer to that question yet. I don't ... I don't think we know the answer to ... You ask... A lot of the statements are going to be you just said, we're spending more than what we're bringing in. I don't know if we're done bringing in, so I don't know the answer to that question. And again, I think we're going to have a conversation about revenue and I think we all are looking forward to that, but again, when you talk about revenue, a lot of focus is being placed on this temporary tax increase. And again, in my opinion, the revenue is a larger conversation. Again, we are rolling back some of the corporate... corporate taxes, as well, to try to help businesses here in the State of Illinois. Presumably, that help, they will invest more in the State of Illinois, so that could increase revenue. I think there are a lot of things that can happen on the revenue side that we can speculate about. We won't actually know the answer to those questions that can overall help this picture."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ever-evolving, money where our mouth is, sound practices, reservoir of trust. Some of the sound bites that have been given to us from the other side with respect to a process that is entirely illicit. A process that is absolutely a farce. The idea that we're going to get to the revenue someday while we spend dollar after dollar of taxpayer money in an absolutely inappropriate way, a way that no other person, business or entity would endeavor to spend money, makes this process absolutely a shame, a sham

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

and something I'm embarrassed to be a part of. I will continue to speak to this though and I know colleagues of mine will as well, because their taxpayers probably still don't know what's going on here, but it is absolutely the wrong process. An earlier speaker talked about the fact that it's not a constitutionally balanced budget, it isn't. A previous speaker talked about... a previous speaker talked about rules of engagement we passed by way of budgeting for results. We're certainly not in any result oriented mode when all we do is spend and we're not talking about how in what manner we're going to spend. The fact of the matter is, that we're spending for poor results, continued results. Our state is in an absolute free fall. We've got 5 billion in unpaid bills. This is not going to make that endeavor any easier. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Mr. Speaker, my computer does not have an analysis. I don't know if anyone else has that problem. And I'm reading the text of the Bill; it's only a page. Have we got a... Can we get this fixed because I'm not sure what the analysis shows on this Bill?"

Speaker Turner: "We'll get someone to assist you, Representative."

Franks: "Can we... can we hold this until we get the analysis 'cause it's hard to debate when I don't know what's in the Bill?"

Speaker Turner: "There are additional people, wishing to..."

Franks: "All right."

Speaker Turner: "...seeking recognition. So..."

Franks: "Can I... can I come back later, then?"

Speaker Turner: "Sure."

Franks: "Thank you."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Sorry. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative, we had a lot of discussion about the amount of money that this budget has increased, and a lot of the discussion has really focused on how we're going to fund it. And I know that you have said you're open to that debate, you want to have that debate, we should have that debate. And I... and I get that. My question is real simple. What happens if that focus on funding doesn't materialize? What happens if this tax increase doesn't get passed by your side of the aisle? What happens to your budget that you're presenting to us today?"

Davis, W.: "Well, in our committees, we had an opportunity to start a conversation where we were. And what I can tell you about in K through 12 that was not a conversation that anybody wanted to have. A lot of what you see and heard in K through 12 wouldn't be able to do any of those things and maybe you don't really care about what we wouldn't be able to do in education, but if the revenue, ultimately, doesn't meet what the spending is, then we have to go back, start over from the beginning and craft another budget. I mean, I assume that's what we would have to do."

Sullivan: "Well, when we talked about the revenue number that we passed in the House Resolution, we then moved on to the second part of that on allocations, top of the line and below the line. Why do you have in your proposed budget the top of the line allocations being changed from when they first were introduced to show the draconian cuts that take place? Did we

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

all of a sudden have new ideas on how we're going to pay for things or..."

Davis, W.: "Well, in..."

Sullivan: "...how did that take place?"

Davis, W.: "In... in the budget for the Illinois Education Labor Relations Board, which is the one that we're debating right now, I don't think there's any... anything in that budget as it relates to above the line or below the line expenses."

Sullivan: "Okay. Well, thank you."

Davis, W.: "Unless... unless you have a different analysis that I don't have."

Sullivan: "Okay. I can share that with you. But Ladies and Gentlemen, you know, in the words of Congresswoman Pelosi, we need to pass this budget in order to figure out a way to fund it. That's what the statement of the day is."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Will, it wasn't long ago that I had the opportunity to attend a Federal Reserve Board luncheon. And the speaker was Tim Geiger, who I think we all know, and his... the subject..."

Davis, W.: "No, I didn't ... I didn't get an invitation to that."

Kay: "Well, I'm sorry about that. It was in St. Louis. I know that's down south. But having said that, he talked about budgeting. He talked about three things. Let me just tell you what the first one was. He said first of all, you determine the revenues that are available. Would you think that's a good idea?"

Davis, W.: "Sure, why not."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Kay: "Okay. Then he said you determine what results matter the most. In other words, what are your priorities? Do you agree with that?"

Davis, W.: "About determining priorities?"

Kay: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "Sure, why not."

Kay: "Okay. And then he said you have to decide how to distribute your revenues amongst the priorities that are the most important once you determine what your revenues are. Can you agree with that?"

Davis, W.: "Distributing money based on your priorities once you determine what the revenues are?"

Kay: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "I have no argument against that."

Kay: "Okay. Why didn't we do that with respect to your
appropriations and this part of the budget?"

Davis, W.: "Again, I would argue, Representative, that the conversation is not done. Again, if you think that a vote on this Bill or these Appropriations Bills is a finality of this entire conversation, I would argue that you're... that you're incorrect. There is still yet more conversations to come as it relates to appropriations, budgets and revenue. And so, yes, this is a piece of the conversation. You would argue that it's the wrong piece first, I guess... I'll say it that way."

Kay: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "Okay. And that's fine and you can have that argument, but it's a piece of the conversation and there's still other pieces that are still yet to come. So, again, if your feeling

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

is that this vote or these votes are the final piece, again, I would argue that that's not correct."

Kay: "Well, what you're really saying then to me is you agree with the proper budgeting process. We haven't determined what the revenues are. We know we don't have enough revenue, but guess what, sooner or later..."

Davis, W.: "Well, see you said, we know we don't ... "

Kay: "...we're going to have a revenue source..."

Davis, W.: "You said..."

Kay: "...we're going to have a revenue source that comes in the form of a tax increase. Thank you, Representative."

Davis, W.: "You said we don't know what the revenue is. You're right, we don't know what the revenue is 'cause it's an ongoing conversation. You're absolutely right."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hammond: "Representative Davis, we have a very short analysis on this particular Bill, as you might imagine, but it's my understanding that the funding for the Education Labor Relations Board last year came from the CPPRT. Is that correct?"

Davis, W.: "That is correct."

Hammond: "And am I seeing correctly, Representative, that there is an increase in this line for this year and we are taking another \$36 thousand from the CPPRT?"

Davis, W.: "That is correct."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Hammond: "Is there any concern that we're just draining this revenue stream dry and the folks that it is really targeted for are going to continue to suffer when we do this?"

Davis, W.: "I don't believe so, Representative."

Hammond: "You don't believe so."

Davis, W.: "I don't believe so."

Hammond: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6022 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? DeLuca. Representative DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6022, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6051, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6051, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6051 is the appropriation for the Illinois Council on Developmental Disabilities. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the speaker yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The speaker will yield."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Sandack: "Representative, how much in spending increases in 20... in fiscal '15 over fiscal '14?"

Harris, G.: "Zero GRF, and are you writing this down, \$143 thousand in other funds. Write that down..."

Sandack: "I am."

Harris, G.: "...143."

Sandack: "I wrote it down 'cause we're keeping a running tally of exceed... expedience exceeding '14 over '15."

Harris, G.: "Right. That's why I wanted to speak slowly."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Harris, G.: "Okay."

Sandack: "I appreciate that. And some of the same questions that were offered to the previous speaker. Obviously, we're spending more money year over year and we've done that for a while."

Harris, G.: "And we also hope to get more money, as in this case, we get from the Federal Government and other sources to spend to benefit the people of our districts."

Sandack: "There's no question that it's a worthy spend. The question is what we have to spend and whether we'll actually have those funds and we have not had a revenue conversation other than a Resolution that all of us agreed upon."

Harris, G.: "Are we... wanting to debate the GRF portion now..."

Sandack: "No."

Harris, G.: "...on the..."

Sandack: "No."

Harris, G.: "...Developmental Disability Council?"

Sandack: "We'll get to that, I think..."

Harris, G.: "Okay. All right."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Sandack: "...next Bill I suspect, right? To the Bill. And while it's \$143 thousand increase over the previous year and while there may be increases in revenue from the Gov... Federal Government or other sources, the fact of the matter is we're continuing to spend more than we bring in and we've not yet had an honest conversation about what we're going to actually see in revenue other than what we've agreed upon as a chamber. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "Actually, Ladies and Gentlemen, one of the key things that we're going to need to be able to do here is count up to two, one and two. There's two different kinds of money. There's GRF money and there's federal money. The 143 here we're talking about is federal money. That's type two, so it should not go on your list of money we're spending. This is money that we're bringing into the State of Illinois. You know, I'll just tell you, go ahead and start talking about it, you know, the other things that come in twos we're going to be talking about. There's revenues equal expenses. We need to know what all of our expenses are and then match them up with our revenues to be constitutional. And there are two chambers of the General Assembly, the House and the Senate and both must act on budgets and then we will come up to a constitutional number."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6051 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', 0 voting

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

'present', House Bill 6051, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6052, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6052, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "So, Ladies and Gentlemen, there are two departments with the words 'human rights' in them. So, I want to be clear which one we're talking about. This is the Human Rights Commission, the Human Rights Commission. There is an expense here related... an expense increase related to increases pursuant to the collective bargaining agreement. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Representative Harris. And I just wanted to start off by saying, as the budgeteer for our Human Service Approp, we appreciated all the work that you did with us and your professionalism in working with it and all your staff and our staff too because these budgets are huge. But as we talked about yesterday, this is one of the smaller items in the budget, we know that, but there still was an increase I think of \$119 thousand or 119... what was it?"

Harris, G.: "About 110."

Bellock: "And what was that covering?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Harris, G.: "Those are... they're pursuant to the collective bargaining agreements and the resultant payments to Social Security. They're required by law."
- Bellock: "Correct. Are you... do you know what the entire increase of the collective bargaining was over all the agencies under the Human Service budget?"
- Harris, G.: "If my assistant brought his trusty adding machine, we can get it to you while essential you'll have the time to talk, but I don't know that off the top of my head. It's about... I think it looks about 6.9 percent."
- Bellock: "Okay. All right. Thank you. So, again, I guess just in addressing this budget as we've addressed in the others before, our main concern here is that by voting this budget, along with the other budgets in the Human Service, that the aggregate is going to go over the 37.2 billion. And what we initially worked on in the committee was the, what we call, the doomsday budget. But that was the budget that we had agreed to in House Resolution 80 regarding the 3... the \$34.4 billion. So, our point is, in voting this Bill or any Bill under the Human Service budget, is that you are voting for the tax increase because we don't have the revenues in place. And that is the reason, even though we understand all the issues that are very, very important in these Bills and especially this one. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill. The Sponsor mentioned 2 two times and I agree with him in both instances. We are bicameral Legislature and we will apparently, eventually, when the Party in charge decides, have a conversation about revenue. I do think,

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

however, in the other chamber, the upper chamber, they're doing it a little differently or at least I hope they are. I hope they're not following our example because our example is backwards, upside down, cart before the horse, a previous speaker said. The fact of the matter is no honest conversation about budgeting can really occur in the vacuum that we are now creating, which is a lack of revenue. A definite conversation, one that is materially different than what we agreed overall to be a ceiling on spending of 34.4 billion. This conversation is wrongful. It's illicit. It's not helpful. And it's really disingenuous to the people of the State of Illinois. I again urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I enjoy the discussion, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. About the world of 2, well, there's a 2 percent tax hike that's set to expire, 67 percent, but that 2 percent appears that it may stay. There are two worlds. The real one, which most of live in, and the land of make believe, where many of the other side happen to live with this budget. Those are the two worlds that we're talking about. There's two budget numbers, 34 billion and 38 billion. Well, these are estimates and every year at the end of Session we have two different competing numbers. Why vote for the Resolution at the beginning of the year when you're not going to stand by it. That's the pretend world. That's the third world that we are here on. Why bother? We go through all the theatrics, we're going to work together, we're only going to spend \$34 billion, but somehow that number increases. And if we don't spend more taxpayer money, terrible things will happen to the people of

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

this great state. Either people will go to... to school or they'll go to prison. Either people will be able to go to the hospital or we'll put them out on the street. Why are we already starting this nonsense on Bill #2 or 3? Why don't we abide by the rules that we set for our... ourselves? Talking about the reservoir of trust. I trust that when I voted for that Resolution that that was the number we were going to spend and that's the number you guys agreed to. Where's that reservoir of trust? Right now we're traveling down the river of deceit."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, for your very thoughtful and insightful comments there. There's a... there's another two category that we can talk about. There's dealing with the grownup responsibilities that we've been elected to come here and discharge and then there's turning our backs on those and adequately budgeting to meet the legal requirements that are imposed on us by the Federal Government to provide for those who are in the most need, to meet the funding requirements of our local schools so that the tax burdens are not shifted on to our local taxpayers. Those are one of the major responsibilities that we all have. I think we're doing the right thing by honestly talking about our expenses, passing Bills, then matching revenues so that we are sure at the end of the day we've done all those things. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6052 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Have all voted who wish? Representative Hurley. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6052, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 15, 2014: approved for consideration Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 6156."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6053, Representative Harris. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6053, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the annual appropriation for the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. It has two major lines of increase in it. There is the line that is an increase pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement and there is a 40 percent increase in Other State Funds for the Guardianship and Advocacy Funds. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill. The Sponsor talked about the responsibilities grownups have to take care of things they are charged with taking care of and I couldn't agree more. However, the responsible way to handle those responsibilities is with a serious and focused attention on what resources are really available and then going through the sober activity of meaningfully budgeting and making sure we're adhering to our

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

promises, our promises not to tax and spend willy-nilly. And the whole term tax and spend is actually, in this instance today, turned on its head. It's spend and maybe do something else, maybe talk about revenue at some point in time. It is absolutely, again, the wrong way to deal with grownup responsibilities. I agree, being in this Legislature is a fiduciary duty in funding human services, public safety, education, those are really important grownup activities we all took an oath we would undertake in a serious, sober manner but to do so in a fiscally sane manner too and not just spend, and spend, and spend, and hope somehow, someway, we'll be able to fund those appropriations and those promises. Yes, the grownup way of doing things is to honor our commitments including how much we said we would spend on a macro level. So, let's honor those and let's be grownups."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. You know, when you talk about grownup responsibilities, we talk about trust, I guess, the reservoir of trust. And grownups make promises to one another and I guess those can change at any given time. And when you're a grownup, you have to make tough decisions and sometimes you have to tell a child that the answer is no. You can't spend that much money. As much or as important as it may be, no matter how much they jump up and down and tell you that the wo... the sky is falling. But I guess instead, part of my insightful conversation is that when I came down here and made a promise to 108 thousand people that we'd work on a balanced budget. I don't think this gets us anywhere closer. It gets us closer to an unbalanced budget which we've had for

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

a number of years. So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd move for a verification of this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Reboletti. Representative Sullivan."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative Harris, we have talked about putting the cart before the horse and I'm not going to go into that again, but I would like you to answer a question. Let's say we have this revenue discussion and you know, it's okay, we're going to pass this budget now and get the revenue later. I disagree with that, but what happens if the revenue doesn't arrive? What happens if the tax increase comes and it just falls flat on its face, we get into June, we get to the new fiscal year? Do you believe this budget would be constitutional, absent the revenue that shows up?"

Harris, G.: "All budgets are estimates, Representative and I think we, you know, go with the best numbers that are available to us at the time and we often come back and we have to adjust either up or down. That has been our history because the economy changes, the world changes. I don't think you or I can look forward to what may happen in December of next year, what may happen in Syria or Iraq or some of these other places that may drive the world markets or the economy. We need to work with the information we have available and make good decisions as with the information that's available to us now."

Sullivan: "So, you don't have an opinion whether this is constitutional if the revenue doesn't match at a later date?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Harris, G.: "Well, I don't... to that point, Representative, we will not know what those numbers are until we have the total expenditure number and then compare it to the total available revenue number upon which both Houses have voted."

Sullivan: "Right. Okay. Well, thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Currie: "Sir, I'm having a little trouble reading the analysis,

Representative. So, the Bill as introduced, was... was it a
shell Bill or was it a substantive Appropriations Bill?"

Harris, G.: "So, Representative, I'm told by staff that the budget
Bill as originally introduced was the... not recommended
version of the Governor's budget..."

Currie: "Ahh."

Harris, G.: "...and the Amendment we see before us which would meet our legal obligations under the collective bargaining agreement and also allow the 40 percent increase to Guardianship and Advocacy Funds was what was in the Amendment."

Currie: "Okay. All right. So... so, the... with the Amendment, the Amendment becomes the Bill and the Amendment would reflect the Governor's recommendations for budgeting for the coming fiscal year. Is that accurate?"

Harris, G.: "That is accurate."

Currie: "Okay. But..."

Harris, G.: "It would meet our legal responsibilities. And let me just say, Representative, that as we go further into other pieces of legislation that may before this committee, that

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- we're going to also have to consider the effect of various consent decrees that mandate the state does certain actions. We're going to have to look at the requirements of Federal Law and the maintenance of effort agreements. Sometimes, you know, a lot of what we do is driven by what is required of us by the courts and by the Federal Government."
- Currie: "Right. I think that's a very helpful explanation. It looks to me again, from the analysis, as if the increase in spending to the recommended level rather than the not recommended level is primarily coming from Other State Funds rather than from general funds. Is that accurate?"
- Harris, G.: "That is accurate."
- Currie: "And could you give me a clue as to where those Other State Funds we think will be coming from recognizing, as you just pointed out, that we won't know the whole budget story until sometime to come?"
- Harris, G.: "Actually, the fund, Representative, I just want to be clear with our learned staff here, is called the Guardianship and Advocacy Fund."
- Currie: "Okay. And that is another fund held in the State Treasury?"
- Harris, G.: "This is a fund of the State of Illinois that is held separately and we appropriate... we must appropriate funds each year so that the State Guardian, who is as I might remind you, takes care of those who are really unable..."
- Currie: "Right. And that..."
- Harris, G.: "...to take care of themselves to see they function."
- Currie: "And that is the point of this very important Commission, that is the underlying reason that we have it in the first

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- place. I just wasn't clear in how we got money into that separate fund in the Treasury. Does it ultimately come from GRF or does it come from fees or other... other sources?"
- Harris, G.: "All right. Thank you. I'm learning some things here as we go along about what the source of the revenue for those funds are. So, it's very good you're asking 'cause now I can educate the entire Body..."

Currie: "Good. Right."

- Harris, G.: "...who I'm sure is waiting... waiting to hear the answer to this. There are certain court fees related to guardianship and advocacy actions which pay money into the Guardianship and Advocacy Fund. Representative Sandack is asking me to slow down because I think that he's not catching all this. So, I'll say it again. That there are different fees collected in relationship to guardianship and advocacy actions before the court system that are paid into the Guardianship and Advocacy Fund that are then used for the Office of the State Guardian."
- Currie: "Good. So... so, what that really means is that the increase between Amendment 1 and the Bill as originally introduced doesn't look like it's primarily coming from General Revenue. It looks like it's a reestimate of what moneys will be available through those fees and other activities that go on through the court system. Is that a fair characterization?"
- Harris, G.: "And I think there are guys over there who really want me to go slowly with this, so they can write this down, but there's also increases according to the collective bargaining agreement. Did I mention that? As well as that which goes into the Guardianship and Advocacy Fund."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Currie: "Right. But what that's do..."

Harris, G.: "Which are collected from courts due to guardianship action."

Currie: "So... so, but what that suggests is we've had a lot of discussion about revenue estimates, how much money is going to be available for... through GRF, but what you're really saying is that when it comes to this budget a lot of the increase is not a function of a reestimate of what's available in general funds, but a different way of looking at what will be available in the Guardianship and Advocacy Fund."

Harris, G.: "Actually, just for folk's edification, who are keeping track, I'd like to read out the numbers that are... come from GRF and Other State Funds."

Currie: "Good, good. That would be very helpful."

Harris, G.: "So, would this be helpful to you?"

Currie: "Not just..."

Harris, G.: "Okay."

Currie: "...not just for me, but I think for all of us."

Harris, G.: "I think that everyone's waiting to be edified by this. From the General Revenue Funds with the State of Illinois and for those of you who may be wondering where the General Revenue Funds originate, those come from the income taxes and sales taxes and you know, other things that are appropriated by law. And the increase to from the General Revenue Funds are \$591,200. That's \$591,200. The Other State Funds which come into this budget are \$200 thousand. That number is \$200 thousand."

Currie: "All right. So, and... and the total spending then between...

a different kind of question, Representative... the total

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- spending in this agency proposed through Amendment 1 to House Bill 6053 and what we expect we will have spent during the current fiscal year. Could you address that question?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes. The difference in General Revenue Funds is \$591,200 and the total increase in all funds is 791 thousand..."

 Currie: "Right."
- Harris, G.: "...which is arrived at by adding 591,200 and 200 thousand."
- Currie: "So, that really does make the point that what we're spending here is primarily coming from the Other State Funds from the Guardianship and Advocacy Fund. This is not a major increase in state GRF spending. Since so much of the conversation about budgeting this morning has been about General Revenue Funds, I think it's important for the Members to understand that it isn't that we're anticipating a whole lot more revenue from that source to fund this critical budget really required by people who are unable to care for themselves, but it really is the moneys that we expect will be available in the Guardianship and Advocacy Fund itself."
- Harris, G.: "And it's only going to get worse as we go on in these budgets as far as keeping track not only of two funds but three resources of funds, when we will have General Revenue Funds, where we will have other funds of the state... Other State Funds and in some of these departments, we're going to have federal funds that come into play as well. So, there are going to be three things to keep track of."

Currie: "Okay."

Harris, G.: "So, there will be increases in federal funds, which are not funds of the state. There are increases in Other State

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Funds, which are increases of funds from the state that are not General Revenue Funds. And there might be increases in the General Revenue Funds themselves."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Representative. I think that you and your committee deserve to be commended on the careful work you have done on this budget and the distinctions that you're making between General Revenue and Other State Funds I think are critically important. So, I hope all the Members will join me and Representative Harris in voting 'yes' on House Bill 6053."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Representative, we had a... a rather... a good debate, I thought, yesterday and I didn't get a whole lot of... some key answers to questions that I asked. So, I'm going to revisit those, but..."

Harris, G.: "What kind of answers were those?"

Kay: "Let me... let... Pardon?"

Harris, G.: "You didn't get what kind of answers? I didn't hear you, Representative."

Kay: "I didn't get real clear answers."

Harris, G.: "Clear answers. Okay, clear."

Kay: "Yeah, clear answers. Well, by the way, I just wanted to let everyone know that thus far in the last two hours we have appropriated and said we can pay for a little more than \$11 billion worth of things that are coming out of appropriations. Just checking, if anyone was, you know, just curious. We talked about the Finance Act yesterday, didn't we?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Harris, G.: "We talked about a lot of things yesterday,

Representative. We had quite a discussion..."

Kay: "We did."

Harris, G.: "We... we talked a couple hours."

Kay: "We did. My question is, do you think what we did yesterday and what we're doing today meets constitutional muster?"

Harris, G.: "I would say this, Representative. And first of all, I will put the standard disclaimer that, you know, if I'm running a TV ad, I would say I'm not an attorney. But I would say as a Legislator, you know, I understand that the Finance Act and the Constitution require of us certain things. And that those things require the totality of our action to meet the requirements of the Finance Action... Act and of the State Constitution. And I would say that individual budget Bills, whether if it... if you're talking about an item such as this, which has \$11,291,200 worth of total spending in it, which I might point out, comes... \$591,200 from GRF, certainly would be within the GRF spend than any of us would anticipate because I think all of us would believe the State of Illinois would, yeah, take in \$591,200."

Kay: "Okay."

Harris, G.: "But there'll be a lot of other budgets that are presented today..."

Kay: "Sure."

Harris, G.: "...and at the end of the day, we're going to have to total up all those amounts and then we're going to have to match them will available revenue."

Kay: "So, Representative, since you have read the Finance Act, Article VIII, when we hit the 34 billion... just north of 34

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

billion, you are going to say we are constitutionally out of line. Is that correct?"

Harris, G.: "Then I would say we would have to look at adjusting revenue or expenses. At the end of the day, after all the budgets are passed, I think it's a very responsible way to pass budgets, you know, both the revenue number and the expense number..."

Kay: "Well, that's a yes, though."

Harris, G.: "Right."

Kay: "That's a yes answer. Okay. I'm also curious. If you thought today or you knew today that your revenue estimate was no more than \$31 billion, would you propo... be proposing the same line items with expenditures for '15 that you have this morning?"

Harris, G.: "I'm... I'm really proud of the work our committee did that voted these budgets out and I'm proud to stand here and support them."

Kay: "Well, Greg, if you're not going to answer the question,
just tell me. I won't waste any time. That's... I know you're
proud of it. We are... we're all proud of the work we do, but
my question was a question."

Harris, G.: "Could you repeat the question?"

Kay: "If we had a revenue estimate of \$31 billion, would you be proposing the same appropriations to this House today?"

Harris, G.: "But we do not have a source of a total available revenue yet."

Kay: "You're right. We have no source."

Harris, G.: "That's a discussion that we do not have."

Kay: "We have no answer."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Harris, G.: "Right."

Kay: "We have no estimate because no one has provided it in any committee and that's... that's not what the Finance Act says. So, basically, what we're doing..."

Harris, G.: "And so, Representative Kay..."

Kay: "...is not constitutional. It's not the law."

Harris, G.: "...can I ask you..."

Kay: "Thank you, Representative."

Harris, G.: "Do you know what the total expenditures we're talking about? No."

Kay: "By the end of the day I will, because by the end of the day I'm going to tell you when you're constitutionally finished. But you can do whatever you want after that."

Harris, G.: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Lad..."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me. Representative Mayfield. She's not seeking recognition. Representative Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "So, thank you. We've gotten a little far afield and we've covered a lot of topics, Ladies and Gentlemen, so I just wanted to recapitulate what this budget is here. This is the Office of the State Guardian and the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission which looks after and protects the interests of the very most frail and vulnerable citizens of the State of Illinois. This is their annual budget. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is... Well, Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Reboletti. Please vote your own switch. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6053

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourself. Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Representative Reboletti, would you like to proceed with your verification? Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative votes."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Acevedo; Representative Representative Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Berrios; Representative Bradley; Representative Burke, D.; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis, M.; Representative Davis, W.; Representative DeLuca; Representative Dunkin; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Golar; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Harris, G.; Representative Hernandez; Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Jackson; Representative Jakobsson; Jefferson; Representative Representative Representative Lang; Representative Lilly; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mautino; Mayfield; Representative Representative Representative Mitchell, C.; Representative Mussman; Representative Nekritz; Representative Representative Riley; Representative Rita; Representative

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Representative Sente; Representative Scherer; Representative Smiddy; Representative Smith; Representative Soto; Representative Tabares; Representative Turner; Verschoore; Representative Representative Walsh; Welch; Representative Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I withdraw my Motion to verify."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6053, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mayfield, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mayfield: "Just like to draw everybody's attention to the back of the chamber and welcome our former Leader, Representative Art Turner, Sr., back to the chamber."

Speaker Turner: "Hey, hey. Welcome back. Thank you, Representative. Representative Mussman, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mussman: "A point of personal privilege, Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Ma'am."

Mussman: "Thank you. Representative Chapa LaVia and I would like to call attention to a friend up in the gallery. We have Matthew Rodriguez, who is the incoming Illinois PTA President. He is the first man and the first Latino. So, please give him a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6054, Representative Harris. Please read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6054, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Commission. I believe their request is flat from FY15 as proposed in this legislation. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 6054 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representatives, please record yourself. Representative Costello, Willis. Costello. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6054, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6055, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6055, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill is the Department of Human Rights. There are two increases included in this piece of legislation. There is a 5 percent increase in Other State Funds for pickup of retirement. And there is an increase of about 42.9 percent funds in the Human Rights Special Fund, which is federal money and we were appropriating to allow them to accept and expend federal money."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate... With a late light, we have Representative Ives."
- Ives: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."
- Ives: "You indicated that there was an addition to pension pickups of 5 percent. Is that correct? Five percent increase in funding for pension pickups. Is that correct?"
- Harris, G.: "I believe that is the case. It says here on my sheet retirement pickup. I'm not sure if it is Social Security or state pension. We're still checking."
- Ives: "Okay. And would this include the Human Rights Commission? Would that be part of this budget?"
- Harris, G.: "To my knowledge, the Human Rights commissioners, themselves, are not in this budget. I believe they are in the... They're paid out of the Comptroller's Office. So, this would be the state workers who are employees of the office who are covered under this budget."
- Ives: "Thanks for that clarification. I'll keep my comments for
 when that budget comes up."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris to close."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6055 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Sim... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6055, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Bill 6056, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6056, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill is the appropriation for the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs. And I will point out some increases that are contemplated in the legislation that is before us. First, there is an increase in about \$94 million for staffing costs, which mainly rely to... refer to rather... refer to the hiring of additional RN staff to meet the requirements of the State Nursing Staffing Ratio Act. There are about \$8.3 million that supplies health insurance to veterans who do not have any and there are two smaller appropriations in new funds to help upgrade electronic medical records for our veterans and also to purchase needed health care equipment for the homes."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 6056 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 61 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6056, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, the status of House Bill 6057."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6057 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Can you move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6057, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. 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 Greg Harris."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "So, I would like to move the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2, which I'm told is purely a technical correction to a misdrafting of the Bill. It does not change any appropriation line."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris moves that the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6057. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6057, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the appropriation for the Department of Children and Family Services, which, as we all know, has, you know, come under a great deal of stress and strain in recent years accommodating the needs of new children who are coming into the system, protecting needs of vulnerable children across the State of Illinois, helping families to stay intact and helping children to return home to their families and successfully thrive. There are a number of increases in here which I'm, you know, very, very proud to say the committee approved yesterday. First of all, for the first time in many

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

years, we are going to be able to provide the foster parents of the State of Illinois with an increase of 4 percent in their foster care... parent rate. We're able to provide a 4... a 5 percent increase to foster care providers. We are able to provide a 2 percent increase to institutional group homes. All of this will go to better serve the needs of children, you know, who are in the system or who are at risk in becoming members of our system. In addition, we are storing... restoring about \$5 million in prevention funding to the Family Prevent ... Preservation Services which have been cut in previous years much of which will go to the Intact Family Initiative to help return youth to families when they have left for some reason, but more importantly, to work with families and provide services to keep youth at home before the youth are at risk of becoming separated from their parents. There is also a million dollars, an increase for purchase of adoption and quardianship services and about 1.956 million increase in foster homes and specialized foster care and prevention. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "A couple questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Greg, I asked you previously when we had GRF questions, year over year from fiscal year '14 to the… next year in fiscal year '15, how much more is being appropriated for this department?"

Harris, G.: "The analysis I have here in front of me is \$20,499,900 in GRF."

Sandack: "So, more than..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Harris, G.: "There are..."

Sandack: "...20... I'm sorry."

Harris, G.: "Twenty million, four hundred ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred dollars in GRF."

Sandack: "What percent of increase is that from fiscal '14 to '152"

Harris, G.: "The guy with the calculator says it's 18 percent."

Sandack: "Eighteen percent increase over one year and that...
Obviously, that's a pretty significant increase and probably
outstrips other departments or portions of the budget. And
you make a nice impassioned speech about the important work
that's done and there's no doubt about that, but how can we
fiscally justify that percent of increase given, again, we
haven't had a discussion on revenue?"

Harris, G.: "Well, Mr. Sandack, I would think that one way or another, these youth who are in our care or who may come into our care, we're going to end up spending some money on them. We can spend the money to keep them at home with their families. We can provide services to keep them healthy and well. We can prevent their abuse, neglect and their death. Or we can send them out into the world alone. We can put them into the juvenile justice system. We can put them into the system of the Department of Corrections. We can put them into the mental health system, at a much greater cost to the people of the State of Illinois. We can send them into our communities alone and helpless to create crime or havoc and to harm themselves or others. Those are the choices that we have."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Sandack: "To the Bill. That was a completely nonanswer... the complete nonanswer to a question. That was an emotional response based on hysteria, based on hyperbole, based on not one lick of facts, and it doesn't justify an increase of 18 percent. Because if we really want to do that, by all means, let's increase the budget 30, 40, 50 percent, right? Let's keep going. We don't want any of those horrible things to happen to anybody, no one here does. So, let's just increase the budget 30 percent, 50 percent because it's not real money, right? We're not talking about real money. We're talking about making sure people eat, they're not abused; they're not in jail. I agree with all those sentiments. Of course, we still have an obligation to act in a grownup-like manner and budget like grownups. We're not doing it. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. Representative Harris, I just wanted to ask, because we've gone over this and over this over the last couple of years with this agency, because it's so important because of taking care of the children. We've had an abysmal rate of directors leaving, I think it's been two in the last eight months or whatever, and we're looking forward to the new director and hope that that will work out. But in a follow-up of other questions that I've brought up, does this budget include any money that is recovered from the fraud that was held in close to \$8 million in grants out of the DCFS budget from four years ago?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Harris, G.: "I think you're talking about the hearing that, you know, we had in Human Services substantive when I chaired it a couple years ago..."

Bellock: "Correct."

Harris, G.: "...where we heard about the gentleman who had defrauded not only DCFS but also the Department of Human Services and I believe the Chicago Public Schools and some money. There is ongoing legal action under the Illinois Recovery Act by the Attorney General to reclaim that money. I don't know... if she did send us a letter, I don't have it in front of us. The new director of the status of that. When that money comes back, it is my understanding that that goes directly into the General Revenue Fund total. It doesn't, for instance, come back into the DCFS line or the DHS line. That would be part of a state recovery."

Bellock: "And have there been any safeguards put in place in the DCFS agency to prevent that fraud from happening again?"

Harris, G.: "I think one of the things about the new director that really stands out to me about her, is her law enforcement background as an assistant U.S. state's attorney and as her previous experience as director of International Compliance for both JP Morgan Chase and the AON Corporation. I think she understands how to control and manage large systems and I hope that she will look at the systems, even though she's brand new there, that are in place and strengthen the controls 'cause I think each and every one of us, wherever we are on the debates about should we spend this or should we spend that, want to be sure that every nickel and every dime that we spend in the state is held to high account."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Bellock: "Thank you very much. Speaker, to the Bill. This issue we have asked for four years since it happened and light was shone on it. Again, my consistency here is about grants and the misuse of grants. And in this, you are taking \$18 million away from children that have been entrusted in the DCFS agency. It had gone on for years, it had been asked questions about and finally it was acted upon. But this is now still four years later and there has been no recovery of that money either into GRF or into helping the children in the DCFS program. So, I am just asking the Attorney General of the State of Illinois to address this issue as soon as possible regarding the grants in this DCFS."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask some Franks: questions, Greg, but I'm not. I'm going to... I respect you too much and I know you care about this. And... but my concern is we're spending money that we don't have. We have... we're asking for an 18 percent increase. In a perfect world, we'd open our checkbook and give you anything that you needed and all of us believe that. But I don't understand how we can spend additional \$20 million, an 18 percent increase for GRF. I'm concerned it's going to become a cruel hoax. That we're telling an agency that they're going to have money that's never going to materialize. There's no consensus here on raising taxes. We... we talk... I talked briefly before earlier today about getting additional revenue from the lottery. I mean, only in Illinois, the state that's given us Al Capone, can we screw up gambling, you know. We're not ... we're not maximizing the return that we should be getting, so we're

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

leaving hundreds of millions of dollars on the table that could help pay for DCFS and pay for so many other things, but we're not doing that. So, what I'm concerned, besides the constitutional aspects, I think we're trampling on the Constitution because we're not providing a balanced budget. I think we're trampling on our BFO laws because we said we couldn't produce a budget that didn't match revenues. I think we're trampling on the taxpayers, but I also think we're providing this cruel hoax because we're promising imaginary money that does not exist. I mean, that might work in Toontown, but this is not a cartoon. This is real people, with real issues, with real problems, that must be addressed in the real world. Accordingly, we should be doing this with the real money that we have. Not the imaginary money that we don't have and that is what concerns me. And I understand the arguments because I agree with the arguments. But I don't want to stand here and say that this is something that's going to happen because I don't believe that it will. And you're going to feel good about voting for something that's not going to materialize which is the cruelest thing that we could do. And what we ought to be doing is dealing with the reality and it breaks my heart that we're not."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. You know, as families across the state are preparing for more money in their checkbook with the income tax hike mostly expiring, we'll give them a surprise here, hopefully in the next couple weeks from your side of the aisle, where they won't. We're a family that makes \$50 thousand a year who would have gained back a thousand

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

dollars, won't have that. And maybe they'll have to do without. Maybe they won't be able to provide something that they wanted to for their children. Maybe they'll have to wait. Eighteen percent is a huge number. Of course, we support all of those endeavors, but for eight years that I've been here, we do a lot of promising but don't back it up. Now we're promising an increase. An increase to families who might have some additional dollars and we won't be able to make that promise come true. Based on what I've read in the Tribune, based on what I've read in other media reports, there aren't the votes here for the revenue stream. So we'll continue the charade and make more promises that the checkbook of the state can't meet. Eighteen percent is what probably the real unemployment rate here is in the State of Illinois. We don't have 18 percent more businesses in the State of Illinois from last year. We don't have peoples' income rising 18 percent. But what we do have is about one in every two Illinoisans who said they would leave if they could. I wonder why. Well, we promised them that taxes will change, but then we decided to change the ballgame at the very end. How frustrating for people that represent these individuals to tell them, well, you know what, we didn't really lie to you, things changed. Eighteen percent more sounds great. I can only imagine what Bill 54 will increase its line items by. But you know what, I guess and I don't know what our tally is at Representative Fortner, but I could only imagine what numbers we're at now. And eventually, when we get to \$34 billion, that's when the clock stops 'cause... that's what the Resolution said. But 18 percent. I only can imagine what's coming next."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "To respond to Representative Reboletti, we're now at 11, 408,000,000 and climbing and the day has just begun. Representative, I'm curious. How many intergovernmental agreements is DCFS involved in?"

Harris, G.: "I don't know the answer to that."

Kay: "And so, you wouldn't know how much money's involved in those
intergovernmental agreements."

Harris, G.: "I do not know."

Kay: "Okay. Well, that's pretty important to know. Let me ask you another question. It's my opinion that we are dying a thousand deaths every day. Would you agree with that?"

Harris, G.: "I think as we look at this budget there are some kids out there who are dying every day too."

Kay: "Well, exactly. And I don't disagree with that and no one on my side of the aisle disagrees with it, but the simple truth is that pretty soon we're not going to be able to take care of anybody because we don't realize that there are limits. And so, we have no idea today what revenue figure we're dealing with. We're just spending money. And that's irresponsible. So, my question to you is this, would you support a mid-year budget cut?"

Harris, G.: "Representative, I'm talking about the budgets, they're in front of us now. Should we come back in a mid-year Session and we want to do adjustments, up or down, that will be a discussion for mid-year. The decisions for us today, you know, these are going to be some tough discussions. Today,

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

tomorrow and the days leading up to our adjournment at the end of May where we have to do, not just one Bill, not just two Bills, but the totality of the expenditure Bills. We have to provide for the payment of the certified expense of our pension plans. We have to provide for the payment of the debt of our state as tabulated by the Treasurer of Illinois. We have to provide some money for unpaid bills, which we've heard about. And we have to look at sources of revenue. All those things taken together. The budget Bill is not one Bill. It is not one thing. It is a collection of things taken together and all of those things, as we move down this path, we're going to have to look at, we're going to have to vote on and we're going to have to take a stand."

- Kay: "Representative, there's not one authority, public or private, that thinks the State of Illinois knows what they're doing financially, fiscally or otherwise, not one. So, my question is, all I want is a simple yes or no answer, would you agree to mid-year budget cuts?"
- Harris, G.: "I'm only talking about what we're doing today. We have budgets that are in front of us, come back in the mid-year, and introduce the Bill. I haven't seen any Bills proposing a budget come forward, cutting, keeping level or increasing or otherwise come from your side. We did have..."

Kay: "Representative..."

Harris, G.: "Can I just finish here this time? We did have a Resolution yesterday in committee introduced by a Member from your side urging us to fully fund veterans' homes, which was voted on unanimously by the same group of people who then

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

voted to cut the funding for veterans' homes. So, we do have that on record."

Kay: "Representative... Representative..."

Harris, G.: "That, by the way, is on page 28 of the House Calendar."

Kay: "...would you agree with me that our primary responsibility is to provide security to the general public and that's every citizen in this state?"

Harris, G.: "And I think also we have a special responsibility..."

Kay: "Yes or no? Yes..."

Harris, G.: "...we have a special responsibility..."

Kay: "Representative, all I need..."

Harris, G.: "...to the children..."

Kay: "...is a yes or no."

Harris, G.: "...and the most frail and the seniors."

Kay: "Representative, is that a yes or a no?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Kay: "Very good. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I appreciate the debate. Again, this is the budget for the Department of Children and Family Services. And I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6057 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6057, having received the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Phelps: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we all know it's going to be a long day. You're going to need to keep your energy and you're going to need to eat. So, Representative McSweeney and I bought pizzas for everybody. So, help yourselfves."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6126, Representative Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6126, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is actually the first Bill out of 27 for the appropriations for General Services. If I may, I want to echo what Leader Durkin said in his opening remarks. I want to thank my colleagues on this side as well as my colleagues on the Republican side. We worked well together. Obviously, there's a disagreement, but I can say this for myself and for the rest of the Members, I think there's... there's mutual respect here. I should also add that the Appropriations Committee for General Services, we passed two budgets. Right now, we'll be talking about the budget based on the Governor's recommendation. We also passed a budget based on the Governor's nonrecommendation as well. I should also point out that it's being moved forward. This committee has done, traditionally, we always leave some

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

money. We don't use all the money that gets appropriated. We leave that for probably other committees that might need some funds for a supplemental later on. And with that, we start out with House Bill 6126 which is the Bill that deals with the Executive Ethics Commission. And as we have done consistently in our committee, when it comes to the Auditor General, the Inspector General, and this Commission as well, we feel that we need agencies out there departments that police what we do, so we go along with their request for the ... for the budget year. And in this case, they're coming in, and they're all GRF by the way, and they're coming in with an increase of \$2.4 million, which is a 38 percent increase in GRF for the agencies to fill out the state procurement officers and procurement compliance monitors for the procurement oversight duties. And with that I'll be happy to answer any questions and I'll remind my folks on the other side, tomorrow's my birthday. Please be nice."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Can I be nice to the Sponsor for a little while, please?"
Speaker Turner: "Please."

Sandack: "Fred, our analysis says that this particular commission head... head count goes from 77 to 93. Is that correct?"

Crespo: "It does go up, yes."

Sandack: "Our analysis says that there's an increase in personal services and Social Security by 20.2 percent. Does that jive with your numbers?"

Crespo: "I believe so, which is consistent with the number of employees, yeah."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Sandack: "And our analysis says that this department's increase is in contractual services by 425 percent. Can that possibly be accurate?"

Crespo: "Give me one second. Yes."

Sandack: "I'm sorry?"

Crespo: "Yes."

Sandack: "Our analysis says that this department's travel increases by 375 percent. Can that possibly be accurate?"

Crespo: "Yes, it does. Again with the additional people they're going to do more traveling, so that's how."

Sandack: "You've got more people that are traveling. We're spending more money. Our analysis also suggests that this commission is an actual increase over what the Governor sought..."

Crespo: "Correct."

Sandack: "...in his budget."

Crespo: "Yes."

Sandack: "To the Bill. It's his birthday, so I'm going to be nice.

That's insane. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, I find it pretty interesting. This is the Executive Ethics Commission budget and there's an increase in personnel. I've got to wonder. Do you think maybe that's because we have one of the most corrupt states in the union? Do you think we have to do a lot more ethics investigation? I'll tell you what. I don't know why the Attorney General isn't handling some of these ethics complaints. Why we have a specific Executive Ethics Commission? Why we would even have to go and spend all this

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

money on unethical people? Because we have a ton of them in this state. We hire navigators for our Medicaid or our Obamacare rollout that are known terrorists. We hire gang members to work in our prisons and with DCFS. Yeah, we have a problem with ethics. It's too bad that we don't have the money to spend to actually root out all the ethical violations we have and until we start to actually elect ethical people, this is going to be a problem. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Representative, the <u>Chicago Tribune</u>'s been brought up just a couple times today and there was a story and one of the comments in the story was... was that we made a promise to the taxpayers and we should keep that promise. It was a temporary income tax increase and it should be kept that way. Do you know who's quoted that?"

Crespo: "You're talking about the <u>Chicago Tribune</u>. I believe they list a number of Legislators that made a comment in terms of the income tax increase. Just for the record, I did not participate on that. I voted 'no'. I made no promises of any kind back then 'cause I... I did believe that we shouldn't have passed the income tax state increase."

Reis: "But the quote was... was that we made a promise to the taxpayers and it was a temporary increase and it should be kept that way. Now, the only way that some of the people are voting today can keep that promise is to vote 'no'."

Crespo: "Representative, if I may. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, my committee, we passed two appropriation Bills.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

This is the recommended Bill under to the Governor... what the Governor recommended. We also passed a nonrecommended Bill. My job, as a chair of that committee is to facilitate and do what we're asked to do. Just because you vote for one or the other, does not mean you're going to support a tax increase. There's been a lot of conversation taking place on the revenue side. At some point, I agree, we need to reconcile the spending with whatever we have. And I also agree that process has been delayed. But if I voted for this one or I should add, voted for the not recommended, doesn't mean you take a position. We passed these out of committee and we need to move the process forward. Now, listen, there's a discussion that's going to take place on the revenue side. Obviously, that's not going very well, but I don't think anyone would suggest that we should stop at that point and do nothing else. And this is basically what we're doing with this process."

Reis: "Okay, okay. And I'm... I know that a lot of people are bringing up this same topic today, but I guess I'm wanting to go forward and I'm going to assume you might be voting 'no' on this Bill because you can't just keep increasing all these budgets and expect them to... even Common Core math couldn't get you the... our revenues without voting for a tax increase are going to meet our expenditures. Not even Common Core could come up with that answer. So, all of you guys that are quoted today in the Chicago Tribune, and we're watching, you're voting 'yes' on all these Bills that increase the budget. So, either as... Representative Franks said, we're giving false hope, or we're going to go... to go back on our comments."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney. Your light was on, Sir. Mr. McSweeney does not wish to speak. Thank you for the pizza though, Sir. Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields. Representative Lang in the Chair."

Kay: "Representative, with regard to your budget, which one... you said you did two, which one did you adopt in committee?"

Crespo: "We adopted both with... both Bills. We passed the recommended and the not recommended as well."

Kay: "And the not recommended... Why wasn't it recommended? What was... What didn't you like about it? What were the unintended consequences that you didn't care for?"

Crespo: "On what? On the not recommended?"

Kay: "Yes."

Crespo: "You know, when I call that Bill for a vote, I'll be more than happy to debate that."

Kay: "Okay."

Crespo: "At this point, we're looking at House Bill 6126."

Kay: "Okay. Greg..."

Crespo: "I'm hoping to be able to call the not recommended."

Kay: "Very good."

Crespo: "I'd love to have you as a cosponsor."

Kay: "Very good. Are you familiar with your constitutional obligation with respect to bring a budget to the House Floor?"

Crespo: "I'm sorry. I... Could you repeat that?"

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think any of us can hear here. Could
you... a little order, please?"

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman's point is well-taken. Could we hold the noise down in the chamber, Ladies and Gentlemen? Keep the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

pizza eaters in the back and hold the noise down so we can hear ourselves out here. Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Fred, my question... my question is, are you familiar with your constitutional obligation with regard to appropriating money for a budget?"

Crespo: "I'm aware of my obligation as a chairman of the Appropriations Committee to present a budget before the House Floor."

Kay: "Well, are you familiar with Article VIII of the Constitution?"

Crespo: "Can you please talk about... what is that?"

Kay: "I'm sorry?"

Crespo: "What... Can you explain what... what that is?"

Kay: "Well, the fact that we're supposed to be operating with an estimated budget so that we have some pathway to follow, some direction to... And I guess what is it that... that led you to come to the number that you got to because I want to know what revenue number you're dealing with."

Crespo: "As I said in my opening remarks, this particular budget, all 27 Bills, are based on the recommendation of the Governor, what he recommended, then we have a not recommended. I would also add, as I stated before, this is part of the process. There's going... there's a discussion going on, on the revenue side and this is the spending side. But folks, there's less than a week and a half left of Session and we need to come up with a appropriations here in Springfield. If nothing's happened on the revenue side, we can't just wait 'til the last second to come up with a spending side. At the end of the day, we need to reconcile this. I give you that. I think

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

we all agree and I also have... as I stated before, we're delaying that reconciliation process. Now, this is... this is a little bit different than what we've done in the past. Right? In the past, we've worked on the revenue side first then the spending side. While we're doing it differently, but the end date here is May 31. That's when all of this has to come together."

Kay: "Do you know any... do you know any business or any other state that does business like this?"

Crespo: "Well, again, we have until May 31 to reconcile the spending with the revenue side. We're talking about the spending right now. I hope as we keep talking about the revenue side we can reach some kind of agreement, but there's not much going on there right now. We can't just stop and get to this point of paralysis by analysis, but we do nothing else. We got to get something done and once we work on the revenue, we're going to have to reconcile both of them."

Kay: "Representative, I'm going to ask you the same question I asked the previous presenter. Would you support or are you in favor of a mid-year budget cut where we would come in and mid-year make adjustments based on revenues that we don't have?"

Crespo: "I'm working under the premise that we're working on a 12-month budget, as we speak."

Kay: "Well, you guys are pretty slick. I'll tell you."

Crespo: "Thank you."

Kay: "Let me ask... let me ask this again. I mean, how in the world, if you don't know a budget number and you don't agree to a mid-year budget cut, can we say this is even credible?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Crespo: "Representative, there is a number. We might disagree with the number. The Governor put a number out there and we were tasked, our committees, to put a budget together based on that premise. My committee, we went a step further. We took the not recommended, which is really the facts... based on the facts, we have that Bill staying out there until which I'm hoping at some point will run."

Kay: "So, what... what we're really saying... and this is my last comment because I'm having a hard time getting just simple yes or no answers and that's a shame. The bottom line is, if you vote for these appropriated moneys today and it doesn't make any difference who's the presenter... who's the presenter, you're voting for a tax increase. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. You know, we talk about, for many years, about the budgeting for results. Well, this year we turned that process upside down and it's results for budgeting. And if you look at some of these line item increases, they are astounding to say the least. Increases in contractual services by 425 percent. Increases travel by 374.3 percent. Increase in printing 144 percent. And a 4,667 percent increase in equipment and the list goes on. The dollar change is two and a half million and instead of taking those dollars and paying down the \$5 billion that we owe providers all throughout the state, we'll thumb our nose at them and spend more for this panel that was able to do their job with a lot less money last year. So, all those providers, who give those services out to the disabled, who give those services out to the children and to the seniors, we won't pay them.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

We'll continue to pay the interest on those, actually, loans. We forced them to give us loans, lines of credit, but we'll now go off the premise that we have a tax increase which doesn't exist here in make-believe land. We do have a budget number. The budget number was the Resolution at about \$34 billion. Now, we're going to go and presume something completely different. I wonder how many households across this great state are increasing their line items by 4,700 percent."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. A couple of comments. I think, as I listen to my colleagues on the other side, I... I agree. You know, we've had some issues, ethical issues in the state and as this commission... my committee's always done, when it comes to the Inspector General, the Auditor General, we always make sure they're funded at the requested amount 'cause we think we need... I think you're saying the same thing... an entity or entities out there to police what we're doing and the Ethics Commission is basically doing the same thing. Now, keep in mind, this is a byproduct of Senate Bill 51 that we passed some time ago was... actually, does request they do more. I disagree that they haven't been able to do their job with the previous funding, they've actually, had a very difficult job. This puts them at where they need to be to make sure they... they all reach the procurement process in the state which I think we need to do. And with that, I please ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

voted who wish? Mr. Sims, Mr. Smiddy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6127, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6127, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. This is the second Bill out of the 27 for the Appropriations Committee in General Services. This one deals with the Civil Service Commission and it remains flat from fiscal year '14 at \$379 thousand. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

There being 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?

Mayfield, Smiddy. Representative Mayfield. Please take the
record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting
'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6128, Mr.
Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6128, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. This is the third Bill out of 27 for General Services and it has to deal with the Illinois Commerce Commission. This Bill is Other State Funds. There's no GRF

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

and there's a decrease based on the funding that's available.

And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Smiddy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6129, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6129, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And this is Bill #4 for revenue for the committee. And House Bill 6129 deals with the Drycleaner Environmental Response Trust Fund. There's no GRF. There are Other State Funds and they're flat compared to fiscal year '14. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being 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? Mr. Costello. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6130, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6130, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And this is the fifth Bill. House Bill 6130 deals with the Office of the Executive Inspector General. It's a combination of GRF and other funds. And it remains flat compared to fiscal year '14. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6131, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6131, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And House Bill 6131 deals with the Environmental Protection Agency. They're funded by Other State Funds, no GRF. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Evans. Please take the record. On this question, 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Andrade."
- Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to... a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Andrade: "I'd like to introduce... we have the Korean American Community Services in Troy. They're in my district and also Ann Williams. And I just wanted to give them a round of applause for coming over here to Springfield and see us do some work for the people."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you for joining us. House Bill 6132. Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6132, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. 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 Crespo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. I ask for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2 which basically takes \$500 thousand in GRF from the personal service line for operations of the agency's executive office and puts those funds into separate line items for the Illinois Bicentennial Commission. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6132, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And House Bill 6132 is the appropriations for the Historic Preservation Agency. It's a combination of both GRF and Other State Funds. And the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

increase here has to do most with personal services to fully staff the historic sites in the state."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Fred, our analysis says that there's a 14.4 percent increase in GRF spending in FY14... in '15 over '14. Is that in your analysis?"

Crespo: "Yes."

- Sandack: "And similar to what has been talked about with previous Sponsors' previous Appropriations Bills, 14.4 percent is a pretty large increase. And given that we haven't discussed and passed a revenue Bill, we don't and... by the way, do you assume that this appropriation keeps the tax increase in effect?"
- Crespo: "We're having a discussion on this budgeting side Leader,
 I'm not sure what's going to happen on the revenue side. As
 I said before, I do have a not recommended budget I would
 love to run, as well, that pretty much is consistent with the
 numbers that everyone agreed to some time ago."
- Sandack: "Well, I... I understand that, but this appropriation's increasing 14.4 percent. How can we pay for it but for keeping the tax increase in place?"
- Crespo: "And that's the question we've been asking for quite some time, right? The component on the revenue side unfortunately there hasn't been agreement and there's some discussion going on, we have to move forward with this plan. We can't wait 'til the last second. I should also add, as we go through

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

these Bills, there are some cuts in some of the other agencies as well."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. We don't have to wait for the last second. We've got plenty of time. The idea that we have to pass spending Bill after spending Bill, one that now increases spending 14.4 percent and we'll get to the revenue later, is a disingenuous argument. The fact of the matter is these spending Bills assume the tax increase will stay in place. Given that many in this chamber have made a promise that they would vote against any tax increase, to offer these spending increases in that vacuum, again, is a disingenuous stance. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, you're spending a lot of money here today that we have no idea whether or not we can afford. My question to you is, would you support a stabilization Act where we put... took 3 percent, or 4 percent or 5 percent of GRF and put it into a fund to guarantee that we could pay for the most necessary items, programs or policies of the State of Illinois?"

Crespo: "Representative, I believe we already have that fund available. It hasn't been funded, what we call a Rainy Day Fund. And if I recall, I believe the Governor also talked about another Rainy Day Fund. So, I agree. What we should be talking by having a Rainy Day Fund and at least it's on the radar screen, as I know. We do have something out there, unfortunately, it hasn't been funded. And the money that's

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

there, by the way, I did learn that we've been borrowing from that as well, so it hasn't grown the way we would have expected it to grow."

Kay: "So... Okay. I couldn't hear half of what you said, but I will just say this. I think you're in agreement with me that there should be a stabilization fund to make sure that when we get down to the bottom line and we can't pay bills that we finally prioritize the real needs of the state. Is that your understanding too?"

Crespo: "You know, I would love to see a Bill."

Kay: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Cavaletto. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6133. Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6133, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Crespo."

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

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And I ask for the adoption of the Amendment which is increases the appropriations to the Shared Services Center and decreases the appropriate personnel services line. And I ask for its adoption."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6133, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And House Bill 6133 deals with the...
the Gaming Board. And these are all Other State Funds, no
GRF. And it reports a decrease of \$5 million. And I ask for
an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Smiddy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6134. Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6134, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Crespo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And this... House Bill 6134 deals with the Illinois Racing Board. It's all Other State Funds, no GRF. And we see a decrease of \$23 million which is the elimination of a first-time payment into the Horse Racing

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Equity Fund for fiscal year '14. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6134, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Again, Speaker, this Bill deals with the Illinois Racing Board. It also includes a... the increase in appropriations for Shared Services Center and decreases the Personal Services line. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Brady, Mr. Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6135, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6135, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And House Bill 6135 deals with the Property Tax Appeal Board. These are all Other State Funds. There's a de... increase of \$239 thousand for operations. And I ask an 'aye' vote."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Sente. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6136, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6136, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6136, which is the eleventh Bill out of 27, deals with the Independent...

Independent Tax Tribunal. And in this case, we zero out their line item."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, let me tell you why you should vote 'no' on this Bill and it has absolutely nothing to do with overspending 'cause we're not overspending. We have zeroed out the line for the Independent Tax Tribunal. Now, let's ask ourselves, why does this exist to begin with? Two years ago, the General Assembly created the Independent Tax Tribunal for one primary reason; because we were trying to improve the business climate in the State of Illinois. And a very well-respected, national taxation organization, known as the Council On State Taxation, rated Illinois with a D because a tax appeal did not have an independent review. In other words, if you have a contest with your taxes, it gets to the Department of Revenue to be adjudicated. There's no independent review of your tax

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

problem. So, the Council On State Taxation rated us a D because of that. And we said, if we put in an Independent Tax Tribunal, the Council On State Taxation is going to rate Senator Hutchinson, the distinguished Illinois higher. chairman of the Senate Revenue Committee, pushed the hardest to make this happen. She said if we institute an Independent Tax Tribunal, our rating by the Council On State Taxation for business purposes would go from a D to a B, and that's exactly what happened. We set this organization up. It's been in operation one year and all of a sudden it's getting zeroed out. It sends exactly the wrong message of what and how we want to treat business. Has nothing to do with dollars and cents. I understand the distinguished chairman's reason for zeroing it out. Nonetheless, it shouldn't happen. You should vote 'no' on this, not because of the dollars and cents issue, but because it sends a wrong business message on how we treat tax appeals in the State of Illinois. And I urge a 'no' vote." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And know, this is a new agency, I know last year we struggled in funding them as well. We were able to fund them for six months of the year 'cause they came on board then. It is a new program. As we're looking at making cuts, we felt, you know, we could revisit this one next year, but at this point, we have to make some cuts as well. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Sosnowski. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6137, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6137, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6137 deals with the Procurement Policy Board. This is all GRF and it remains flat from fiscal year '14. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. D'Amico. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6138, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6138, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. We're halfway there. This is Bill 13 out of 27. House Bill 6138 deals with the Labor Relations Board. They are funded by GRF only and it remains flat from fiscal year '14. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the record show that Representative Sosnowski is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect that. Thank you, Representative. 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? Cross, Tabares. Please take the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6139, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6139, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6139 deals with the State Employees Retirement Systems. It's based on all GRF and there's an increase of 12,500. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Sims. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6145, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6145, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6145 deals with the Arts Council. It's a combination of GRF and other funds. And compared to fiscal year '15, there's an \$11 thousand increase. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? D'Amico. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6146, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6146, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6146 deals with the Department of Professional and Financial Regulations. They are mostly funded by Other State Funds, and they're coming in at \$109 million compared... pretty much compared the same to fiscal year '14. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hurley, Sims. Representative Hurley. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6147, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6147, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6147 deals with the Department of Employment Security. They're funded mostly by Other State Funds, federal dollars and they're seeing an increase of \$13 million. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take them record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6148, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6148, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6148 deals with the Department of Natural Resources. It's a combination of GRF and Other State Funds, so we do see an increase on the GRF side mostly for the department of youth employment programs. Happy to answer any questions. And ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Senger."
- Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Senger: "Very quickly, Representative, wasn't this the department that last year we helped assist them with a increase in a fee?"
- Crespo: "I believe, yes. We did vote for a Bill to increase fees and make sure they were funded at the appropriate level."
- Senger: "And I also recall in the conversation last year that this... one of the convincing reasons why we had to increase the fee is to make sure that the department would have enough funding to operate going forward. They were very short in the past. So, my question is, again, with the increase in fees, we are now al... also asking for an increase in GRF, which is not the promise that was made a year ago when we did pass that fee increase. So, that's my... that's my point I would like to make here. And I'm asking for a 'no' vote."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Lang: "Are you..."

Crespo: "I'm sorry. Was that a question or are you just making a statement, Representative?"

Senger: "It was a statement. I'm... yes, yes."

Crespo: "A statement, okay. Yeah."

Speaker Lang: "So, have you completed your remarks, Representative?"

Senger: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, to expand on what Representative Senger just said, I think it's more than once we voted to increase fees to help fund these agencies because they were in such dire straits because of budget cuts and shifting of money into other programs. So, my more specific question is, now, that it seems like we're headed towards a conclusion this year of increasing the... or making the income tax permanent, are we going to rollback those fees now or are we just going to continue to pilfer more and more money from the taxpayers of Illinois?"

Crespo: "Representative, as I mentioned earlier, there has to be a reconciliation process at some point and that... I'm pretty sure that will be taken into account then."

Reis: "Will you cosponsor a Bill with me to reverse all those fees back?"

Crespo: "No. Draft the Bill, I'll take a look."

Reis: "To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is kind of off subject of what many of the comments have been today, but we

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

all talk about we don't know what the revenues are, we're going to discuss those, we're going to discuss those. Last year we passed a historic Bill to allow fracking to begin in Illinois. We don't know what's underground. We don't know what it's going to bring. But you know, a year later we're still muddling around in the rulemaking. This could be hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue to our state, not from gaming, not from increase in taxes, not increase in fees, but from natural growth. And yet, the administration and the Attorney General's Office and the EPA continues to stall all this. And I know there's bipartisan support on this issue and I wish that more people on both sides of the aisle would contact the Governor's Office and tell them to get off their hind ends and get these rules done so that we can start fracking and get money the honest way by putting people to work."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I'd like to follow up for a second on this issue of the fee Bill that was passed to support the Department of Natural Resources a year or so ago and many of us recognized the plight that DNR was in, in terms of the amount of money they had been receiving previously and the reductions that they had taken over the past seven, eight, nine years. So, many of us, myself included, cast a tough vote to increase those fees, license plate fees and other fees for the department. That was a substantial amount of

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

money. How much... Do you know how much those fees are bringing in?"

Crespo: "Twenty-two million dollars."

Harris, D.: "Twenty-two million dollars in new fees, which many of us agreed to, and now the department needs another 7 percent increase in GRF for this... this year. Twenty-two million dollars is not sufficient?"

Crespo: "Well, I think, ever since we passed that Bill, Representative, they're taking on new responsibilities with the… especially with the fracking and mining operations. And the increase is mostly for those new responsibilities, which weren't part of the Bill that you supported last… last year."

Harris, D.: "Well, I hear what you're saying, although I have to tell you that it seems to us that given the fact, the support we've already given the department, this seems a bit high. But thank you for your answer."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "It has been a year. The Governor's Office has failed to get those rules done. The... the former Representative mentioned and with the exception of criticizing the Attorney General's Office, he's correct. It's been a year. And so, beginning tomorrow, I'm going to be more aggressive in my comments regarding the failure of the administration to get those rules done."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker. And I thank Chairman Crespo. I rise in support of the appropriation for the Department of Natural Resources. In answer to your question, the fee packages that were introduced, I sponsored, many Members voted for, have

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

generated in excess of \$22 million and they are working towards making the improvements in all five of the funds which had been raided over the past decade to levels where they could not sustain. There's about \$700 million in needed repairs, so the \$22 million per year does assist and they have been into the parks, fixed roads, fixed all of the infrastructure problems or set a schedule to do them and it is helping. But I do support the Gentleman's budget. There is a need, given the new responsibilities of fracking, of permits, of mining operations, the strengthening and creating of the strongest set of regulations in the country thanks to the negotiations from many parties, including Representative Bradley. So, I support this budget and thank you for your work, Chairman Crespo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. I just ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 3283?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3283 is on the Order of Senate-Bills Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Please place that order... on the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 6152, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6152, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6152 deals with the Department of Agriculture. It's a combination of both GRF and Other State Funds. You see an increase in general operations which is mostly to meet their obligations for... for the (unintelligible)."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may ask a question real quick. I know we were just on 6148 and we're now on 6152?"

Speaker Lang: "That is correct."

Senger: "Are we not going to call 49 and 50 and 51?"

Speaker Lang: "You can count on the fact that we will get back to those Bills, Representative."

Senger: "Okay. Thank you. Just to... basically, to the Bill. This is... 6152 Bill has an increase in it of 2.6 million and it has to do with an increase in medicinal plants program and the Forever Green programs. And the Forever Green program is increasing from 200 thousand to 950 thousand. So, again, I'm just... to the Bill. This is a situation where initiatives that we would necessarily say were necessary at this time because of the fact we're struggling with the budget are totally unnecessary."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. DeLuca, Mr. Sims. Please take the record.

On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hays."

- Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you let the record reflect that on Bill 6148 it was my intention to vote 'no' on my... I didn't... I failed to vote my switch. My intention is to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. The record will reflect your intention.

 House Bill 6156. Mr. Clerk, please place that on the Order of
 Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6156, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration.

 Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Crespo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo on Amendment 2."

Crespo: "Speaker, I believe we're adopting Amendment #3."

Speaker Lang: "So, do you wish to withdraw Amendment 2?"

Crespo: "Withdraw Amendment #2, yes, please."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Crespo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo on Amendment 3."

- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. I ask for the adoption... adoption of Amendment #3 which becomes the Bill. And it basically, deals with the appropriation for the General Assembly Members' salaries and stipends. And it puts it at last year's appropriated number. And I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

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

 And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6156, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And House Bill 6156 deals with the Constitutional Officers, legislative agencies, the OMB, and the Supreme Court Historic Preservation Commission. There's a combination of both GRF and Other State Funds. And I ask for its adopt... I ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "In this particular budget Bill here, is this where we're going to find the commission, such as the Human Rights Commissions. Are we going to find their salaries in this?"

Crespo: "Give me one second, Rep... The salaries for the commissions, yes. They're included in this Bill. For Human Rights, correct?"

Ives: "Yes. Well, for a lot of different ones, but specifically Human Rights, right?"

Crespo: "Right."

Ives: "Okay. So, in here, you've got the chairman at \$52 thousand.

The 12 members at \$563 thousand. Is that correct?"

Crespo: "That sounds about right, Representative."

Ives: "Okay. So, and in this case, you know, there's 12 members. So, each member's making around \$46 thousand a year, roughly."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Crespo: "If you're reading from the record, I'm pretty sure that's accurate."
- Ives: "Okay. And then, the other thing is they meet about once...
 they meet about once a month. So, essentially, we're paying
 these commissioners \$4 thousand a meeting. Is it... would that
 be the right number? Roughly \$4 thousand a meeting to meet?"
- Crespo: "They... they, I believe, the immediate requirements are correct. I believe they do other work besides that behind the scenes."
- Ives: "Regardless, this is a lot of money for people that are appointed by the Governor to sit on a commission that meets infrequently. In fact, it shows ... when I was looking up their agenda, it shows already that their May meeting is canceled. So, I mean, I think the taxpayers, you know, should understand exactly where this money's going. Now, last year, I filed a Bill that said that these commissioners no longer get accumulate pension accumulation. And that Bill passed out of the House. It was picked up in the Senate by what apparently could have been only entitled to be called a hostile Sponsor 'cause he never forwarded the Bill. So, not only are these commission members making outrageous salaries, they're also collection... collecting pension benefits. I have a problem with this and it's not something that we're going to correct today is it? We're going to continue to pass this type of legislation. Did your... did your General Services Committee ... did you even look into the details of some of these commissions or did you just blindly pass on the cost what ... just like last year?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Crespo: "We... we looked at these. And as I said before, under this particular budget we've taken the but... the Governor's recommendation. On the not recommended budget we... we cut a lot more."

Ives: "Well, I think there's got to be a lot of more due diligence done when we're looking into passing these budgets with all sorts of egregious spending. Commissioners making, you know, \$4 thousand a meeting on average. I think the taxpayers deserve an answer to this. I think they need to understand why part-time commissioners, part-time elected officials even, why they receive pensions... government pensions. And on top of it, this, for sure, is adding to any other additional government money if they hold a different position. I think it's crazy. We have not even started to scratch of the surface of the mismanagement and the misspending that's happening in this budget. We've not done our due diligence in looking at line by line by line. We're just passing on the cost from before and doubling down on it. Also in this budget ... is there also a place in here where there's a \$200 thousand appropriation to the Elgin Library?"

Crespo: "There's no line item like that in this Bill."

Ives: "There's not in this Bill in Amend... in Floor..."

Crespo: "I mean, the libraries are funded by the Secretary of State, so to that extent, the Constitutional Officers fall under this Bill, but there's no individual line item for any particular library. This is just... As this is funded, especially on the library side, libraries can apply for those grants. And I believe that the Secretary of State has a

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

formula he uses as well on a per capita basis to... to fund some of the libraries in the state."

- Ives: "Well, I believe if you go to page 68... well, now you've took out amended 2... Amendment 2. You went to Amendment 3 and you replaced the language. But on Amendment 2, where you first had it on page 68, you'll find a \$200 thousand grant, the Daily Herald reported on it today too, that goes to the Elgin Library. Now, that's in your freshman... your new freshman Anna Moeller's district. To me this just sounds like a political... political positioning. I don't... I don't know. I want to know how Wheaton gets... I'd like to know how Wheaton gets a \$200 thousand grant for their library that is oftentimes in the top 10 of all libraries in the U.S. I'd like to know how I get some of this money too for libraries in my district. Do you have an answer for me? Who do I go to? Did I need to come talk to you about a library in my district 'cause I don't know how to do that yet?"
- Crespo: "Representative, it's current... there is a request in the Gail Borden Public Library district."
- Ives: "I don't know how you get a library in your district...
 funding for a library in your district. That's what I want to
 know."
- Crespo: "Again, this comes out of the Secretary of State's Office.

 They are the ones who control the formula for the libraries in the state. And yes, there is a request from the Gail Borden Public Library."
- Ives: "But your committee looks at that budget in detail, obviously thought that this was an okay thing to spend money on. Vote 'no' on this budget."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Crespo: "Speaker, it's a little bit loud. I'm not sure..."

Ives: "This budget is full of political pork, political handouts; 12 million in targeted initiatives that we don't know where it's going, libraries funded for particular Members. And just wait 'til we get to the community colleges one, I have a few good comments on that as well. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield, reluctantly."

Franks: "Reluctantly. I will..."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've got, I don't know, 40 of these left. Why don't we hold the noise down and let's do the business of the day."

Franks: "Well, I'd like to ask the Sponsor some questions, but I think the previous speaker brought up some interesting points. I certainly would agree on the boards and commissions. We've tried to pass legislation here getting rid of some of those boards and commissions, some that haven't met for years, but our colleagues on the Senate side thought that they actually should be expanded. We passed that Bill in the House, so we should continue to keep working there. As to the ... the issue on the library, I think that... I don't think we have enough information to make that determination. I think that we shouldn't disparage peoples' work until we know all the facts. So, I presume that my seatmate here has a lot more juice than I ever did coming in as a freshman and was able ... because she hit the ground running and was able to help her constituency. But what I'd like to talk about is ... I'm looking at our line items here and maybe our analysis is wrong, but

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

it shows that the Lieutenant Governor has gone up to \$18,521,000 which is about \$18,521,000 more than a Lieutenant Governor should get. I think we passed a Bill here in this General Assembly that's sitting over in the Senate right now. I think, Mr... was that Mr. McSweeney's idea that we would be zeroing out the Lieutenant Governor. But our analysis indicates that there's \$18,521,000 for a job whose only requirement is to be able to get up in the morning and to read the obituaries to see if you hit the lotto because that's all they do. And I think that we could certainly have a different way to have a succession in the unlikely event of a Governor leaving office early, which just never happens in Illinois. But should it happen in Illinois, other people could take over besides creating or having an existing position that is meaningless and useless. So, could you please tell us why we have \$18,521,000 on a useless, meaningless office?"

Crespo: "So, Representative Franks, I'd like to first answer your question and then make a comment. Number 1) our records on our side, they're wrong. It's not \$18.5 million. It's \$1.1 million for the office. I should also point out, if you recall, last year we did decrease the funding for Lieutenant Governor by 25 percent based on the commissions belief that there is some redundancy in that office. So, we did decrease that fund by 25 percent and under this budget, it remains flat to fiscal year '14."

Franks: "Well, thank you. I appreciate that 'cause our analysis indicates that they got a major increase, but it appears that you've cut them by 25 percent. I think that's admirable. I'd like to cut them another 75 percent soon, so it's a good

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

start. But nonetheless, I would still encourage a 'no' vote because I don't think that we should be throwing good money after bad, and these should be zeroed out completely. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the birthday man yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Is it his birthday?"

Sandack: "Tomorrow."

Speaker Lang: "Oh, well then say it tomorrow."

Sandack: "Nah."

Speaker Lang: "The man will..."

Sandack: "It's a..."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Thank you. Fred, our analysis shows that the Supreme Court portion for GRF is an increase of 20... almost 22 percent. Is that accurate?"

Crespo: "Yes."

Sandack: "And is there some specific reason why? Again, we're seeing some increases that outstrip any semblance of CPI or any cost of living increase."

Crespo: "Yeah. The increase for... for that line item has to do with the probations. We've had two Supreme Court Justices testify in front of our committees stressing that probations has been grossly underfunded and there's a lot of concerns about the consequences of that. And under this budget, they're... they're being funded at their requested amount."

Sandack: "All right. And there's other GRF increases in this... in this Appropriation Bill. I'm going to try this one more time.

How is it that we're going to pay for these increases?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Crespo: "A very good question, Representative. At some point, there's going to be a day of reckoning. We're going to have to reconcile both the revenue and the spending side. Currently, we're dealing with the revenue... with the spending side. And I repeat again, I also have a not recommended budget was based on the not recommended number. I'm hoping to get some support so I can run that Bill as well, but we are just going through what we were asked to do, and that is put a budget forward based on the recommended amount and put a budget forward based on not recommended. And at this point, I'm pretty sure those discussions have, as they've mentioned before, on the revenue side it will continue. And we're going to have to reconcile this and we have until May 31."

Sandack: "To the Bill. We are going to have to reconcile this. The concept of a not recommended budget on a not recommended funding concept is something apparently that may or may not be recommended. For purposes of today and this vote, however, I'm going to say we should not recommend passing this Bill and everyone should vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, the Lieutenant Governor's budget is in here, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "And what is the... What is the level of funding for FY14 to FY15?"

Crespo: "I believe... it is flat at \$1.1 million."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Harris, D.: "Right. And the Attorney General's budget is in here as well, correct?"
- Crespo: "Correct."
- Harris, D.: "And what is the level of funding for the Attorney General's budget from '14 to '15?"
- Crespo: "On the GRF side, it is... remains flat fiscal year '14."
- Harris, D.: "And the Secretary of State's budget is in here as
 well, correct?"
- Crespo: "That's correct."
- Harris, D.: "And what is the level of funding from FY14 to FY15?"
- Crespo: "There is an increase of \$200 thousand."
- Harris, D.: "An increase of \$200 thousand. In... in... \$200 thousand in what size of GRF funding?"
- Crespo: "The GRF funding is 259 million 5."
- Harris, D.: "So, it's 200 thousand in terms of a \$250 million budget. What about the Comptroller? What's the funding for the Comptroller?"
- Crespo: "Comptroller's... Well, the Comptroller's, in terms of the overall funding, remains flat. On the GRF there's a decrease of \$21 million."
- Harris, D.: "And... and what about the Treasurer? What was the funding for the Treasurer's Office?"
- Crespo: "The Treasurer's Office came in \$400 thousand less than last year at his request."
- Harris, D.: "Interesting. So, the Constitutional Officers, the folks who actually run the State of Illinois, can get by with no increases whatsoever in their budget, yet every other department, every other agency has to have increases of

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

substantial amounts. Kind of curious. Is the… is the Governor's Office of Management and Budget in there as well?" Crespo: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "And what was the level of funding for the Governor's Office of Management and Budget?"

Crespo: "In GRF there's an increase of \$557 thousand which is intended to fund House Bill 3820 which we passed out of the House and played throughout the Senate."

Harris, D.: "Which is an increase of about 30 percent, correct?" Crespo: "On GRF the numbers look about right, yeah."

Harris, D.: "Yeah. So, amazing to me that the Leaders of our state can get by without any increases, but we have to put increases everywhere else. But thank you for your answer, Fred."

Crespo: "Yeah. I should also point out on the OMB the 500... \$500 thousand will be reimbursed by the Federal Government as we implement House Bill 3820."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Just a technical question, with the third Amendment, I want to make sure my numbers are adding up, what is the level of GRF funding now for this Bill as amended? I'm just not sure my numbers are adding up after the third Amendment?"

Crespo: "Are you talking about..."

Fortner: "Total GR..."

Crespo: "...the overall?"

Fortner: "...total GRF that would be expended from this Bill."

Crespo: "Give me one second. Okay. The total for all these agencies under House Bill 6156 is approximately \$835,336,000,

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

which is the biggest part of the overall appropriation for the committee, which in this case is based on \$1.2 billion."

Fortner: "You don't have the exact number? You just gave me an approximate number."

Crespo: "Eight hundred thirty-six million dollars is what we have.

Yes, for all these agencies listed in this Bill."

Fortner: "Yeah, okay. I know it's the biggest portion that's why
I wanted to make sure. So... so, you think it's about 836 is
where it ended after the Amendment?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Fortner: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to put the Body at ease. I've just delivered Mr. Franks a cold glass of water and some cough drops, so he'll neither be parched nor hoarse for the rest of the day."

Speaker Lang: "So, we'll have you to blame for that? Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6216, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6216, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6216 deals with the State Board of Elections. It's a combination of both GRF and Other State Funds. And we see an increase in general operations, an increase to reimburse the local election jurisdictions for support costs and State Board of Elections maintenance for... of local election jurisdictions. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Cloonen. Representative Cloonen does not wish to speak. 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? McAsey. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, appears House Bill 6157. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6157, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6157, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6157 deals with the Court of Claims. It's a combination of GRF and Other State Funds. And it's a decrease of \$1.4 million on the GRF line. Ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Yingling. Mr. Sandack."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, typically, this appropriation also is in a Supplemental. Is one anticipated for the Court of Claims?"

Crespo: "For the what?"

Sandack: "A Supplemental... appropriation?"

Crespo: "I don't think we're factoring that in yet."

Sandack: "So, we're... so, while we're budgeting for revenues we don't anticipate, we're at least not anticipating Supplemental appropriations as well?"

Crespo: "Again, I can't speak to the Supplemental, Representative.

I'm not sure what the plan is, number 1 and number 2, if we're going to have any funds for that."

Sandack: "So, at least before we decide if we're going to spend more than what we're budgeting, we'll then have a discussion on revenue?"

Crespo: "On the Supplemental?"

Sandack: "Yes."

Crespo: "In this case, I'm pretty sure we will."

Sandack: "I think that's a good idea."

Crespo: "One of the two, yeah."

Sandack: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Crespo, you can take

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

a small rest now. We're going to do a few of Mr. Harris's Bills. The first one is House Bill 6066. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6066, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 6066 is what we would call the above the line expenditures. And it maintains in it for pensions the certified amounts as certified by all the state pension funds. It contains the amounts for SIP and TRIP. It contains the amount for employee group insurance. It contains the amount for the debt service of the State of Illinois as certified by the State Treasurer of Illinois. And it provides \$600 million for the payment of old bills which, I point out, will go to the Healthcare Provider Services Relief Fund and that will attain a match of another \$600 million from the Federal Government which can be used to pay down obligations of the state related to the Medicaid program."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, the \$600 million that you speak of, is that to cover liabilities in fiscal 2014 or 2015?"

Harris, G.: "That is to cover payments toward unpaid liabilities that have accumulated up until 2015."

Hays: "Thank you. To the Bill. One of the… one of the reasons that I rise on this particular Bill is because certainly I think most in this chamber and I know certainly on this side

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

of the aisle would agree with making pension payments, would agree with making group health payments. You know, the term cart before the horse has been used many, many times so far in this debate. I think, in fairness, we should really change that vernacular to the cart before the donkey. And one of the things in my district, and I'm sure for any of you who have any appreciable number of public employees, you know this; public employees are irate with this chamber. Public employees are irate with this administration. They're irate for many, many reasons. They're irate because they have entrusted to the State of Illinois money that they depend on in their retirement and now that is very much up for debate. In my district they're irate because twice in the last three years... twice in the last three years, they've been told that the carrier that they depend upon for health insurance, by far the largest carrier in the central part of the state, is not going to be part of the bid process. Thankfully, COGFA fixed the first erroneous decision. The second one, retirees from across central Illinois were told that the gold plate standard was not going to be included in the bid process at all. And we find out after the fact that their bid was 74 percent lower than the winning bid. Public employees are irate with this Body and this administration. They don't trust Springfield. So, this line item alone is \$8 billion and I get stopped at the end of the aisle of the County Market in Danville and a public employee asks me, how in the world can I trust when you're not even talking about a revenue number that this will be paid? How do I trust you this time around when I've been stiffed on my health insurance repeatedly?

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

When I've been stiffed on my pension? The pension situation, just yesterday, the court makes a ruling we can't even figure out through SURS and other retirement plans what they... the reform Bill even goes into effect. I mean, this is ... this is serious important stuff to public employees. When are they going to retire? Is there going to be a mass exodus from our universities? Ιs the entire senior complement administrator from your local community college going to run for the door at the same time? They can't figure it out because it is ambiguous and unclear. So, at the end of the aisle at the grocery store, they say, let me get this straight. So, you're talking about and debating a Bill and a budget that will spend x amount of dollars, but you have no earthly idea if those dollars are going to be there. They are simply horrified that, yet again, they will be the body left out. The Comptroller can only pay the bills and the obligations with the dollars that exist. And while the Comptroller doesn't pick winners and losers, the truth of the matter is, some bills will be paid; some bills will not be paid. Who's going to get the call for the bills that are not paid because the revenue simply doesn't exist? Is it going to be our public employees? Is that wall... is that call going to go to TRS? Is it going to go to SURS? Is it going to go to one of the Appropriation chairpersons? Is it going to go to Representative Harris or Crespo or Davis? Is it going to go to Representative Dunkin? Who's the call go to when, yet again, there's not enough money? This is exactly why this cart before the donkey scenario is so important. They want to know. They want to know when you fail to complete the exercise

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

of prioritization who gets shorted. The public trust that existed with this Body and this administration left the building a long, long time ago. I know this for sure because I'm reminded of it almost daily in my home district that has a very significant number of public employees. And I'm also reminded that despite the fact that the GRF budget in this state has grown from 27 billion in 2010 to over 36 billion this year, 38 billion in the budget we are talking about now. How is it possible that the local school district got shorted? How is it possible that the community college... How is it possible that roads and bridges are visibly crumbling when more money is being spent than any year in history? Not only did your K through 12 district not get the money that they had coming, but now they're held hostage. And if we don't do something later in the Session, who are we going to hold hostage with school children of this state? It's quite incredible. I ask public employees across all sectors in my district, would you budget in this fashion? Would you even entertain a discussion about a budget when you didn't know how much money you had coming in to your own household? I asked a teacher, would you budget in this fashion? She said no. I asked an IDOT worker, would you and your family budget in this fashion? He said no. I asked a community college instructor, would you even begin to have this discussion in your household? They said no. A frontline staff at DHS I said, is this how you budget at your household in Westville, Illinois? And they said no. I asked a university professor, is this how you budget? You're running the economics department at the University of Illinois. Is this how you

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

budget? He said no. I asked a DNR employee at Kickapoo State Park, is this how you run the budget of your own household? He said no. I ask, is there any employee with a pulse on this planet who would budget in this fashion? And they, in unison, say no. I say no."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, I think I heard you say that this dealt with the pension payments that were actuarially certified. Is that correct?"

Harris, G.: "Well, yes. And I... we just heard a lot from the last speaker and I just want to go on record here, as I have many times before and I think it's being reported, I agree. We absolutely need the revenue that this state needs to meet all of its legal obligations including making our pension payments, including paying our debt, including paying for our group health insurance. And I will happily support voting to keep our revenue equal to where it is today to do that. And I hope my colleague who just spoke will join me in that, so that when he goes back to Country Market, he can answer his constituent that he is taking care of him. So, in answer to..."

Pritchard: "You missed... you missed my question."

Harris, G.: "I was so excited by the last speaker that..."

Pritchard: "I know you were."

Harris, G.: "...I was enthralled."

Pritchard: "And I know you wanted to respond to him."

Harris, G.: "Why is... say yours again."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Pritchard: "My question deals with an actuarially certified pension payment amount."
- Harris, G.: "Yes, this would be the normal amount plus that which is required to meet..."

Pritchard: "By statute..."

Harris, G.: "...our obligations under..."

Pritchard: "...or by actuarially certified?"

- Harris, G.: "Certified... And, but let me answer the question, Representative, you answered. It's certi... actually both, I'm told. Certified by actuary... actuaries according to statute which would meet the normal cost and also the necessary payments to pay down the unfunded liability under law as it exists today."
- Pritchard: "So, the last few years we've been aiding to our unfunded liability to the tune of 10 to 15 million dollars.

 Does that mean we're not going to be adding anything to our unfunded pension liability?"
- Harris, G.: "We're... we're paying down the unfunded liability with portions of each of these payments and within Article I of the Bill. There are payments to the different systems that are set out there and we're paying down not only..."

Pritchard: "So, that we're not mincing words here..."

- Harris, G.: "We're paying not only the normal costs, but we're paying down the unfunded liability."
- Pritchard: "So, we are not adding anything to the unfunded liability?"
- Harris, G.: "Not that I know of, no."
- Pritchard: "Well, I hope that's true. This also talks about interest payments for bonds and unfunded payments. Do you

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

know what the interest cost is for bonds and for the unpaid bills that we have?"

Harris, G.: "Well, they vary, Representative. So, there are... let me just find the Section here... there are a number of Acts which have bonded indebtedness of the state: the Anti-Pollution Bond Act, the Transportation Bond Act, the Capital Development Bond Act in 1972, the School Bond Con... School Construction Bond Act, the Illinois Coal and Energy Development Bond Act and the General Obligation Bond Act plus the Prompt Payment Interest Act. You know, all of these have their own requirements and the bond issues have different interest rates according to the tranches the boards were... that the bonds were sold in. And what this number represents is the principal and the interest that is due in total, but the rate differs depending on the instrument."

Pritchard: "So, the question was interest."

Harris, G.: "Interest."

Pritchard: "How much are we paying in interest?"

Harris, G.: "One billion four hundred and sixteen million four hundred and fifty thousand dollars."

Pritchard: "And that includes the interest on the unpaid bills..."

Harris, G.: "That is..."

Pritchard: "...or is that just bonding?"

Harris, G.: "...that is from the Bond Fund."

Pritchard: "Do you know... is there anything in here for the interest on unpaid bills?"

Harris, G.: "That could... That would be in a different line. This is dealing only with bonded obligation, this Section here."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Pritchard: "I see there's also money in here for the Teachers
 Retirement Insurance Program and the Community College
 Retirement Program. How much does that amount to?"
- Harris, G.: "Can you tell me which part are you talking about, SIP and TRIP?"
- Pritchard: "CHIP and TRIP."
- Harris, G.: "Okay. Let me just get my note here. That's 105 million for SIP and TRIP."
- Pritchard: "Hundred and five million? Is that similar to what we've paid in the last year or two?"
- Harris, G.: "Yeah. Looking here along my sheet it seems to be, yeah, pretty close to what we paid, yeah."
- Pritchard: "Because I know we were very concerned about these two insurance programs going broke. So, are they now stable?"
- Harris, G.: "And I think we need to be sure we have the revenues to continue to make the payments to keep them stable; therefore, I would urge you to join me in voting to keep our state revenue stable."

Pritchard: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris will respond to Mr. Harris's question."

Harris, D.: "Representative, also in this Bill is appropriation for group health insurance. Is that correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "And how much is that?"

Harris, G.: "That would be about \$1.476 billion."

Harris, D.: "And does that include SIP and TRIP?"

Harris, G.: "That is exclusive of SIP and TRIP."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Harris, D.: "Okay, \$1.476 billion. Roughly, \$1.476 billion. Ladies and Gentlemen... And thank you very much. That ... that's what we have in our analysis. Ladies and Gentlemen, let me address that issue of \$1.476 billion for group health insurance. And you got to go down into the weeds with me a little bit in terms of the process that I referred to earlier that we set up to determine a budget. We first of all determine what our revenue estimate is, and then from that revenue estimate, we deduct mandated expenditures, mandated expenditures. One of those mandated expenditures is group health, okay. I'm holding in my hand the document that was given to us, the Republicans, by your side of the aisle at the very start of the process. At the very start of the process, your side of the aisle said that group health insurance, I can show it to you, group health insurance would be \$1.947 billion. This Bill appropriates \$1.475 billion. That is a 5... almost, \$500 million difference. What does that mean? That means that if you didn't have \$500 million above the line, you could have million below the line to appropriate to the Appropriations Committees. Do you get a sense why we, on our side of the aisle, feel that the language of draconian and extreme and radical cuts is not justified? If you can move 500 mil... if you could if you put a number above the line that's \$500 million higher than what it is supposed to be, as shown in this Appropriation Bill, then you've \$500 million more to spend. And maybe it's not just group health. You know, we have 1.2... keep in mind, we have \$1.2 billion in this fiscal year, in revenue that has not yet been appropriated, that we can use to pay old bills, which means there's \$650 million in

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

this scheme that we were going to use to pay old bills. If we pay \$1.2 billion in old bills now, we can move another \$650 million from above the line, below the line, which means that an additional \$650 million that can be spent on programs. So, you can avoid draconian, radical, and extreme reductions. That's the type of program that we could sign on to. That's the type of program that we could build a budget based on the revenue estimate that has been prepared, not... and we don't need to build a budget on a \$38 billion scheme proposed by the Governor. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. And the other Mr. Harris... anyone named Harris always makes good points... so, you got to... you got to talk about them. And we all know that the biggest receding month for the State of Illinois is always the month of April which just concluded when people pay their income taxes. And the Gentleman who just spoke is absolutely correct that this year, because of an improving economy in our state and more people going back to work in our state, we did collect some more money in April which can be used to pay down more old bills from FY14. And I think that what the Gentleman requested was that we use some of these to pay down not only old bills for employee group health, but other old bills on top of the 600 million we're planning to propose in the FY15 budget. And I'm hopeful in the next couple days when a Supplemental Appropriation for this year comes forward, that the other Representative's wishes will be granted. But for now, Ladies and Gentlemen, these are expenses which the state must make. We have to keep up with our expenses. We

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

have to make our pension payments as certified. We have to make our SIP and TRIP payments. We have to provide for debt service. We have to pay down old Bills. And we have to provide for our employee group health insurance. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6069, Mr. Harris. Please read the Bill. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Please move this Bill back to the Sec... Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6069, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Greg Harris, has been approved for consideration."

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

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is an Amendment with substance in it, so I just wanted to be sure to explain what this Amendment includes. And this relates to the Illinois Poison Control Center. This Amendment would provide funding for the Illinois Control... Poison Control Center at a level of \$2 million. This was the amount requested by the Poison Control Center so that they can continue to serve the people of the State of Illinois in a sustainable way and not have to cease operations. Additionally, three lines that are funded by the Tobacco

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Settlement Recovery Fund are being changed at the discretion of the department. These result in a zero net gain and are movement of money within lines. There's no new spending. They are as follows: with the BASUAH Tobacco Prevention Program lowered by 1 million, the Illinois Tobacco Quitline Cessation raised at 100 thousand is removed, and 1.1 million added to the line for operations of the American Lung Association QuitLine."

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

Fortner: "Again, as I had asked with one of the earlier budget Bills, I just want to make sure our number... I think I get now for this line 139,192,600. I want to see if that agrees with your staff's analysis for what the GRF portion of this would be with the Amendment."

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Fortner: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "So, I just wanted to go over that with you,

Representative Harris, that that is in the Amendment that the

Poison Control Center is reinstated into the budget?"

Harris, G.: "Absolutely. I mean, I think we heard it in committee in testimony yesterday. I've heard it from Members on your side. I've heard it from Members on our side. We... I've heard it from across the state. We need to fund the Illinois Poison Control Center. This Amendment does that. And it funds them at the level that they say they need to sustain themselves."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Bellock: "Out of GRF?"

Harris, G.: "Out of GRF."

Bellock: "Thank you. And then, I just wanted to ask about the Illinois... the Breast and Cervical Cancer Program. Because..."

Harris, G.: "We're still on the Amendment I think, Representative."

Bellock: "Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. Thank you, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "On the Amendment."

- Harris, D.: "Very quick... very quickly, Representative. On the Poison Control Center, does this mean that they then will not be proceeding with their... their attempt to get a dedicated source of funding through the wireless fee?"
- Harris, G.: "No. I can't speak for what they may do in the future, but this will give them the comfort that they can operate for the next year and not have to worry about ceasing service to the people of the State of Illinois. If I remember their testimony from our committee yesterday, I think that they would like to find a sustainable source of funding on an ongoing basis. What that might be, I don't know how that will turn out."
- Harris, D.: "Well, I... I will tell you, I applaud you for taking this action. I don't know that any organization deserves contin... sort of a continuing appropriation. Most agencies and departments have come to the Legislature for funding every year. I don't know why they should be any different. I'm pleased to see that they are funding. We need a Poison Control

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Center. We're not going to let that go out of existence. But one final question. It's a 53 percent increase. They say they need it. Did they justify it? I mean, a 53 percent increase, if they've been operating at 1.3 million and they've seemed to have operated fairly well, why do they need a 53 percent increase?"

Harris, G.: "They're staffing levels have dropped substantially and of course, to deal with medical emergencies they need a very high caliber personnel and it was their request in their representation that they needed to be able to hire additional staff with the professional qualifications that when an emergency department physician, a first responder or you know, a parent called, they would get the right answer regarding a life and death decision."

Harris, D.: "Thank you. Have they opened their books... one last question... have they opened their books to an audit?"

Harris, G.: "I do not know the answer for that. I'd be happy to inquire."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, I appreciate your response there, but just a little further clarification on the Poison Control and use of... original use... intent to get some 9-1-1 funds. Under this Amendment, does this meet the request of the Poison Control Center so that their... they'll be receiving the funds that they requested at the level they requested?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Harris, G.: "They will be very happy, I believe, with this outcome."

Moffitt: "And that... and you said for this year that's without any 9-1-1 or wireless funds?"

Harris, G.: "That's my understanding."

Moffitt: "Thank you very much."

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

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6069, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. As amended, this Bill does a couple things. It funds the Illinois Department of Public Health. There are a couple increases in addition to that which was just mentioned for the Poison Control Center. There is a \$2.15 million increase for education and an outreach program for HIV and AIDS awareness. There is creation of a new line and transfer of some money from an existing line to... for a hepatitis program which is particularly targeted at pregnant mothers in immigrant and refugee communities, and in fact, all pregnant mothers who are potentially carrying the hepatitis virus so they can learn to be tested and avoid passing the virus on to their as yet unborn child. And there is \$500 thousand for a mobile asthma treatment center. Oh, also one more thing. There is a... and there's a, as part of the Governor's recommended budget, a

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

\$2.5 million increase for maternal and children's health programs from the FY14 level."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise to say thank you to each and every one of you here in the General Assembly who signed on to cosponsor the Poison Center's legislation to keep it open. And with our efforts, our leadership understands the importance and have taken the step to make sure that our Poison Center's open for all of the families in our great state who find themselves in emergencies. I'm looking forward to working with all the emergency systems to make sure our communities are safe and the people you represent. Thank you, Leader Harris, for your ingenuity and courage in making sure that our citizens are safe. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And Representative Harris, I just want to comment on that also and comm... Representative Lilly for all the work on that. We all feel that that is extremely important and we're disappointed that that had been zeroed out of the Bill and are happy that it's back in the Bill because if one thing shows that something does something good in Illinois in health care, it's the Poison Control Center. For every dollar that's spent, they save \$13 for the state. So, we're glad to have that back in. I just had a question about a few things in the budget. I wanted to make sure the Health Protection Grants are they appropriated at the same as last year?"

Harris, G.: "Local Protection Grant... local de... the Public Health..."
Bellock: "Yes."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Harris, G.: "...Department grants are appropriated at the same level as last year."
- Bellock: "Okay. One other thing I was starting to ask before was about the Illinois Breast and Cervical Cancer program. I know we talked about when the Affordable Care Act passed that some of that grouping was going to go over into that. And I'm not sure what percentage went over into that this year."
- Harris, G.: "Well, if you remember when Director Hasbrouck came to our committee, he talked about the fact that there were certainly a number of women who were eligible for the Breast and Cervical Cancer program who had been transitioned into the health insurance exchanges. There were a number more who will be transitioned into the Medicaid program, but he pointed out there were... was still a waiting list of tens of thousands of women who are not yet enrolled in either program who still need the services of the Breast and Cervical Cancer program. And that is what this GRF number would serve."

Bellock: "Thank you. And what is the ..."

- Harris, G.: "I would just say, I would hope as time goes by and you know, the processing of, you know, applications goes through in the Department of Human Services with the new workers that I hope we can provide them that, you know, we can whittle down over time this... this amount."
- Bellock: "Right. Well, I'll save my questions on the other for the next budget. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Bost, Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6070, Mr. Harris. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6070, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is the Department of Healthcare and Family Services budget which includes... I will tell you some things it does include and I will tell you a couple things it does not include so that we won't go astray in our debate. But this does include the operation's lines for the Department of Healthcare and Family Services which did receive the same employee wage increases as other collective and bar ... bargaining agreements. It also ... it's required to pass the entire Medicaid budget for the State of Illinois which allows us not only to expend GRF money, but also to receive the complete federal match from the Federal Government. It allows for an increase in Medicaid liability. It does not include the Medicaid determination and redetermination employees who are in the Department of Human Services. And I think that budget's coming up next, so this does not include those employees. And then the ... there was a line moved from this agen... agency to the task force that is working on Medicaid and hospital issues that relates to restoring adult dental services. As you know, there's a task force that has been meeting between the House, the Senate on which many of us on both sides of the aisle have attended who are addressing many issues relating to health care that are, you know, substantial issues in the billions of dollars for... that we will have to

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

address before we leave here in May that relate to the hospital assessments numbers 1 and 2 expiring at the end of this calendar year, that will also discuss what's called the ACA 400 proposal for attaining more federal match for our hospitals. It would talk about the issue of restoring adult dental, podiatry and removing the four script limit. Those are not in this Bill. Those will be in a pe... subsequent piece of legislation along with a myriad of other things: the belts and suspenders Bill, you know, closing up loopholes that were created by state reform in the transfer to do ICD-10 coding system, SMURFS, and a herd of other things."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Gabel: "So, did you say that dental services were removed from this legislation that were in the Governor's budget?"

Harris, G.: "The appropriation is going to be moved over. It is the top priority... as you know, you've been attending the Medicaid task force working groups on a variety of subjects as I have and as some Members here and Members from the Senate, and it is the top priority to include in that Bill when it comes forward."

Gabel: "So, as you know, when we attended those meetings, that dental services were really seen as something that was taken out during the SMART Act, but actually could have cost the state a lot more money than the amount that was removed because of the severe problems that not getting dental services cause."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Harris, G.: "And I don't want to debate a Bill before it's actually here, but I think a lot of us realize that on... taking adult dental as an example, we heard testimony from dental professionals from southern Illinois that what could be served in a dentist's office for a cost of about \$600 to the state currently are now being seen as emergency department visits. And if you check the coding of the various diagnostic codes, we're paying about 6 thousand, so it turns out to be a very false economy and you know, we squeeze the balloon in one place it came out in another place and I think we need to fix that. And that would be part of the... a part of the Medicaid task force which will come before us in the next couple days."
- Gabel: "So, I'm a little uncomfortable that the dental was taken out of the Governor's proposal. So, what would you say are the chances that this other Medicaid Bill will come to this... will come to the General Assembly?"
- Harris, G.: "Oh, I... Because of the expiration of the hospital assessment, because of the need to do rate reform, because of the need to transfer from the ICD-9 to the ICD-10, because of the need to correct the problems with things such as the four drug limit, the adult dental, the podiatry, that Bill will be coming before we leave here. It would be my estimation."
- Gabel: "Well, I'll be voting 'yes' with the assurance that that Bill comes to... comes to the floor. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 6069, I request to be a 'no'. I don't know. My electrician might come back here to check my switch. It's been voted 'no' so often today it's turning green."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention.

Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. Representative Harris, I wanted to ask what... what is mainly the cost... the increase of the 12.5 million in their budget?"

Harris, G.: "Can you help us? What line you're looking at. It's a pretty big budget, Representative and..."

Bellock: "Oh, I was looking..."

Harris, G.: "...so we could give you an accurate answer."

Bellock: "I was looking at... I'm sorry. I wasn't looking at the line item. I was looking at the overall that we had in our budget summary on the Bill. It was over... it was overall. I'm not saying... I... I just meant what was the largest portion of the increase of the 12 million?"

Harris, G.: "Of... of GRF?"

Bellock: "Yes."

Harris, G.: "I mean, I would say there's probably two things."

Bellock: "Yes."

Harris, G.: "One would be the effect of the collective two... two, two things in one. Okay. Representative Sandack is keeping score on the twos. So, one would be the effect of the collective bargaining increase and then there was also a growth in overall Medicaid liability which means our GRF would go up. Also, our federal match would go up when we cycle that through the Federal Government and it came back."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Bellock: "What is the collective bargaining increase in HFS, monetarily? Not a percentage but monetarily."
- Harris, G.: "You know, I'm seeing a variety of things based on different employee classification. In other agencies, it has been averaging about 6.9 percent for the COLAs, the steps, all those things, but you have nurses there. You have AFSCME there. You have different groups there. Yeah. We can probably get you a breakdown, but I don't have like a total agency blended average."
- Bellock: "Okay. If you could get me a breakdown of that, I'd like that."
- Harris, G.: "The step increases, for instance, are 4.5 percent except for those on the top of the step titles and you know, just stuff like that."
- Bellock: "I'd like to ask just a little bit of a question about the LS group that's meeting for the Medicaid because, with Representative Gabel asking that question, I'm wondering if that money is not in the upcoming budget then are we going to have to come back and amend the budget to put that in because that's going to be a sizeable amount, I would imagine? I mean, I think the dental alone is 30 million, isn't it, around there?"
- Harris, G.: "That is... we'd transfer that out. It's taken out of this budget. There would... we would come back with an appropriation because remember the hospital assessment we..."

Bellock: "Right."

Harris, G.: "...which has also a tax that has to be done by law an appropriation. So, It'll be... this is going to be a big Bill.

I mean, this is going to be a big Bill when it comes forward

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

and there will be appropriation that associates itself with it for that, for nursing homes, for rate reform, for these changes in the SMART Act, for the belts and suspenders that we talked about, for the MCO pass-throughs, you know, all those things."

Bellock: "So, wait. How are you going to address that issue of the expenditure on that?"

Harris, G.: "It will..."

Bellock: "And the revenue?"

Harris, G.: "It will have to be appropriated separately. There will be a separate appropriation that is tied to the things in that legislation."

Bellock: "What about the revenue? That's where... that's where, again, this issue comes up..."

Harris, G.: "Sure."

Bellock: "...as to how we're moving forward at 34.4 versus 30... 37.2..."

Harris, G.: "Well, the amounts that's in the 30 was contemplated in the Governor's recommended budget. Now, there would be additional revenues that would be accounted for by the hospital tax. It would come to other funds that would be several billion dollars more, but those would not be GRF. But those, my understanding, would also have to be the taxes levied on the hospitals and then appropriated. That would be the hospital assessments, number 1 and 2. And then if there is agreement on assessment 3, that... or the ACA 400 as we've been calling it, that would also have to be in there."

Bellock: "Thank you. And in the meeting the other day, I'm not sure if it was the working group or the weg... or the regular

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- group, there was a comment about that all Medicaid bills had been paid. Remember, because I asked about taking the 200 million... oh, maybe that was in DHS."
- Harris, G.: "I... I think we're getting very good on it. As a matter of fact, I just got a summary sheet here and, you know, the med... yeah... just the volume of Medicaid bills that come in every day that number fluctuates up and down. But I'm seeing here right now that, as of April 30, the oldest voucher processed at DHFS was about nine days old. So, we're doing fairly well on Medicaid bills, but just because of the size of the program there's always a large quantity dollar-wise that have been coming in. The largest amount of unpaid bills I think we have outstanding would be those that we... in the employee group health program which we're addressing in the Bill we just passed, and hopefully can do some more pay downs on in a Supplemental."
- Bellock: "Well, our concern was and we just got an update from our staff that there's \$1.2 billion worth of bills over in HFS that haven't been sent over to the Comptroller yet and I'm not sure where those are headed. I mean, we have been told all of the bills have been paid off unless those aren't Medicaid bills. I don't know."
- Harris, G.: "Well, again, given the size of program I don't know what the dollar amount is, but I know they're getting processed now in a timely fashion. So, I don't know the answer to the dollar amount that is there."
- Bellock: "And I guess my other question that I brought up several times in the committee is, I couldn't get an amount as to with the huge Medicaid expansion and close to 400 thousand

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

people probably coming on the rolls of Medicaid by the end of July, as to how that issue is being addressed. Even if that is being a hundred percent matched by the Federal Government, of which we know now there's 80 to a hundred thousand who on the woodwork population that are just being matched at the old rate, I never could get a number as what the projection was in this upcoming budget as to what that was going to cost, what the administrative costs are going to be at that and then I'll ask the other questions about the thousand new workers in the DHS budget."

Harris, G.: "So, the administrative costs, as you know, are in the DHS budget."

Bellock: "All of them?"

Harris, G.: "The... for the processing, determinations and redeterminations, yes. Those are..."

Bellock: "Okay. All of them?"

Harris, G.: "...key functions in DHS and we can get into, you know, how those are matched or not matched and at what rate by the Federal Government, which as you know varies. But there's also an anticipated liability increase, as I mentioned earlier. In response to your other question, this is one..."

Bellock: "And what was that again? I'm sorry?"

Harris, G.: "Thirty-eight million two hundred thousand dollars."

Bellock: "Thank you. I just wanted to point out and I don't know if the… as Director Hamos testified in the committee, there was \$1 billion of actual savings from the SMART Act in the 2014 budget. Was that correct?"

Harris, G.: "I think it was a little over that. I don't have her
report with me."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Bellock: "Okay. And since the MAXIMUS contract was ended, HFS said they would update us on any savings and what would be projected into the 2015 budget when they went to their sister agency with DHS processing those claims. To this date, we have not since January, and this is almost June, we have not gotten any update on that, so I don't know how we project into 2015's budget any savings on the switchover from MAXIMUS to DHS and HFS,"
- Harris, G.: "I think they've been using historical trend averages.

 We know that x percent that were processed for redetermination, were actually kept on, x percent were changed their status, x percent were terminated. We also know that 30, for different reasons, 1) submission of paperwork to make complete applications or 2) changes in family status or income, 30 percent of those, who are determined off, soon come back on. So, there's that churn as well. So, I think they try to keep very good running historical averages on which to make their projections to the best of their ability."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I would just like to bring this up that even though there's only a \$12 million increase in this Bill right now, the point is, is that we worked very, very hard over the last two years in the Medicaid reforms and we were seeing savings. And this goes into not having to go to a \$37.2 billion budget, but be able to do reforms in order to stay within our revenue that was projected. As of now, we were on a track of \$350 million worth of savings towards this year in just the, you know, the issue of reviewing the people who are eligible. So, we're looking forward to what DHS and HFS are going to bring forward in the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

savings in the 2015 budget, but I don't think that that is going to help the taxpayers as much as what we were doing before. So, thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair.

Representative Hernandez."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Hernandez: "So, Representative, in terms of the reduction on adult servi... adult dental services, I see that it's approximately 132 million that is reduced?"

Harris, G.: "No, there... we are reserving 35 million that will be included in the Appropriation Bill that deals with, not only that issue, but the other issues that have been before the Medicaid working group of which you have attended some meetings."

Hernandez: "So..."

Harris, G.: "So, it's taken out of this budget and it will be in a different budget is the short answer."

Hernandez: "And... and you say that's 35 million."

Harris, G.: "About 35 million."

Hernandez: "So... Well, maybe I'm a little confused as to what does 132 refer to when it says reduced GRF spending for dentists due to reduced adult services."

Harris, G.: "I'm sorry. I was listening to two people. Could you repeat your question?"

Hernandez: "Sure."

Harris, G.: "I'm sorry, Representative."

Hernandez: "So, as it says here, and maybe you can clarify, what does the 132..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Harris, G.: "Oh, okay, yes. I absolutely can. So, because of we had pretty much eliminated adult dental, going forward, amounts that had been previously spent in that line have not been expended this year, therefore, that line has dropped. So, it was a reduction from what we had spent before because we eliminated the program. Now, you will see when we restore the program that that line will begin to go back up. And this... so, this will be an annualized effect of having eliminated that program, which I think we all decide now, you know, probably was not an unwise idea. So, that... this is looking backward, not looking forward."

Hernandez: "Okay. So, we're looking at a number of approximately 35 million then to..."

Harris, G.: "Thirty-five million, yes."

Hernandez: "Okay. I... I just want to also share that I was... I was rather disturbed to see that the reduction took place and because of the... only for the reasons that it will be put into the other Bill, I will also be supporting this Bill."

Harris, G.: "Thank you."

Hernandez: "So, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Yeah. Thank you. Representative, of this budget for the Department of Health and Human Services, how much money, to the best of your knowledge, is being paid into monthly or annual payments to intergovernmental agreements?"

Harris, G.: "I don't have that number here."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Kay: "Do you have any idea how many intergovernmental agreements
 they have?"
- Harris, G.: "Again, that's a number I do not have here."
- Kay: "Okay. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to let you know a lot of people have been inquiring. We don't have a whiteboard but we do have a total. And so far this afternoon we have methodically, if not incorrectly, spent 21 billion 511 million dollars-plus. I'm going to keep you updated as the day goes on. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thanks for that update, Representative.

 Representative Harris to close."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is, again, the Department of Healthcare and Family Services. It is a department that it brings us back billions of dollars in federal money as we pay for health care for citizens of our state. I would request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6070 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no, 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6070, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, can you please move House Bill 6071 back to the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6071, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration.

 Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Greg Harris."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Are we on 2 or 3..."

Speaker Turner: "Floor Amendment #2. Floor Amendment #2."

Harris, G.: "...Mr. Clerk? Floor... Can I just pause just for a
 moment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Harris, G.: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I would like to table
Amendment #2 and move to Amendment #3."

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

Mr. Clerk, status."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Greg Harris."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

There are two changes in Floor Amendment #3. One is very technical in nature regarding correcting an effective date.

It also adds \$18 million to the Community Care Program for a rate increase for providers of home services to senior citizens."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 6071. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed. Excuse me. Representative Flowers, are you wishing to speak on the Amendment? Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I had to get your attention another way. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes, he will."

Flowers: "Representative Harris, I just have one question I just need clarity in regard to the skilled home care. Will the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

providers that go into the nursing home that give physical therapy, will they also be giv... be given a rate increase?"

Harris, G.: "For skilled home care if they go into nursing homes?" Flowers: "Yes. For nursing..."

Harris, G.: "Nursing homes... the rate increase that is here is for home providers, folks who come into peoples' homes under CCP, there would be other increases in the DHS budget for those who might be in institutions. So, this one just is for those people who get home services such as home... if they are homemakers or services that come into the home not for people in nursing homes."

Flowers: "So, for people that provide nursing home services in the home will..."

Harris, G.: "Yes. It's my understanding, yes."

Flowers: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Fortner: "As before, I just want to make sure that our numbers are in agreement with the Amendment that is just... that we are considering here for adoption. I would then get that we would be... have a GRF expenditure of \$1,143,522,600. Does that agree with your numbers?"

Harris, G.: "No, it does not."

Fortner: "Could you tell me what is the correct GRF expenditure under Floor Amendment 3 then?"

Harris, G.: "Do you have a calculator so I don't get this wrong?

I don't want to goof it up."

Fortner: "I'll do my best."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Harris, G.: "So, it would be 1,169,935,000 plus 18 million."

Fortner: "So, 1,169,935,000..."

Harris, G.: "One hundred dollars."

Fortner: "...100 plus the 18 million. Okay."

Harris, G.: "That would be the total and that hundred took Franks off the Bill, I think."

Fortner: "Thank you. I will make a note of that then. So, I think I get then... I get \$1,187,935,100."

Harris, G.: "Yes. And let me just say that the vast majority of department there are two major increases, Representative, that you might wanted to know about. One is simply the growth of our aging population and as you look around the chamber, you'll see that a lot of us are getting older as we just sit here waiting for these Bills to pass. And within the next couple years, the... This is something we're all going to have to look at and deal with in subsequent years that the director of Aging said that within the next decade, 30 percent of the population of the State of Illinois are going to be eligible for CCP services which may make it the fastest growing entitlement, an entitlement that dates back to the days of Governor Jim Thompson, as a matter of fact, that the State of Illinois has. The other major increase in this department is the transfer of adult protective services which consolidates the investigators who check out and investigate the allegations of abuse, fraud, and neglect against senior citizens and also disabled adults into this department."

Fortner: "And just because I want to make sure because it sounds like my base number was not the same as the base number from

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

committee. We were talking about just the GRF portion of the expenditure."

Harris, G.: "Yeah. The base number I have is 1169935100."

Fortner: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 6071. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6071, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is the appropriation for the Department of Aging. And since I mistakenly debated the Bill during the Amendment, I'll just repeat that there are three major changes: one, consolidation of the adult protecting services in this department to protect seniors and adults with disabilities against abuse, fraud, and neglect. Second, a funding to serve the growing aging population of the State of Illinois. And then the other was funding to provide for a rate increase for those persons who provide the services to our seniors. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 6071 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6071, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you please move House Bill 6072 back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6072, 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 Greg Harris."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is an addition of some programs serving youth and disabled people that were made at the request of Members of the committee and also the Senate in our effort to continue to drive funding into our communities to serve families and at-risk youth."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "So, again, with the Amendment, I just want to make sure that we agree with the numbers that your staff would have with the Amendment and the changes to the General Funds, expenditures. What number would you have then for this Bill with this Amendment that's being proposed?"
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris's microphone."
- Harris, G.: "Are we on? Okay, there we go. All right. The answer to your question, Representative, according to the sheet that is before me is 3538094.71 thousand."
- Fortner: "Okay. So, let me make sure I wrote down what you said correctly."
- Harris, G.: "Three five three eight zero nine four point seven one thousand."
- Fortner: "Three five... three five three eight..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Harris, G.: "Zero nine four..."

Fortner: "...zero nine four..."

Harris, G.: "...point seven one thousand."

Fortner: "...point seven one and that's in thousands. And that's with the Amendment?"

Harris, G.: "That is my understanding."

Fortner: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Bellock: "I'm just trying to look over... So, is this the appropriation for 5,645,000 for community services?"

- Harris, G.: "Is this youth guidance and... No, I don't think that's this line. This one totals up in the Amendment, I'm doing it in my head, about 4.6... about four and a half millionish."
- Bellock: "I think... I'm asking about what I have down for Floor Amendment #2 is an appropriation for 5,645,400 from GRF to DHS for community services including operating and administrative costs."
- Harris, G.: "Okay. Again, I have... Forgive me, I have it here as a bunch of separate lines that could very well add up to that. I have one, two, three, four, five different items."
- Bellock: "Really? It's page 40... on page 40. Do you have it on page 40? I don't have that. All right."
- Harris, G.: "Can we... Is this a copy of page 40 of the Amendment or page... yeah, 40 of the Bill?"
- Bellock: "It's lines 11 and 12 on page 40 in the Floor Amendment

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Harris, G.: "Is this in the Amendment or in the Bill?"
- Bellock: "The Amendment, Floor Amendment 2."
- Harris, G.: "Oh, okay. So, yes, that is in the Bill, but that is not these particular things from the Amendment."
- Bellock: "Is that what you've added on to the Bill, though?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes. These things that I... we just talked to it were added on to the Bill."
- Bellock: "Right. Okay. Then we'll talk about it more on Third Reading when it's added on. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6072. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6072, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis. Excuse me, excuse me.

 Representative Harris, my apologies."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, there are a number of complications here. So, I just want to try to answer as many questions as I can before we get going. This is the appropriation for the Department of Human Services and there are a couple things going on here and I'll try to answer Representative Bellock's question as, you know, we talk. The major one is that we are anticipating, and this we discussed in committee with all the Members, that there is \$60 million that was included in the Governor's introduced recommended budget for child care

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

services that were due for services rendered in FY14 that will be paid in a Supplemental that would come forward; therefore, there is \$60 million worth of additional room in this Bill. As we talked in the committee, it was the goal of the committee to drive that money directly into programs that served youth, families and communities. And I'd like to briefly describe, you know, how those moneys were expended. First, after many, many years, our mental health and substance abuse providers who work in our communities have not received a rate increase and they are struggling to keep their doors open, especially with closure of some of the state-operated facilities to serve people with mental health and addiction problems in our neighborhoods. We are providing a 3 percent increase for those agencies. So, that means for DASA providers \$6.2 million and for providers of mental health services about \$14.7 million. We are providing additional funds to serve people with epilepsy in the amount of \$500 thousand. A similar amount to provide respite services for families dealing with autistic children. And we are also, for the first time in many, many years, thanks to Representative Sims, no, and Cassidy, increasing the personal needs allowance that is available to residents of CILAs and ICF/DDs. There are many Members here on both sides of the aisle who have worked on the heroin task force and are concerned about the explosion of heroin dependence and other opiate dependence across our state. And there is a \$1.5 million increase to the Opiate Dependence Program to deal with those issues. There is \$350 thousand increase to rape victim prevention. There is \$1 million to provide case management for families with

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

premature children. There is a \$750 thousand increase for domestic violence shelters. There are increases of \$2 million... let's see, am I getting this right here... Yes, \$2 million for services for homeless youth. One million dollars to address the hunger in this state through the various state food depositories and several other items. But that gives you a good idea of where our commu... our committee decided we needed to prioritize the funds we had available to serve those who are most vulnerable, most in need, and directly provide service in our towns and cities. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Reis."

Reis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Therein, I wanted to ask. Did you get enough pizza when it was back there before?" Speaker Turner: "On a diet, Sir."

Reis: "Okay. You're working very hard. I wanted to make sure you got some of it. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Representative, Representative Bellock kind of started on this with the Chicago Area Project. When did this particular grant item first appear in your budget?"

Harris, G.: "There is no budget in here for the Chicago Area Project. There is no line."

Reis: "No. When... in the past?"

Harris, G.: "In the past, I do not know."

Reis: "Okay. So, that was \$5.6 million and now it's basically just called something else. It's still in your budget. It's called Community Services. Is that correct?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Harris, G.: "I don't believe that we have, you know, anything for that particular agency in the budget. There are a number of services that are provided that were funded through that agency such as, you know, after school programming, youth services, violence prevention in there. But I think we still want to be sure that we provide those services, but we want to be sure that everything is done in an accountable manner and that each agency dollar is provided for appropriately."
- Reis: "And certainly, we want to do that too, but our analysis shows that grants for community services including operation and administrative costs, \$5.6 million and some change, are in this year's budget which used to be the old Chicago Area Project."
- Harris, G.: "There may be services that might, you know, it's a several billion dollar budget. You may be able to find lines that would total up to that amount. I don't have the data... kind of analysis here."
- Reis: "Your staff help you behind you?"
- Harris, G.: "So, for instance, the teen living project... program. There were some agencies that did after school work that had been funded out of Chicago Area Project. If they wish to continue to provide after school programming to at-risk youth, they will have to apply again as individual agencies to the Department of Human Services and meet all the requirements of the Procurement Code and you know, prove their metrics and their results and you know, hopefully, prevent violence and problems in any of our communities."
- Reis: "Okay. Well, I bring this up because and there's several line items in various budgets that we're going to point out

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

today that the Governor said he found all these mistakes a while back and that he ended the program. Well, he didn't end the program. They're just spreading them out to new people, calling them different things. I mean, we went from Chicago Area Project to Community Services. So, we want to make sure we can follow where all this is going and as Representative Harris just said, we want to make sure the timecards are kept right, RFPs are issued, that the money is truly going to the areas that are in most need and not because some alderman says it needs to go there and that background checks are done. And when we interviewed the director for IEJA this... this spring, a lot of that's still not being done with the old NRI programs. So, Representative Harris, I would ask that you stand with us and make sure that all that's being done right because the last thing we need is more money being spent without oversight."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Harris, G.: "First of all, be... before I speak, Representative, I just wanted to answer Representative Reis's question because he did ask me if I would stand with him. And the answer is yes, absolutely. If you remember, when you asked for the audit of NRI, when we served together on the other Appropriations Committee, I stood with you then because I think it's the right and responsible thing to do. And now, in this new role, I look forward to working with you to be sure that our money is spent well and responsibly."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Bellock: "Oh, thank you very much. I'll just follow-up on that because we had started that before. And I guess, moving back one step further is when we discussed this in committee I kept going back to that \$200 million that was set aside in a fund that was created by the temporary income tax Bill from a couple of years ago wanting to use it, if we could possibly, to pay down old bills, you know, that were in DHS. So, that seems to be a lump sum and I just wanted to ask you for a break out. I think this money we were just talking about that was in that lump sum too, that 5., whatever it was, 6 billion dollars."

Harris, G.: "Representative, my understanding of the commitment to Human Services Fund, and there was a similar fund created for education, was to supplement programming not to pay old bills. I went down this list with you yesterday in committee and... because, I think it's important for the edification of your colleagues..."

Bellock: "Right."

Harris, G.: "...I will read it out again here."

Bellock: "Yeah."

Harris, G.: "In the Department of Aging for Community Care Program \$21 million. In CCP care coordination \$20 million. In regular care coordination in the Department of Aging, \$3 million. In the Department of Healthcare and Family Services for long-term care for persons with developmental disabilities \$48,970,000. And then, within the Department of Human Services, whose budget we're on now, for long-term care for persons with developmental disabilities who fall with under... within the DHS budget \$64,968,000. For Family and Community

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Services \$46,284,000. And for rehabilitation services about \$21,411,000."

Bellock: "Thank you. So, was that a total of the 200 million..."

Harris, G.: "That should..."

Bellock: "...or was that 130?"

Harris, G.: "...that should get it close to the total. I don't..."

Bellock: "Okay. Thank you. So..."

Harris, G.: "...I didn't total it up. And so, a lot of that, you know, also is, if you remember, the budget walk in Human Services which we went through of..."

Bellock: "Right."

- Harris, G.: "...the different increases. Well, that has to do to expanding services and populations due to consent decrees by Federal District Courts to which the State of Illinois must comply or be held in contempt."
- Bellock: "Right. I had a couple more questions. So, going back to our budget and I know we went over this and over this, but I just want to make it... I want to be clear and have it clear for everybody else too, is that two years ago when we passed the SMART Act we added in 600 new workers. This year with the arbitration on the MAXIMUS contract we added in another 500 workers. So, it's a total I think of 1100 new workers. Is that correct in the upcoming budget?"
- Harris, G.: "Yeah. And let me just talk about that a little bit because I think people want to hear this is that we heard that with the expansion of Medicaid, with all the redeterminations, there has been a huge backlog and we hear this in our district offices all the time, constituents are not getting their application processed in a timely manner.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

And also we hear from those who are living in nursing homes, particularly in nursing home providers, that there's sometimes, you know, months and months and months delay between the time they have to start paying for services and when the people are finally determined to be eligible and their banks are at their wits end paying them. So, yeah, 500 hundred people will be frontline workers to work in our different central offices for Department of Human Services and of those, I think, a hundred people will be dedicated and specially trained in, asset redeterminations and you know, asset reviews for those who are entering the long-term care system."

- Bellock: "So, what cost of that is federally matched and what just does the state have to put in for those thousand workers?"
- Harris, G.: "All of these peop... most of these people... I don't want to say all... but most of these people are matched and there are slightly differing match rates depending on which program they're serving. And this is divided up by the amount of time that they spend doing particular tasks. So, there... it's about 50 percent, I think. It's in the 50s. It depends on which program they're doing. It varies slightly depending on which stream they're working on."
- Bellock: "So, what was the total cost of the increase of the DHS budget, not a percentage, but in money?"
- Harris, G.: "In... people or just in the raw numbers?"
- Bellock: "Just raw numbers, the increase. Do you have the increase in the personnel right there?"
- Harris, G.: "No. The number I have here is 354,628,184."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Bellock: "'Cause I think we had had it close to 500 million. Are you just talking about GRF? 'Cause we thought it was an increase of close to 500 million."
- Harris, G.: "I don't know if that counted match coming back or not."
- Bellock: "I guess my point is, it's hard to tell in this upcoming budget Bill."
- Harris, G.: "All right. I've just got the answer here. So, if you add back in the amount from the commitment to the Human Services Fund, you would get to the number you just said."
- Bellock: "Oh, okay. So, it is closer to 500 million. I mean, we're just trying to come up with how much extra with these new 400 thousand people coming on as to where we see that in HFS budget or DHS budget. I know a lot of it is matched, but I can't imagine taking on 5... close to 500 thousand people by next year when we're back here in the fall that we won't have a lot more expense."
- Harris, G.: "And if you recall in the DHFS budget, which we approved just a few moments ago, there was a liability increase in anticipation based on redetermination rates and average per member per month cost. It was included in the DHFS budget to cover the cost of serving those new clients."
- Bellock: "And was there any money into the '15 budget on the MAXIMUS contract? I'm sorry. I don't know if that's totally finished. I never asked that."
- Harris, G.: "There's a small amount. I think they're going to pay to buy some services to clean up that contract. I'm not... I don't know the exact amount."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Bellock: "Who pays for the navigators and the people like that who are doing a lot of the work in the Medicaid expansion? What budget does that come out of? 'Cause I know it's not all federally funded."
- Harris, G.: "I know it's not in our area."
- Bellock: "Really?"
- Harris, G.: "I don't know where it might be."
- Bellock: "Oh, maybe in insurance? I don't know. Okay. So, the total collective bargaining... I asked this before... is it 120 million, the collective bargaining increase just in DHS?"
- Harris, G.: "I believe when the Secretary testified that was the number she told us."
- Bellock: "And does that include the increase with the thousand new workers?"
- Harris, G.: "You know, I don't want to misspeak, so we'll check and I'll get back to you on that."
- Bellock: "Okay. I just have one more question regarding the budget, 'cause I don't think we went over this and I don't know if you even have an answer, because moving forward, mental health is going to be combined with substance abuse. Was there any cost savings in that projected into the 2015 budget or..."
- Harris, G.: "There were some small savings within operations lines, but I don't think anything would have a major impact on the overall budget."
- Bellock: "Okay. And I'm not saying I'm looking forward to that.

 I don't even know if that's a good idea."
- Harris, G.: "But I think that there's a very great concern and I'm sure you've heard it from substance abuse providers and

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

you know, I've heard it from them and also behavioral health providers that even if, you know, we had merged the administration of those kind of offices at the top level and when it comes down to our neighborhoods we want to be sure that each one still maintains its separate funding and its separate identities. Because while there are some people who have dual diagnosis. of mental health and substance abuse disorder, there are a lot who are in just one category or another and we want to be sure they're still able to receive treatment or care in our community. So, that's something we have to keep focusing on."

Bellock: "Right. Thank you very much. And just again, to the Bill. We've just gone over two huge budgets, probably two of the biggest appropriation budgets, the HFS and the DHS budget. Looking towards that, we've worked very hard over the last couple years on reforms in order to take care of the most fragile population, but moving forward, I think it is still looking at what we've done today, you are still voting on a tax increase of the temporary tax increase staying in place by voting for these Bills even though they have good programs in them and we certainly want to go forward with the Medicaid and treating the most fragile populations, giving them medical homes and taking care of our kids in the DCFS and all the other budgets in the Human Service. I appreciate all you've done, Representative Harris. You've done a good job, but again, this is... by voting on this you are voting on a 37.2 budget... billion dollar budget. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brauer."

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

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

- Brauer: "Representative, I see in here it talks about the anticipated closure of the Murray Center. Is there any contingency there to clean that site up?"
- Harris, G.: "To clean... I think the intention right now is to provide the funding to keep it open because right now we're under court order that while Murray... there's a number of lawsuits, both federal and state, to, you know, discuss whether or not it should or should not close. So, we have provided funding to, you know, operate the Center during that time and be sure that the needs of the residents are met, something very, certainly, dear to Representative Meier's heart."
- Brauer: "Well, I certainly compliment you on that, but in our analysis it says anticipates the closure of the Murray Center. And the reason I ask that is because we had LDC in Lincoln that closed and the only thing they've done to that is boarded up the place and that's been 12 years ago. And there's still no anticipation of bringing that site back to pristine condition and we have a lot of sites there that have asbestos in them. We have a coal-fired plant. What's..."
- Harris, G.: "I don't mean to deflect off of somebody else, but I'm about to, so when property becomes surplus like that I don't think it is any longer the responsibility of the Department of Human Services. I think then it goes to CMS and they're responsible for the environmental cleanup, the disposition, the sale. So, I think that question will be more direct… appropriately directed to CMS when their budget comes up."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Brauer: "Well, I think that we need to have something in place 'cause, again, this site's been 12 years and I talked with CMS. They have a power plant that has been vacated for 25 years."

Harris, G.: "I agree."

Brauer: "So, you'll help me get that done?"

Harris, G.: "I will give it a whirl."

Brauer: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, my question, with regard to 6072 is, what are the contingent liabilities that are presently applicable to this part of the budget?"

Harris, G.: "And describe what you mean by contingent liabilities?"

Kay: "Well, what's outstanding that we owe in terms of bills
invoiced?"

Harris, G.: "Because of our Section 25 changes years ago, outside of the child care, which we're going to pay I think in the Supplemental which was about 60 million, we'd certainly be within the Section 25 liability so that 30-day period, whatever that number would be of bills that are coming in and out."

Kay: "Okay. Well, yesterday, I think when I asked that question and I'm not sure, I think you gave the answer of I believe it was 800 million but possibly a billion. And so my question, if that's correct and you made that state..."

Harris, G.: "That was a different department, Representative."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Kay: "Okay. I apologize. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. You know, while this is a large appropriation, this is a department that touches, you know, each and every community across the state. It touches all of our families. It touches all of our youth. It provides prevention for mental health, for substance abuse that keeps people from getting into the criminal justice system. It helps them lead happy, productive lives in the neighborhood. This is also a program which is largely driven by consent decrees in Federal Court orders that require us to move persons into certain levels of care and for which the state is obligated to pay money. I think we've handled all of these in a very well-balanced, respectful way. I particularly want to thank my colleagues from the other side of the aisle who've worked with us in the committee because they've expressed so many of the same concerns that we have about mental health, about substance abuse, about being sure that Medicaid offices are staffed in an appropriate way so that citizens get their determinations our can redeterminations in a timely fashion. I wanted to thank our approp staff on this side who had to sit and write all this stuff. I want to thank the approp side on that side of the aisle had to read it and try to figure out what we were doing. So, thank you very much. This was a very important piece of legislation. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6072 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 61 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6072, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6149. Can you please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6149, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Crespo, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I ask for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6149. Basically, it's a gut and replace Amendment that provides the following. It provides a \$500 thousand grant from the Tourism Promotion Fund for the Gateway Motor Sports Park. The Tourism Promotion Fund receives its money from a portion of the states hotel tax. It also increases grants associated with the business and community development. And it makes a technical change correction in a drafting error. And I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner on the Amendment."

Fortner: "Yes. I've been trying to check through as these Amendments have come up. This one also does change the GRF expenditures, as I understand it, from what was adopted in committee?"

Crespo: "It's... From what was adopted in committee, yes. But I should also add that the committee still has money on the table, \$17 million or so that we did not appropriate."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Fortner: "Well, that... that's fine. I just want to make sure I know what the GRF expenditure number would be..."

Crespo: "Correct."

Fortner: "...under this Bill. I think I understand it it's... that this would take us to 73,471,300. Does that agree?"

Crespo: "Sev... 71,271,300."

Fortner: "Sorry... say that again? Seventy-one..."

Crespo: "Seventy-one million two hundred seventy-one thousand three hundred."

Fortner: "Seventy-one two seventy-one? Three hundred."

Crespo: "Yes."

Fortner: "Okay. And that's with this Amendment?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Fortner: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6149. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6149, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 6149 appropriates funding for DCEO is a combination of both GRF and Other State Funds. There's an increase here that's to be applied for job training and summer jobs program. Be happy... happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Senger."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Senger: "Representative, is this also the department that basically has the pass-through for the Governor's Neighborhood Recovery Initiative?"

Crespo: "No, this is not."

Senger: "So, it's not in DCEO?"

Crespo: "Not under this... not under DCEO."

Senger: "Okay. Then let me... let me ask this question. I know in the summer jobs program, originally this program was budgeted through the Budget Relief Funds. Is that correct?"

Crespo: "I believe, give me one... I believe so, yes. The FY09, yes."

Senger: "Okay. And... and I also believe that those funds were due to expire in '14 or there needed to be..."

Crespo: "Correct."

Senger: "...additional... Okay. Another 2 million or whatever in '14?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Senger: "So, is it not the case then we're asking for a new GRF to fund this program now?"

Crespo: "We're asking for a new GRF under this scenario, correct."

Senger: "Okay. So, again, this is a... an expansion of government, basically, making it permanent now through GRF."

Crespo: "This is additional GRF."

Senger: "And then the second... the second piece of it that I'd like to talk about. This is a DCEO job training program that's also in here?"

Crespo: "Correct."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Senger: "Okay. And this job training program, again, is an initiative by the Governor's Office?"

Crespo: "Yes."

Senger: "And it's to... it's basically it's separate from the summer
jobs program?"

Crespo: "I'm sorry. Can you..."

Senger: "You can't hear me."

Crespo: "Can you repeat the question?"

Senger: "It's separate from the summer jobs program?"

Crespo: "Yes."

Senger: "Okay. And is it also a \$21.8 million increase in GRF or in other words..."

Crespo: "Yes."

Senger: "...a 242 percent increase over the '14 estimates?"

Crespo: "Yes."

Senger: "And the concern... To the Bill. The concern I have here is and I mentioned earlier already the position the Governor's in with the Neighborhood Recovery Initiative. These two programs, particularly the program for the job training programs, are once again something the Governor is using politically. There's been little fundamental oversight and accountability in this program. And again, the job training program is a 240 percent increase, 21.8 million from '14. So, these programs are questionable. And I wanted to point that out on record and ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Franks: "I'd like to follow up on that DCEO budget which is approaching \$1.8 billion. And it appears that we want to spend an additional \$25 million in GRF on job training programs. Is that correct, Mr. Sponsor... Mr. Crespo?"

Crespo: "Yes... yes, it is."

Franks: "Is this... What's that based on? Is it based on the wonderful track record the Governor's had on job placement programs?"

Crespo: "Well, you're talking about the job training, let's be very clear. This is very specific to ETIP which we've had so many manufacturing companies and businesses that have been asking for that and claim that it does work. It does also include the Day Tech, DTT program and the Employment Opportunities Grant Program. So, these are very specific to those programs when we refer to the job training. It's not just any kind of job."

Franks: "Isn't their violence prevention program in here?"

Crespo: "No, It's not."

Franks: "Okay. Where do we stand... I saw today the new numbers that we were touting that our unemployment's gone down to just under 8 percent. But isn't it true that we're still the third worst in the entire nation when it comes to the unemployment rate?"

Crespo: "I haven't seen that report yet."

Franks: "It came out today. What concerns me is we keep doing the same things with DCEO and it's clear that it isn't working. We've done the EDGEs program and these special EDGE and we passed something in committee yesterday, but the Governor has been focused on job retention while using false definitions

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

of retention. In this Orwellian world of Governor Quinn, job retention somehow means loss of jobs. It seems that the Governor's idea of job creation is to pay companies to fire taxpaying Illinoisans. Because what we do is we turn and we give them hundreds of millions of dollars in tax breaks, many of which for companies that don't even pay taxes in this state, so they can turn around and fire taxpaying Illinoisans. Now, I don't think that's a very sound policy. Then what we do is we... we're talking about raising our tax rates here and continuing the tax rate that we... supposed to be temporary because all these votes are a... are a precursor to a tax increase. Yet, you're talking about trying to attract businesses and grow jobs while at the same time saying, we're going to raise taxes. Now, my suggestion would be to line item out DCEO and save \$1.8 billion and I'll tell you why. Because if we cut out that \$1.8 billion and then we do the stuff we talked about in the lottery yesterday, that's about two and a half billion dollars in revenue and we don't need a tax increase. Because once you do the tax increase, you're not going to get employers. What is the incentive for an employer to come to this state or to create jobs when we're talking about raising taxes? So, why don't we line item out DCEO's 1.8 billion, 'cause there ain't enough money they can throw at companies to come to this state when we're raising taxes and saying we got to throw in more money for pensions. We're not fixing that. So, why don't we cut out this dough and we could really fix the budget that way? That's a question."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Crespo: "So... so, listen, I appreciate the comments. Again, let me be very specific. The job training knowledge that we're talking about here have to do with ETIP, JTECH, and the Employee... Employment Opportunity Grant Program. I think you're referencing the EDGE program, which is not contained here. So, I'm with you on the EDGE program, but that's not what I'm talking about with the job training."

Franks: "No. I understand..."

Crespo: "So, I appreciate the energy and the excitement on the EDGE. It has nothing to do with this though."

"No, I appreciate it, but you know what, folks, there's no more reason to have a DCEO. There is no reason to have a Commerce and Economic Opportunity agency when we are raising taxes. Their job is to bring business. I tell you, Bobby Jindal in Louisiana jettisoned their DCEO. They did just fine. If you want to bring jobs, cut the tax rate. It's very simple. We don't need to spend a billion eight. I think that this Governor's introduced budget here, his proposal, is a fantasy wrapped in a delusion. There is abs... a fantasy wrapped in a delusion. And here we are, we don't even have the dough, we don't have the money. As I said before, it's imaginary money. Can you show me the money, Mr. Crespo? Show me the money, Mr. Crespo. I need more than that, Mr. Harris, but it's a start. You're asking us to vote and give you an extra billion eight for an agency that is obsolete. If we're going to fix our budget, if we're going to fix our state, it's time to start cutting extraneous agencies. Zero them out, give them nothing. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Riley: "Representative Crespo, one of the responsibilities of DCEO is not only to attract business but to..."

Crespo: "Al... Al, I'm sorry. I'm having a really difficult time...

If you guys here, can you just please move out of the way?

And I appreciate it. I'm sorry, Al, go ahead."

Riley: "...not only to attract business but to retain business also."

Crespo: "Sure. The whole economic development, which we talk all...
about all the time, does require investment. And that's
basically what we're talking about here."

Riley: "I have a number of large businesses in my district and some of my surrounding representatives, one in particular, My Jack, that a lot of people knew about that basically loved DCEO and some of the things that they have done to... to help them expand. Their headquarters is in, you know, one of my towns. And actually, there is a lot of businesses that, you know, we meet some of our local chambers that think that the agency is not quite doing enough. And so, thank you for all of the work that you've done. One of the things I want to point out. Some of the other speakers have talked about the Governor. Well, a lot of these programs that are listed here, like EOGP, many of us created. We created them for particular purposes. The other thing I want to point out also is that all of these programs are really beyond reproach. They've been around a long time. One of the things that DCEO does is, again, to promote job creation and job training is run by a lot of our community colleges and is also run by a lot of our

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

WIAs, the Workforce Investment Area programs. Isn't that correct?"

Crespo: "That's correct."

Riley: "Thank you for the work that you've done. I request 'aye' votes on this Bill."

Crespo: "Thank you, Al."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. To the spending Bill, please, Mr. Speaker. There was a previous speaker who was... it looked like he was looking at us the whole time he was speaking... the Gentleman from McHenry who was talking... it looked like he was talking to us and I want to say, come over to the water. It's warm on our side. It's warm and comfortable. Because... because the speaker wants you..."

Speaker Turner: "Shhh. Members, Members, thank you."

Sandack: "Because that speaker was eloquent, was to the point and nary a word out of his mouth could have been actually debated. The fact of the matter is, there's plenty of areas in this budget that should be cut, that shouldn't even exist. We're continuing to spend and spend and spend. Since, I don't know, 10, 10:15 this morning, we've run 20 or so Bills without one responsible word on how we're going to pay for it. So, I want to thank the Gentleman from McHenry for his words of wisdom. Let him know that the water is warm over here and take a few more of his brethren here with us because it's time for some sense and sensibility in this process. It has been senseless and absolutely an embarrassment to this august Assembly to continue to spend and spend and spend again. Stop it. Just stop it. Vote 'no'."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative, I want to take you back to the appropriation hearing when DCEO Director Pollet testified before the General Services Approp Committee a few weeks back. During that discussion with Director Pollet, I referenced \$10 million that was spent on the… the Neighborhood Recovery Initiative. Do you remember that conversation that I had with him?"

Crespo: "I... I don't recall... Are you talking about our Appropriations or are you talking about General Services? Our Appropriations, when he came? Okay."

Sullivan: "Yes."

Crespo: "Yes."

Sullivan: "So, in that conversation, we discussed three different areas that money passed through DCEO in the troubled Neighborhood Recovery Initiative. One of them was for a federal micro loan program and I think the total was \$10 million. In that discussion with the director, I asked if the records that were turned over to the state's attorney in Cook County would be presented to our committee and the Members of our committee. Do you remember that conversation?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Sullivan: "Have you heard from the director who agreed to turn those records over to us?"

Crespo: "No, I have not. I know that the documents were sent to the state's attorney. Although I understand that they didn't even subpoena the freedom of information, but he will only

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

give it to her. I'll be more than happy to follow up 'cause I do recall that you did make a request that he submit information to the committee."

Sullivan: "And kindly, he did agree to do that and I said you can direct... turn them..."

Crespo: "I believe he said he had to go check with legal before he can give us the an opinion, but I do recall the conversation taking place and I think his response was he had to go back and check with legal staff to make sure it was okay."

Sullivan: "Well, I'd like to solicit your help in trying to work with the director..."

Crespo: "I already talked to him."

Sullivan: "...and to have those turned over and maybe we can work it out by the end of the week."

Crespo: "Absolutely."

Sullivan: "Great. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "I wanted to rise in support of this budget itself. And also to say that the... some of the programs have been very, very successfully utilized here within the State of Illinois. I know in my region the last four major locations of both manufacturing and logistics have come through the... the expertise of the folks in this agency. And we've seen an increase in the employment. As a matter of fact, I see that today the unemployment for Illinois fell to 7.9 percent on here, lowest point since 2008. We have had some increases. We're doing some things right throughout the State of Illinois. This is part of our... our process. This agency has

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

brought new jobs to the State of Illinois and it help... has helped us to negotiate and compete against our fellow states who have the same agencies. I find that it would be irresponsible to eliminate the economic development agency for the State of Illinois when we are, in fact, in search of creating new jobs, attracting new businesses, looking at rewriting our Tax Codes as they currently exist, reducing our stores of old bills, changing our unemployment structure so that fund, the trust fund, did not go broke. And in the midst of that, you need an economic development agency. So, I commend the chairman and the Members of that committee and would ask for 'aye' votes for the state's economic development agency that helps to ... us to work towards falling unemployment numbers, lowest since 2008, increase of job placement. And if we want to talk about jobs, we should be investing more in the agencies that bring us actual jobs and work. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Yeah. Representative, I commend you for your work on this, but do you find any merit whatsoever to the comments that Representative Franks had and particularly with regard to DCEO?"

Crespo: "If you're talking about poetic Jack, it was very entertaining. I want to let... I want to let Leader Sandack know that there's a tax incentive if you adopt a certain Representative from McHenry County. Listen, I... I heard what he had to say it, but again, it has nothing to do the job training items included in this Bill. He was referring mostly,

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

if I understood correctly, with the EDGE program. Some of the other tax incentives are offered to businesses which is now the job creating here with ETIP and some of the other items that we have on this Bill. So, where it was very entertaining, I'll give him that. It didn't really talk about the Bill at hand."

"Well, I took it a different way. It may have been Kay: entertaining, but for a businessman, it made a lot of sense. And let me... let me just say this to you. Whether there are some good things or some things that may have marginal effect on business in Illinois, I have not heard of them. Others have spoke to it, so I take them at their word. But let's face it; let's be very clear. Until you clean up the legal climate, you actually do workers' compensation reform and you bring true tax reform to this state, you can have DCEO 3 times, 10 times, 20 times over and it's not going to make any difference and Jack Franks doesn't need to say that. I will, and I'm a big business guy in Illinois and I know what's driving business out. And DCEO is not going to bring anybody in and it's not going to keep anybody in. So, my question was very serious because I wanted you to take it in a serious note. Jack may be entertaining; I don't know about that, but I thought his comments should be taken seriously. And so, that's why I asked the question and I hope you take it seriously because the issue of spending \$1.8 billion for something that has no relevance and not addressing the three problems that this state has, in the minds of businesses, is just patently wrong. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you let the record reflect that Representative Schmitz is excused for the day?"
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. The Journal will reflect your request. Representative Crespo to close."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And to the previous Representative, I do take this very seriously. Again, the comments that were made on behalf of my side here, had nothing to do with this Bill. It was a whole different topic. So, with that, I just ask for... for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6149 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 61 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6149, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bost: "Never mind. They already..."

- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6150, Representative Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6150, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 6150 is your appropriations for the Department of Revenue. It's a combination of both GRF and Other State Funds. There's an increase on the GRF side, mostly to fund the collective bargaining agreement. Happy to answer any questions."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Representatives, as we stand here right now, do you know how much money we have appropriated in the various appropriations, i.e., spending Bills that have passed the House this afternoon?"

Crespo: "I... I don't have the running total, Representative, but I think, it shouldn't come as a surprise to anyone if folks listened to the Governor's introduced or recommended budget. There's a dollar amount already there. I mean, we know what that is. How close we are? I don't know how close we are, but we know what that dollar amount is."

Sandack: "Are we close, do you think, to the amount that we agreed upon as a Body as a ceiling, that \$34.4 billion number?"

Crespo: "Again, I'm making reference to the Governor's recommended budget which has nothing to do... Now, are we talking about the revenue Resolution..."

Sandack: "I'm talking about how much we've spent today. How much is gone? How much..."

Crespo: "I don't have the... I don't have the..."

Sandack: "...has been appropriated in the various Bills today?"

Crespo: "I don't have the running total under this exercise."

Sandack: "To the... to the spending Bill. We've spent a lot of money today. Forget the Governor's appropriation or budget, it doesn't matter. We have a... we have a singular responsibility to be fiscally prudent, to be judicious in spending the taxpayers' money and we've been anything but this afternoon. I think the record will reflect we have kind of a running

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

total of how much has been appropriated and how it does not correlate to reality and how we're going keep going. I think we have 20 more Bills or so, so by all means, let's just keep racking up the taxpayers' money because it's not real, right? It's not ours. Folks, we got to get this process under some rules of reasonableness. We ought to stop this process, rewind it and work towards a revenue number that makes sense before we're spending again the taxpayers' money. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And I just ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6150 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6150, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6151, Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6151, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6151 is the Appropriations Bill for CMS or Central Management Services. It's a combination of both GRF and Other State Funds. And I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 6151 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6151, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6153, Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6153, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6153 is the appropriations for the lottery. There's no GRF here. They rely on Other State Funds and there's a decrease of close to \$3 million in this Bill, and happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, yesterday I had it... I had a press conference and I highlighted the problems... I know it's a surprise. It's a surprise; it's a surprise. I know you're shocked. You're shocked. I was too. I came out of my shell. But the reason I did it was because I was studying a little contract called the Illinois Lottery Private Management Agreement. Now, I have copies if you'd like to see them. But it's really interesting because the person who signed the copy was none other than Governor Pat Quinn. This was negotiated by this administration and was entered into by this administration. Unfortunately, we're not getting the benefit of the bargain that was in this contract. Some of the issues that I can highlight I think will shock you. For instance, when they did the rollout of the online games last year, they promised that they would provide \$34

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

million in net income. Folks, they didn't even have \$34 million in sales. They didn't even meet the sales. This year 29 other states have seen their sales increase. Illinois is not one of them. Those other states don't have private managers that we are spending a hundred million dollars a year on. This year... this year, FY14, Northstar was supposed to sell \$970 million profit work for the State of Illinois. They've increased the weekly games from 40 to 136, but they have not increased sales because they keep selling to the same people. They will not expand the base. So, as a result, instead of receiving the profits that the state's supposed to get of \$970 million we're only going to get 778. That cost us this year alone \$202 million. That's this year alone, 202 million. Now, Northstar is going to have to pay a penalty of approximately \$38 million because they have not met their numbers. But that still leaves the state over \$160 million short this year alone. Over the three-year period since they've had this contract, they've shortchanged the taxpayers of the state in excess of \$445 million. That's real money, folks. We're talking budget stuff today. We're talking about how we are going to allocate our resources. One of the issues that keeps coming up is how are we going to get additional revenue. One of the answers is here. If we get rid of Northstar, we would plug approximately 7 percent of the budget deficit with this one action. Understand that's a huge amount of money and if you look at what other states do on a per capita basis, Georgia, for instance and Massachusetts sell about two and a half times more per capita than we do. If we extrapolated those numbers and ran the lottery as well as

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

other states do, that would be approximately \$1 billion. That's a b... \$1 billion extra a year to our State Government and to our... to our Treasury. It is absolutely an abomination that the Governor has not canceled this contract. Every day he does not cancel this contract costs the State of Illinois over \$800 thousand a day. He needs to terminate this now so we can turn this into the entity it should be and make the profit for the citizens of the State of Illinois. I've asked the Governor to terminate this contract. Obviously, there's going to be litigation. There's always litigation. Northstar has been in litigation since day one when they entered into this contract. Folks, they're better at litigating than they are at running the lottery. So, what we need to do is cancel this contract right now and I believe that we can bring in a minimum of an additional \$400 million a year and probably closer to a billion. For that reason, I would ask that we send the Governor a very strong message. Everyone please vote 'no'. Force his hand. Make him step up and do the right thing, so we can bring money into the State of Illinois without having to raise taxes. This is a clear 'no' vote for everybody."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really don't have a question of the Sponsor, but rather would like to address some of the comments that were just made by the previous speaker. He is correct. There is a private management agreement in place. I would ask him, if he were the Sponsor, if there are greater revenues coming in to the state now under the lottery than there were before? The answer to that

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

question would be yes. It is not at the level that the project manager, private manager, hoped for, but it's still higher by about a hundred-plus million dollars than it was before. I grant you, the private manager agreement may not be the best, but I will also say this, if they miss their target for two years in a row and it's proven that they missed their target for two... it's either two or three years in a row... two years in a row that the Governor does indeed have the authority to cancel the contract. So, there's a disagreement here. Okay. Other states do have private managers. I believe Indiana has a private manager and I believe Pennsylvania has a private manager. This is a big deal issue. Referencing the previous speaker's comments that if we simply took it away from the private manager, the lottery would grow by 300 or 400 million dollars, I'd strongly disagree. You just don't snap your fingers and generate three or four hundred million dollars in lottery revenues. So, while I'm going to vote against the Bill, it has ... it has nothing to do with the pro... with the private management agreement that's been entered into because that is a contentious issue which is being worked out right now. And I'm voting against the Bill for other reasons. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. There's a couple comments, and this is very frustrating when we deal with the lottery and we've been dealing with the lottery now for three years. Last year, actually, the committee considered just appropriating six months to make sure that they... we saw this whole issue with PM... with the PMA and Northstar, but we ran into some issues

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

with contractual obligations so we couldn't quite do that. There is a court case and they're under mediation right now. I know that it's well. There has been an increase in revenue and this... I think it's a very balanced discussion, by the way. Obviously, they have not met the thresholds they were supposed to meet. In my opinion, I think though the PMA is one of the main reasons why we're having a problem. It was a very... it was very poorly drafted. I think that... that's the genesis of some of the issues that we have here. But with that said, and again, we're very concerned 'cause this money goes to education and capital projects. So, the more they spend on litigation, the less money we have for education and capital. So, the committee's very concerned, but not funding them, I don't think, is an option. And with that, I ask an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6153 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6153, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6154, Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6154, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Speaker, thank you. And I'm proud to announce that this is the last Bill for General Services. House Bill 6154 deals

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

with the appropriations for the Department of Insurance. There's no GRF. It's all based on Other State Funds. There is an increase here to hire additional staff so they can meet their obligations. And I'll be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Senger."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Just... one of the observations I wanted to make and we were talking of ... a lot on additions to General Revenue Funds, but 50 percent of our budget is non-GRF funds. And many times we've listened to hearings for the non-GRF funds, but we don't scrutinize them as closely as we do our GRF because that's our immediate problem. One of the questions I've had all along here and we're still trying to trace it through, has to do with the Department of Insurance being the recipient of a federal fund, non-GRF, of 36 million to fund the in-counselor also known as Navigator program. And it was just discussed on the last debate with Human Services. I'm looking at a document right now that is printed off the Governor's website that basically said the Department of Public Health has a grant of 28 million to be used to apply for programs to basically hire and train in person counselors which are the same thing as Navigators. Now, accordingly, Representative Bellock and I have been very frustrated with the fact that we're not getting a complete picture of how these funds have flowed through, where they have gone and how they're being used. And we're hearing contradicting statements all the time of what's going on. So, again, the point I'm trying to make here is there as a... a lot of what we're looking at, which is non-GRF money, is real

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

money, taxpayer money. And it's about time we disclosed what these funds are... where they're... where they're going, who's using them and how productive they are."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Speaker, thank you very much. Again, it's the last Bill.

Once again, I want to thank all the Members of the General
Services Appropriations both on this side and that side as
well. Again, as I had said earlier, we understand that
sometimes we can't reach an agreement, but there's a lot of
mutual respect on both sides. I'm very proud of that and
hopefully, that mutual respect will continue. And with that,
I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6154 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the rec...
Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Put it on Postponed Consideration please."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please move the Bill to the Order of Postponed Consideration. Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Moving to page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Arroyo... who certainly seems ready to go forward. First Bill is House Bill 6075. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6075, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. What Bill is this? 60... 6075? I ask for... I'll be happy to answer any questions. Any questions? No."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "I'd like to ask any ques... answer any questions of the Members."

Speaker Lang: "Perhaps, you could just present the Bill, briefly to us."

Arroyo: "Well, I just did. Did you... Leader, did you hear that? I would like to present House Bill 6075. Illinois Emergency Agency... Illinois Emer... Emergency Management Agency. I'd like to... I would be happy to ask any questions... answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Sandack to enlighten us."

Sandack: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "I hope so. Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative Arroyo, I have no idea what it is you're offering right now. Could you elaborate a little bit on the spending Bill you offer?"

Arroyo: "Well, we're giving... we're the Governor's introduced level. I believe all the... most of our Bills are all based on the Governor's introduced level."

Sandack: "So, it's his fault."

Arroyo: "You... you want the amount?"

Sandack: "Well, maybe you can explain just because it's kind of important we're utilizing taxpayer time right now and we're going to be spending taxpayer money. What is it this Appropriation Bill is being... what's it doing? What's it spending money on?"

Arroyo: "Well, I... I can give you a line."

Sandack: "Why is it necessary?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "It's got... it's got personal services is going to be 2.398. Social services... social serv... services is going to be 1.83. I mean, I could go down the line. I could give you the total. It's going to be... the allocation is going to be 2.626 from GRF."

Sandack: "Representative, is there any Neighborhood Recovery Initiative money in this expenditure?"

Arroyo: "No."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Of course."

Kay: "Representative, I'm not up to speed on this because I was not in attendance in a meeting or two. So, I'd like you to bring me up to speed on what you did with the State Police and how many cadet classes we're going to be providing in the next year or two."

Arroyo: "Mr. Kay, we're calling a Bill that is not... doesn't have no State Police or anything on it. The Bill is 6075."

Kay: "You haven't got to that yet, then?"

Arroyo: "Emergency Management Agency."

Kay: "Okay. Does this have..."

Arroyo: "But I could... I could talk about it..."

Kay: "No. That's all right. I... It's my... it's my error. I guess I
was just so interested in being a part of the committee that
I... I couldn't help but jump to the issues that I wanted to
talk about. But I'll come back to them. Thank you, Speaker."
Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Franks: "Thank you. I have a par... Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Lang: "The answer is no. Go ahead, Sir, with your inquiry."

Franks: "I mean, you're like Carnac the Magnificent. I love it. Before, as you know, the Chair ruled against my constitutional issue as well as the BFO issue, but I have another request. I remember and maybe I'm incorrect so I'm so glad to see the parliamentarian here... well, hiding now... I remember seeing some reports from the Auditor General. And the Auditor General's report was indicating whether we were spending more than what our revenue estimates were. And I tend to remember in that 11th hour vote some three years ago when the 'temporary', I say in quotations, tax increase was passed by this august Body that one of the provisions was that if we actually spent more money than that was appropriated that the tax would immediately go away. So, my question is, is if we actually appropriate more money than our revenue estimate, would that nullify the tax increase and make it go away immediately?"

Speaker Lang: "On behalf of the Speaker, the answer to your parliamentary inquiry is, as I predicted, no."

Franks: "I'd like a..."

Speaker Lang: "Do you have any other... do you have any questions of the Sponsor..."

Franks: "Oh, I do, but I..."

Speaker Lang: "...that you'd like to make up?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Franks: "No, not at this time, but I appreciate that. But I just...

I want to... I want to explore that a little more, my previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Feel free to go ahead..."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "...and explore."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "I have a parliamentary inquiry too. Can a Member on this side nominate another Member on this side as an Assistant Minority Leader?"

Speaker Lang: "That we will research for you, Sir. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6076, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6076, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6076 is the Southwest Economy Development Authority. We gave them \$2.46 million. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

Cavaletto: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Cavaletto: "Representative, there's \$169,400 increase. What's that for?"

Arroyo: "This is normally obligation bonds that they wanted to increase."

Cavaletto: "Why... why did they go up?"

Arroyo: "Excuse me?"

Cavaletto: "You said bonds?"

Arroyo: "Yes. Moral... moral bonds."

Cavaletto: "Why? Why did they go up?"

Arroyo: "Somebody else defaulted on their bonds."

Cavaletto: "Which two?"

Arroyo: "I'm not sure."

Cavaletto: "Well, will you... what would you know, but... So, we're going to add \$169,400 to... to this SWIDA, right? So, that makes them 2 million... over 2 million bucks?"

Arroyo: "It's always been an agreement that we don't cut this moralized bond."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6077, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill. Yes. Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6077, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

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

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

Arroyo: "The second Amendment is a technical Amendment changing the date."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner..."

Arroyo: "I move to the adoption."

Speaker Lang: "...do you rise on the Amendment? Mr. Fortner on the Amendment."

Fortner: "Again, just confirming as I've been doing with some of the other Bills. So, this Amendment has no impact fiscally.

All the other changes are just in other parts of the verbiage.

It does not change any of the expenditures. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Right. Yes."

Fortner: "Thank you."

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

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6077, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Yes. We just gave the Governor's request; 1.751 with GRF. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Reis: "Representative, is... almost all the increase this year for personnel services?"

Arroyo: "What was that..."

Reis: "Isn't the vast majority of the increase in this year's appropriation for this over last year's personnel and fringe benefit services an increase in that line item?"

Arroyo: "They're increasing the head count, I believe."

Reis: "Is it... are they increasing the head count or are they just giving raises?"

Arroyo: "What was that?"

Reis: "Are they increasing head count or just implementing raises?"

Arroyo: "Head count."

Reis: "By how many and what will these people be doing?"

Arroyo: "I think there's five... five would be the head count and the implementation of two Public Acts."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis, have you completed your interrogation?

Mr. Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Lang: "Happy to."

Cavaletto: "Representative, I have one other question. Under...
we're talking about personal services and I don't know where
the other line is here on a... But what about... what about the
back pay? Where we at with the back pay?"

Arroyo: "It's not in this Bill."

Cavaletto: "It's not in this Bill. So..."

Arroyo: "This is... this is the Prisoner Review Board Bill."

Cavaletto: "How much... Do you know how much that back pay is?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "It's not in this Bill. I wouldn't know."

Cavaletto: "I know, but I think it's about 120 million, maybe?"

Arroyo: "I'm not sure."

Cavaletto: "Do you look... do you think we're going to have to reallocate money then to pay that back pay?"

Arroyo: "I'm not sure. We're... I'm looking at this Bill with the Prisoner Review Board. I'm not sure of that."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "A question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative Arroyo, our analysis indicates that an almost 28 percent increase in GRF is going to occur if this Bill is passed and the appropriation moves forward. How is it that we're going to spe... How are we going to pay for that increase?"

Arroyo: "I believe some of this is for head count that they needed more, 'cause they have a lot of cases that they have to review and they have to look at. So, they're wanting to increase it because they have a big log of cases that they want to be able to get off the books."

Sandack: "That may justify the expenditure. I asked how it is we're going to pay for it. Where's the revenue coming from?"

Arroyo: "Well, we're... I'm pushing to the Governor's request. We're going to leave it up to the Governor and probably some of the Members here to find where the money's coming from."

Sandack: "Let me make sure I'm clear on that. I mean, that's a wonderful response, I guess. The Governor does not have a vote until we give him a Bill passed by both chambers. Doesn't

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

your Appropriation Bill here assume the tax increase is permanent and not temporary?"

Arroyo: "No, no. we're..."

Sandack: "How is it that we're going to pay for it then, Sir?"

Arroyo: "We're... my job is just to get this Bill out of the floor and pass it. I'm not going to tell you how we're going to pay for it just yet."

Sandack: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?"

Arroyo: "No."

Sandack: "You mean, you could. You're just aren't going to."

Arroyo: "Something like that."

Sandack: "Yeah. To the Bill. In a moment of unguarded candor, we just got really what this process is all about. Pass this Appropriation Bill, but I'm not going to tell you how we're going to pay for it. Wow. Is that sensationally unworthy of this chamber? Yeah. I had to temper that, didn't I? Is that sensationally unworthy of this chamber? We'll get to it when we're good and ready. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, I want to... I want to ask you the question. You really don't know how we're going to pay for anything in this portion of the budget, do you?"

Arroyo: "No."

Kay: "And so, the... the bottom line is that the only thing you really care about is spending money. But you don't care about how we're going to pay for the expenditures? Is that not correct?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "I care about passing a budget."

Kay: "Yeah. I... I..."

Arroyo: "So, this is what I'm attempting to do now."

Kay: "Well, this is kind... Yeah. This is kind of the good, bad and the ugly all wrapped into one here. So, let me... let me understand this. You're talking about a sum of money that you'd like to spend and you think it's for good reason, but you have no idea, no idea whatsoever, as to how we're going to pay for this Bill."

Arroyo: "Representative, I don't spend any of the money. We just give the authority for the agencies to spend it."

Kay: "You just give it away."

Arroyo: "Not me."

Kay: "Okay. Do you think the Governor can print enough money to
 cover his request?"

Arroyo: "Well, he would have to buy the machine or ... "

Kay: "He'd have to buy the machine."

Arroyo: "Yeah."

Kay: "Yeah, right. Okay. I'm going to echo my colleague's
comment."

Arroyo: "To vote 'yes'."

Kay: "No. It's appalling. It is appalling to stand here today and violate not only a House Resolution that we said we were going to adhere to, but furthermore, violate the Constitution and stand here in front of the general public and the press and the citizens of the State of Illinois and say, we're going to spend money we don't have. Now, maybe you know something I don't know, but the last time I checked, the only place they

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

print money is Washington, D.C. You have no clue as to how this is going to get done and that's just simply wrong."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Manley. Must have been calling a Page over. Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. You know, I can't wait to pay my bills this year for this month. I'll simply tell the Chase card, I'm not going to tell you how I'm going to pay for it, but I'll let you know when. Maybe... maybe I'll make some more money this month, maybe not. I'm not going to tell you. Representative, are you kidding me? You're not going to tell me how you're going to spend the taxpayers' money or the people of the fighting 45th District. Are you not going to tell me, Representative?"

Arroyo: "Like I said, I don't tell you how to..."

Reboletti: "You're not going to tell me, Representative?"

Arroyo: "No."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, what an injustice here on the House Floor. This isn't monopoly money. This is the peoples' hard-earned money to run State Government. And when I can't get answers, there should be 117 'no' votes, 'cause I assume the Sponsor will vote for his own Bill. There's absolutely no reason to vote for something when I don't know how it's going to be paid for and the Sponsor's not going to tell me how to pay for it. So, I urge an extremely 'no' vote... I'm asking for a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti has asked for a verification. Mr. Arroyo to close, if you wish."

Arroyo: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. Well, Dennis, can I... can I talk about that for a minute? I think that I'm going to have the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

agency spend the money. I can't tell you how to spend the money. Does anybody authorize any Legislators to spend taxpayers' money?"

Speaker Lang: "And Mr. Arroyo, I think we have your problem resolved. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my Motion for a verification at this time."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Dennis."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Cloonen. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Don't sit down, Mr. Arroyo. House Bill 6078, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6078, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 68... 6078 Metropolitan Pier Expansion Authority doesn't have no GRF. So, I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Be happy to..."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. 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? Morrison, Willis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6079, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6079, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "House... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6079, Law Enforcement Training Standard Board, also doesn't have no GRF. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Dunkin, Leitch. Take the record. There are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6080, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6080, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6080, Fire Marshal, also doesn't have no GRF. Be happy to answer any questions. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6081, Mr. Arroyo. You're on a roll, Sir. Please read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6081, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6081, Workmen's Compensation. No GRF. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Costello, Sente. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6082, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6082, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6082, State Police Merit Board. Be happy to answer any questions, a little bit."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6083, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6083, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6083 the Sports Facility. No GRF."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 12 of the Calendar, House Bill 6084. Mr. Clerk, can you put this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6084, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Arroyo, has been approved for consideration."

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

Arroyo: "The Amendment is... the Amendment is a revenue neutral by shifting some GRF dollars including the Franklin County Meth Program from at 1.2 million to reduce the line, so it's already deployed to make sure revenue neutral."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "So, there are changes to the GRF expenditures in this.

Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "We increase the county meth and then reduced another line, so."

Fortner: "So, after the changes, what I have as the General Funds expenditure is 31,254,800. Is that the same number that you or your..."

Arroyo: "Yes, correct."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Fortner: "...staff have? I see nodding head. So, that... so, that there's as much going up as going down. So, it's the same as..."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Fortner: "...expenditure as in committee. Thank you."

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

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 60... 6084, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6084, Criminal Justice Authority... Information Authority. No GRF, yes. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, just a couple points of clarification here.

One of the things that was decreased this year in this particular department's budget was a \$5 million decrease in the Chicago Area Project. Why was that line deleted?"

Arroyo: "We zeroed it out of this budget."

Reis: "And where did it get moved to?"

Arroyo: "I'm not sure. We just zeroed it out."

Reis: "Okay. Well, it went to the Department of Human Services.

And that was with Representative Greg Harris. So, we know where that one's going. Fifteen million dollars in Community

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

-based Violence Prevention Programs is deleted. Why was that?"

Arroyo: "Zeroed out."

Reis: "Why was that?"

Arroyo: "Our committee thought we didn't need to have it there."

Reis: "Okay. Where did that move to?"

Arroyo: "We just zeroed it out. I don't know where it went."

"We'll talk about that one later. It's going to the Reis: Department of Labor. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. Both of these things that I'm talking about are... were the centerpiece of the Governor's NRI program. And originally, that was put in another area and two years ago with all of your help, we commissioned the audit, took that money away from that group, and put it in this particular group because they had a good track record of doing it. So, with all your help, we've started a performance audit on that as well. And now, here we are moving it to another agency. Now, how on earth are we expected, and the people expected of Illinois, to know that RFPs are being issued right, that timecards are being issued right, that this money is truly going to neighborhoods that have the highest crime and not going to the neighborhoods who have the most powerful aldermen? I don't understand why we keep moving this around. So, why was it that our Appropriations Committee decided to from ICJIA again? That was a question, Representative."

Arroyo: "Well, I didn't... I didn't get the question. Could you repeat that?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Reis: "Why are we moving it again? I mean, it's just... it's going to be hard to track, another agency is going to take this over and maybe not do the things that all of us in this chamber want them to do."

Arroyo: "Well, we zeroed it out of this committee. When we get to the other Bill where you say the money is, the Department of Labor, then we can address that."

Reis: "No. I want to know why it was decided it on... in this committee to move it out. We have to start there before..."

Arroyo: "We just never funded it."

Reis: "You just didn't want to fund it."

Arroyo: "We didn't fund it, not that we didn't want to fund it."

Reis: "Why?"

Arroyo: "Some Members wanted to fund it."

Reis: "Why did we move it out?"

Arroyo: "It was introduced by the Governor, zero."

Reis: "Did you ask the Governor why he wanted to move it out? So, he could send out another press release, he ended the program again."

Arroyo: "Dave, if you remember, we talked about this last year and we were the ones that moved it. And we would... you were in agreeing of moving it to ICJIA, yourself."

Reis: "I know."

Arroyo: "So, our committee together..."

Reis: "But I'm not in agreement for moving it again. We felt that ICJIA was doing the right thing. We were going to find out what the performance audit."

Arroyo: "We didn't move..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Reis: "It just seems like we just keep moving this thing around. Why don't we just stop the funding?"

Arroyo: "That is your interpretation. We did stop the funding. We did not move the money or we did not move the program, the violence prevention program anywhere. It was zeroed out."

Reis: "It is going to show up in the Department of Labor, House Bill 6090. We'll talk about it later."

Arroyo: "That is not a violence prevention program, the Department of Labor."

Reis: "We'll discuss that with the Sponsor of that Bill. You know, we're looking for places to cut, all of us say we are and many of you over there are voting 'no' 'cause you say the budget hasn't got the right priorities. I wanted to include this in the Resolution this year that we would freeze all these funds until we found out that they were spending right. Staff on the other side of the aisle came to me and said we'd like to remove that language. Okay. I said we'll talk about it during the budgeting process. Well, this is the budgeting process. We're not ending that program. We're just simply moving it to another agency."

Arroyo: "That program is zeroed out. It's not being moved."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cavaletto: "I... I received about 17 documents from the Criminal Justice Information Authority and really I can't... I can't trace a lot of the numbers, Representative, and maybe we can sit down and go through some of those? But I want to know

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

that the 10 million for the after school program, was that a good program?"

Arroyo: "I believe so."

Cavaletto: "Why... then are... is it being deleted?"

Arroyo: "It's not. We're funding it at \$10 million."

Cavaletto: "You're... we're... It's an after school program, Chicago
Area Project funds deleted. But where's the 10 million? It'll
stay in there... it's going to stay there then?"

Arroyo: "It says after school programs at 10 million. That's in there."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Can... can you just tell me a little bit about what that program does?"

Arroyo: "I believe it's for after school programs."

Cavaletto: "I know, but... Luis, come on. And you know, I want to say something. I didn't... I didn't vote to get rid of anything in the Approps-Public Safety. I didn't... we didn't have any votes to get rid of anything. I never voted for one. I don't think anybody ever voted. It was a consensus thing, but we never... you never asked. And you know, I don't think we voted to get rid of anything."

Arroyo: "Well, some of the things we... we zeroed out, but some..."

Cavaletto: "No, Luis, we... Yeah, I know, but we didn't vote."

Arroyo: "The Governor... the Governor zeroed out some of the programs in ICJIA."

Cavaletto: "Well, but the Governor was never in... I never did see the Governor in an Approps meeting. I never did see him there.

Now, I don't know when he did this, but you know, that's between you and him. But I think that... I just, you know, the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

10 million it's a lot of dollars and if it's doing good for kids, then I'm for it. I'm not against it."

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Cavaletto: "But I'd just like to know kind of what they do. They keep them in school and do they learn... do they read more or do they do math? What do they do? Do they go outside and play on a playground?"

Arroyo: "Well, there's a... there's a sep... a bunch of different things that they do. K-12, there's a lot of after school bilingual education. I mean, there's... there's an arue... of programs. I have a list here, I can give you that. They just give..."

Cavaletto: "I would... I would be interested in seeing it. The money's well-spent, I'm not against that. But if the money is being done like it has been before then, I'm against it. But if there's an improvement and it's for kids and it's saving kids' lives, then I'm for that. But I'm not for wasting money. Okay. One other thing, and the contractual services increase is \$25 thousand for the Franklin Meth Center up to 175 thousand. What... what was I... why was that increase put in?"

Arroyo: "What was the line you said, Repre..."

Cavaletto: "The contractual services increase is at \$25 thousand for the Franklin Meth Center, which increases it 175 thousand. So, why... why was that added to that? And that's already was over a million two and you increased it."

Arroyo: "I think it was a million... it was a million and we raised it up 200 thousand. Oh, it's... it's flat."

Cavaletto: "You kept it at a million dollars?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "We kept it at 1.2. That's what it was in 2014. So, we just kept that flat."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Just a minute. The Chicago Area Project, what did you do with that one?"

Arroyo: "That zeroed out."

Cavaletto: "Zeroed out. Okay. The Chicago Area Project addition."

Arroyo: "Zeroed out."

Cavaletto: "Zeroed out. I've still got a hundred and seventy-seven here, a hundred and seventy-seven thousand."

Arroyo: "You've probably got the wrong piece of paper."

Cavaletto: "Okay."

Arroyo: "We... we go... we get those weekly."

Cavaletto: "All right. Then my mistake. What about the Illinois Family Violence Coordinator?"

Arroyo: "That's still funded."

Cavaletto: "Still funded, okay. It's half a million. What about the VPA Violence Prevention grants, \$1 million?"

Arroyo: "That's zeroed out."

Cavaletto: "Zeroed out. Didn't get... it's not anywhere else?"

Arroyo: "Nope."

Cavaletto: "Okay. What about the Bullying Prevention?"

Arroyo: "The Bullying... some of the Members had a request to raise it, so we raised it to 650 from 2 and some change."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Can you tell me how effective that program is and what they do?"

Arroyo: "Well, it's getting more attention in our schools as having... they're having more kids getting bullied than before. So, a lot of our Members have a concern, so it's growing. So, we want to be able to increase the funding."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Cavaletto: "But how... how are they doing it? How are they adding more teachers or what?"

Arroyo: "Well, probably..."

Cavaletto: "I mean, are they... what kind of programs?"

Arroyo: "...counselors... counselors and... They didn't have the money.

Now, when we give them the money now, we're going to make

sure that they have more counselors and they kind of look

into more of the bullying 'cause there's a... It's a program

that hasn't been looked at as much."

Cavaletto: "Well, I agree that the bullying must be stopped. Back in my day, each individual used to take care of themselves. But anyhow, I think that the… I thank you, Luis. And it was good at working with you with… in times. In times, it wasn't good."

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Cavaletto: "But good luck."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Representative Luis or... I think you are a great person and you have a very powerful committee and you have some very powerful programs that you are in charge of. But I want to tell you, since 2007 about 246 people have been killed in the Austin community. So, and that's the area where I live and I represent. And so, to hear that after school programs have been cut and Adult Redeploy has been increased sort of troubles me. So, I'm going to ask you a question about after school programs and Adult Redeploy. How can I explain to my

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

community that these programs would benefit them if I vote for your budget?"

Arroyo: "Representative, the after school program was not cut."

Ford: "Okay."

Arroyo: "We put \$10 million in there for after school programs."

Ford: "Good. Now, how much of that..."

Arroyo: "So, that was not."

Ford: "...how much of that will go to the 8th District?"

Arroyo: "We can give you the breakdown for that. We don't have the... I don't have that in my papers."

Ford: "Well, can... Okay. You may not have it now, but can you tell me on record that it will benefit the 8th District?"

Arroyo: "Sure, sure. The agency... you should have a meeting with the agency and let them know that and we can talk about that later on."

Ford: "So, once again, like I said, you're very... your committee is very powerful. I got to read to you some numbers and these numbers may not be up to date, but in Chicago in 2011, 441 people were killed; in 2012, 212... in 2012, 537 were killed; and in 2013, 464, and I don't have the number that's still going up in Chicago to date. But I also have to tell you that in 2011, 2,217 people were shot; in 2012, 2,670 people were shot; and in 2013, a 2,571 were shot across Chicago. That's just Chicago. And so, your committee is very, very valuable to the people of Illinois. And I hope that you, after passing this budget, work with the agencies to make sure that these funds are directed to the areas where they're needed most. And I appeal to you today that you make sure that the 8th

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

District is a part of that. And I need your commitment, if you want me to vote for your budget."

Arroyo: "I would be happy to talk to the agency, but there's a RFP process to be able to follow who gets the money. But I'll be happy to sit down with you and the agency and let them know that you have a problem in your district, La Shawn. And we also raised the CeaseFire money and that's also another portion that CeaseFire was cut down to 4.7 million and we raised it to 6.2, so..."

Ford: "It's not important that we just keep raising things. What's important is that we direct them where they need to be. And so..."

Arroyo: "We can do that."

Ford: "...that's what I'm asking you and."

Arroyo: "We can do that."

Ford: "So, you're telling me that you will sit down with me and the directors of these agencies so that we can make sure that the 8th District is represented in these funding appropriations to come to my district?"

Arroyo: "I will sit down with you..."

Ford: "And the..."

Arroyo: "...have that meeting to talk about that."

Ford: "All right. Also, I just wanted to leave this with you.

That the weekend there were about 9 people killed and at least
36 wounded in Chicago and 6 of them were children. So, I just
wanted to remind you that your job does not end here after
this budget is passed, but it must continue to make sure that
the taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and appropriately in
every community that needs it most."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. To the Bill. I feel compelled to talk about the after school program. To think that anyone in this room would consider cutting that is criminal. That's one of the most vital resources that we have for kids to keep them out of trouble, to save money on prisons down the road. It's unquestionable. I've seen... it's seven very tightly managed areas where they have oversight and they watch to see that every part of the program is covered. They learn to read, math, write, socialize, get along with others so we don't need a bullying program. It goes on and on and on. I couldn't say enough good things about it. And I just felt compelled to let people know that if you vote for the after school program, that is the correct vote to take."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Jakobsson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the record reflect that Representative Bost is excused for the rest of the day?"

Speaker Lang: "The record will so reflect. House Bill 6085, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6085, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6085, Capital Development Board has no GRF. And I ask for an 'aye' vote and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? D'Amico. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6086. Mr. Clerk, place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill, please."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6086, the Bill's been read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Arroyo."

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

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt Amendment 2.

It makes a technical change and also makes an addition from
the Grant Crossing Protection Fund. So, we're just
reinstating some of the fund."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "So, you mentioned there's a transfer involved. Does this affect any of the GRF funds as they were allocated in the original Committee Amendment?"

Arroyo: "No, it does not."

Fortner: "So, the GRF that I had from committee was 5,690,000.

That's still true with this Amendment. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Correct."

Fortner: "Thank you very much."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6086, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6086 is transportation Bill. I'd like to... I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Arroyo: "Debatable."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, B.: "Couple of... Mr. Chairman, I know you work hard on this budget. A couple things that frustrates people are just wasted in efficiency in State Government. And I was wondering, can you tell me what the cost is of the air fleet that we have and how many planes, helicopters are there?"

Arroyo: "I believe the budget is 5.690 and I believe it could be five planes... four planes and a couple of helicopters."

Mitchell, B.: "Couple of helic... we had one down this... this past year. Could... What type of use for the air fleet happens? What do they use it for?"

Arroyo: "I believe there's a shuttle from Springfield to Chicago."

Mitchell, B.: "So, the passengers, they're all human?"

Arroyo: "I hope so."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Mitchell, B.: "I guess, what I heard is that we have passengers that aren't human; they're prairie chickens. We're flying prairie chickens from Kansas to Effingham, Illinois, on state planes. Is that true?"

Arroyo: "You've got better information than I've got."

Mitchell, B.: "Well, I know that, but..."

Arroyo: "If you're looking and seeing prairie chickens, something's wrong."

Mitchell, B.: "Not today, not today. There is... I'll give you... this is... this is several... We're trying to find out just exactly what's happening is, but they are flying, the State of Illinois is using the Division of Aeronautics to fly prairie chickens from Kansas to Effingham, Illinois, to repopulate the prairie of Illinois with prairie chickens. And I just, you know, we're... we're passing the budgets here and we're increasing budgets. I think before we pass something like that we should find the answers. Find the answers. Do I get a response from the Sponsor? When will this Body have an answer whether we're using Air Illinois to fly prairie chickens from Kansas to the State of Illinois?"

Arroyo: "I sure will look into it for you."

Mitchell, B.: "Okay."

Arroyo: "'Cause the last time I was..."

Mitchell, B.: "Can we have that answer before you pass the budget?"

Arroyo: "The last time I was on that plane there was no prairie chickens."

Mitchell, B.: "Well, this is... And there is a grant to fly them, so I just think the Body should be aware that there are waste

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

in efficiencies in this budget. Let's talk a little bit else about there's a... Can you tell me what \$750 thousand for the Latino Family Commission... what does that do?"

Arroyo: "That's the Latino Caucus Initiative and the Latino Family Commission is a nonpartisan, independent state commission that establishes to improve the opportunity to research resource availability to Latino families throughout the state."

Mitchell, B.: "It's in the IDOT budget."

Arroyo: "What's that?"

Mitchell, B.: "It's in the IDOT budget."

Arrovo: "Yes."

Mitchell, B.: "Okay. That... that makes absolute sense, doesn't it?

Well, you... Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it. The point we're making is to the Bill. There's a lot of things in this budget that are waste. And it's just too bad, in the state that has \$5 billion in unpaid bills, that we're doing things like that. And I appreciate the Body's time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor, please?"
Speaker Lang: "Sponsor has all your answers, Sir."

Kay: "I hope so. Representative, I want to follow up on the \$750 thousand grant. There are several Legislators in southern Illinois who have growing communities with growing populations of Hispanic commun... Hispanic citizens who, I guess, I'm... so, I'm just curious knowing that there's at least 2 percent in my district, maybe more so in Representative Beiser and Hoffman's district, I'm curious as to how much of this 750 made its way down south."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "That's an organization that advocates the Latino issues.

If you would state why. Representative, do you want them to
go and advocate in your district? I'm pretty sure they're
happy to go down there."

Kay: "Well, that's not my que... Well, let... let me back up. What's the commission... what is the purpose of the commission?"

Arroyo: "I... I could read it back to you again. I have ... "

Kay: "Just in your own words because maybe we can cut this short."

Arroyo: "Well, they work... they work with the Governor and advocate for Latino families through the... through the State of Illinois. And they work with the Governor close to with concerns of the Latino population in Illinois has."

Kay: "Okay. But has any of that money made it south or has it all stayed up in..."

Arroyo: "I didn't ... I didn't hear that, Dwight."

Kay: "Has all of this grant money stayed up north?"

Arroyo: "No, no. It hasn't stayed anywhere. It's a state-run program. It's goes downstate; it comes east; it goes all over the state. Wherever there's an issue for a Latino family it goes to the commission, Layla Suleiman and you could be able to talk to her about what issues you have in your district and any of the Members here. This is just not a Chicago issue. It's a state issue."

Kay: "Do you... do you know, as an example, Representative districts 112, 113, 111, how much of this money, this 750 thousand..."

Arroyo: "I don't know. I don't know who those districts are and I don't keep track of..."

Kay: "Well, one... one's Representative Hoffman's, one's mine, one's
Representative Beiser's."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "I don't have... I could ask and give you a report from the commission, if you will, to tell you how much of that is spent in that area."

Kay: "Okay. I'll look for that information. I think that's all I
have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "I got some clarification here on a couple increases and expenditures, Representative. On the personnel services cost, we show an increase from 28 million 600 and some change thou... million in FY14 to 45 million... well, let's just say 46 bil... million in FY15. Why was that increase needed?"

Arroyo: "Collective bargaining increases."

Reis: "And that came from the Road Fund?"

Arroyo: "I believe so."

Reis: "How long have we been paying for personnel out of the Road Fund?"

Arroyo: "As long as the Road Fund has been there, I believe..."

Reis: "Maybe your staff can help you with that."

Arroyo: "...for IDOT employees."

Reis: "We didn't... we used to pay labor out of..."

Arroyo: "I..."

Reis: "...GRF. So, now we take it out of the Road Fund and we don't have near as much money to fix the roads. And now, we're increasing it because of contractual obligations and I understand that. Next question is, we're increasing state contributions to the State Employees Retirement System costs

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

for the Road Fund from 11 million to 19 million. What's the reason for that?"

Arroyo: "That's the payment that's required to meet their obligation."

Reis: "Okay. Again, we didn't use to do that, so 19 million, 46 million. Ladies and Gentlemen, that's just a lot of roads that aren't getting fixed anymore. Third item is passenger rail funding and this has been a topic in our committee for years and years. We're increasing that from 38 million to 42 million. Why is that?"

Arroyo: "It's the Federal Government, the Road Fund combination."

Reis: "No, what was the incr... what was the reasoning for the increase..."

Arroyo: "The state contribution..."

Reis: "...to the passenger rail?"

Arroyo: "...for the contra... for the rail."

Reis: "Is this for AMTRAK?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reis: "Okay. We've always had an agreement that part of that came out of the downstate, part of it came out of... of District 1.

Has that changed this year?"

Arroyo: "You're talking about the breakdown, the 45/55?"

Reis: "No."

Arroyo: "Because... because I think that that's an issue that I've always had..."

Reis: "That we... we..."

Arroyo: "...with the Road Fund."

Reis: "...we all know about that. I just want to make sure..."

Arroyo: "And we always..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Reis: "...it's not getting changed this year."

Arroyo: "...and we always leave the Road Fund alone. And you guys don't want to touch the Road Fund. I have an issue with the Road Fund."

Reis: "We... No. We all know about your issues with the Road Fund and we've always given our share of AMTRAK payment out of our Road Fund. I just want to make sure that it's still like that this year."

Arroyo: "Still the same."

Reis: "Okay. What about our RT... our obligations to RTA?"

Arroyo: "They're all the same. All the mass transit agencies are the same."

Reis: "So, all of that payment came out of District 1 and none of it came out of the statewide Road Fund."

Arroyo: "I think so."

Reis: "No, we need to know so."

Arroyo: "What was that?"

Reis: "We need to know that that's the case, again. We've had that agreement for three or four years now that that obligation to make that RTA payment came out of District 1."

Arroyo: "The agreement hasn't changed."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "I was looking at the same data that Representative Reis was just talking about and I find it troublesome. I mean, when you've got about 17 million more going to public employees and I'd like to know how much were their raises? Do

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

you know how much their raises were for those employees? Do we have any break out on the Road Fund?"

Arroyo: "The bargaining pressures for them were about \$15 million."

Ives: "Fifteen million dollars' worth. For how many employees?"

Arroyo: "For FY15."

Ives: "Who... who's covered under this particular thing? Is it everybody in IDOT? Is this the employee raises for everybody?"

Arroyo: "About 40 employees..."

Ives: "Forty employees..."

Arroyo: "...4800."

Ives: "...got 15 million more?"

Arroyo: "Give me a minute."

Ives: "Well, while you're looking that up, how many of those guys were political hires, so that Shakman had to refile his lawsuit for IDOT? How many of those people are the political hires that they've been talking about in the newspapers?"

Arroyo: "I don't... I don't monitor that political hires. I don't monitor that. All I do is try to pass a budget."

Ives: "Well, could I get..."

Arroyo: "The agency would have to do that."

Ives: "...could I get a listing of the names of the people that are involved? This is a lot of money. This is nothing to just, you know, say we're going to pass a budget on without knowing what were the raises, how many employees affected, who are the people getting these? Because you're talking about a Road Fund and our roads are crumbling. And we've went through a bitter hard winter. Every dollar needs to be spent appropriately."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "I don't have that answer for you."

Ives: "Can you get it to us..."

Arroyo: "I sure can."

Ives: "...before we vote on this? That's the problem with this. All this information landed on our desk 24 hours ago and nobody can answer any of these questions on the floor about very important issues. And I don't happen to sit in this committee and hear all the debate, but I'll tell you what, we're still affected by all the... the budgeting that goes on in your committee. And I haven't had the time to actually drill down into the numbers and look at it, but when I look at our analysis and I find that we're spending 8 million more just on pensions in one line item in one department, I'll tell you what, we haven't done enough pension reform yet. We're not even close 'cause we can't afford this. I don't see why we're voting on anything like this when we don't even have... you can't answer the questions. It's ridiculous. Vote 'no' on all of this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay, you spoke during debate. Please pro...

Please proceed."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One question, Representative. Are we still paying workers' compensation claims for the state out of the Road Fund?"

Arroyo: "I believe there's a small portion. I don't have the exact amount."

Kay: "Well, let me... let me help you on the small part. Would you... would you say it's between 10 and 20 million, 20 to 40 million or over 40 million dollars?"

Arroyo: "It's not in this Bill, but I think it's gone down."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Kay: "Well, not exactly. Fifty million, at least, is the threshold and it's not gone down because you still got claims settled... to settle out there. And I would suggest to you that you..."

Arroyo: "We'll get the number for you."

Kay: "...yeah, I appreciate that. But not only look at the number of claims that are open past two, three, four years, but also then look at the claims that are being settled and the amounts, the values and bring that back to us because... first of all, I don't understand why it's coming out of the Road Fund. Secondly, it suggest to me that we're trying to portray that we're doing things safer and better and we're protecting our workers and all we're doing is hiding it in the Road Fund. So, I'd appreciate your assistance on that, Representative."

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Jackson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Jakobsson: "I would like the General Assembly to look up in back of me. This is Dr. Rebecca Ginsburg. She's from the University of Illinois, but she's here today to talk to our joint subject matter only committees with the Restorative Justice Committee and Higher Education because she directs a program at the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Department of Corrections called the Education Justice Project. And I think it's very appropriate that she's here today. We're talking about funding education. We're talking about the effects of incarceration or education. Very often, it's one or the other and she's trying to make sure that people do get their educations even if they are incarcerated. In fact, they get degrees from the University of Illinois. So, let's remember to come to the meeting. I'm sure that the House Clerk will remind us what time that's going to be after Session. And let's give her a great big warm welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for being with us. House Bill 6087. Mr. Clerk, please place this on the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6087, 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 Arroyo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to adopt Amendment 2. It makes a technical... a technical change to House Amendment... and it'll make... Amendment 1 omits language dealing with the Social Security and this Amendment reinstates it, the language. I would like to adopt that Amendment, Amendment 2."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Again, just confirming, it sounds pretty clear this time. There's no other fund changes. This is just some technical language. So, this Amendment would leave..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "It would... it was a technical error and we're correcting it. No funding changing."

Fortner: "So, the dollar amount I had from committee which was 1,294,848,000 from the General Fund. That's still true..."

Arroyo: "That's still the same..."

Fortner: "...with this Amendment."

Arroyo: "...same number I have."

Fortner: "Thank you. And I guess it's too bad because at this point we have appropriated today 33 billion, 558 million roughly in General Revenue Funds. I was hoping that I'd hear a smaller number on this. We had agreed by Resolution on a revenue estimate of 34,494... 34 billion 495 million. This Bill with this Amendment will take us over that agreed estimate. So, sorry to see that, but I think we knew this was coming from the get-go from what we heard in committees. 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: "House Bill 6087, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6087 is the Correction Bill. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Reboletti: "Representative, what's the difference in spending from last year in GRF to this year for the Department of Corrections?"

Arroyo: "Almost 80 million."

Reboletti: "Additional \$80 million?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reboletti: "What is that..."

Arroyo: "No. I think it was 90 million."

Reboletti: "Ninety million dollars."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reboletti: "What's that additional dollars going to be used for?"

Arroyo: "Well, we... we moved some money around from what the Governor's request was. I can go line by line and go over them, but I believe that it made... it made compensation."

Reboletti: "How much was that?"

Arroyo: "I think that the most of the pressures was due to collective bargaining and a headcount increase."

Reboletti: "Are there any additional facilities that are going to be reopening?"

Arroyo: "Joliet and Murphysboro."

Reboletti: "And how much will those cost?"

Arroyo: "I believe Murphysboro would be 9 million to start. And Joliet will be 1.6 in startup cost."

Reboletti: "And what will those costs be moving forward into next year, then, into fiscal year '15?"

Arroyo: "When it's fully operational, it will be about 30 million."

Reboletti: "Does this..."

Arroyo: "In FY16."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Reboletti: "...does this address any of the concerns of the inmate population when we know that we have at least probably 4,500 inmates over the recommended amount of how many inmates we should be having in our facilities? I know that that's been a major concern that the federal courts may begin to monitor us and tell us how to manage the inmate population. Does this address that at all?"

Arroyo: "I don't think that this was be to address the overcrowded, but it'll help."

Reboletti: "Nothing further. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cavaletto: "Representative, I know we talked about this opening Murphysboro. It's mainly going to be for DUI offenders. Is that right?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Cavaletto: "And what is the number you expect for that?"

Arroyo: "Twenty-five hundred non-DUI... violent."

Cavaletto: "Twenty-five hundred?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Then do you know how many jobs that will provide down in southern Illinois?"

Arroyo: "I think it would be 102 staff. And we don't know how much would be new employees."

Cavaletto: "Now, there'll be... there'll be times when there'll be certain inmates there only like for maybe three months, six months. The length of time that someone would be required to stay there. Do you have any idea how that's going to run? And

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

then, with the staff, if you get a staff of say 225 and then we're down to say 1500 inmates for that, how we going to handle that situation? When they're going to come and go so fast I would think that they would not keep them that long. How we going to manage that the… that situation with hiring people and then keeping a big staff?"

Arroyo: "You're probably right. They might be in there two months, three months, five months. It could fluctuate up or down. I really don't know what normally a judge would give you for a DUI now-a-days. And that's kind of more of an administrative question. I wouldn't know."

Cavaletto: "And also, these people would not be really..."

Arroyo: "Nonviolent."

Cavaletto: "...nonviolent people. So, I guess, then, probably it won't take as many people to work there. There won't... probably won't have to... there won't be that many jobs."

Arroyo: "Probably not. It won't be like a regular prison."

Cavaletto: "All right. I have one other question with the Corrections. And I think it was probably got a little contentious yesterday with the nursing facilities in the situation. Of course, you're aware of that? And the hospital services is \$6,483,000 and the pharmacies... the pharmacy and the drugs for the Corrections is \$1,800,000?"

Arroyo: "You were talking... Are you talking..."

Cavaletto: "I'm asking... I'm asking a question on that if you don't feel that that's quite high for that."

Arroyo: "Well, if you're talking about what the conversation we had in committee, where Rentschler, the pharmaceutical company..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Cavaletto: "Yes."

Arroyo: "We're going to ask them to come back and we're going to get all those figures correct because I think the Nurse's Association has a problem with them, the way they administer the drugs and all that."

Cavaletto: "Well, I don't know. But \$6 million for hospitalization services is quite a lot of money and I understand a million eight hundred thousand for pharmaceutical drugs is quite high. And from what I understand from the people who spoke yesterday, there's a lot of waste and I think we ought to look at that and try to reduce that cost."

Arroyo: "I believe so."

Cavaletto: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6088, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6088, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6088, Juvenile Justice. Well, I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Just a quick question. Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Ford: "Representative, I just need to know why Cook County is struggling to get redeploy for juveniles. And I know it's in different parts of the state, but for some reason, is it funded for Cook County or is it not funded?"

Arroyo: "Representative, I believe that Adult Redeploy is not in House Bill 6088."

Ford: "No, juvenile. Redeploy for juveniles."

Arroyo: "No, that... that was in the previous Bill that we called and passed already."

Ford: "This is just for the... this is..."

Arroyo: "This is just for Juvenile Justice."

Ford: "Right. That's why I was asking about the Juvenile Justice.

So, there's redeploy for juveniles and there's redeploy for adults. My question is..."

Arroyo: "Youth Redeploy..."

Ford: "Yes."

Arroyo: "...is in DHS."

Ford: "It's in DHS?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Ford: "Okay. Good. I just wanted... I know that we fund it. I'm not sure if it's in this budget, but the problem that I wanted to make the point is that adult is being funded in Cook County, but Juvenile Redeploy is not. It's funded, but we're not operating it in Cook County. And I hope that we can all come together to urge the people in Cook County to bring it to Cook County because I know that Representative Dennis Reboletti he's doing a good job with juveniles with... with what is it... Juvenile Redeploy in DuPage. So, I hope that we can bring it to Cook County because I believe it's a real

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

good effort to help direct juveniles out of the criminal justice system. Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Chapa LaVia: "Representative Arroyo, could you tell me exactly how much we spend per child in Juvenile Justice? Do you have that number?"

Arroyo: "Not... not right off hand, I don't."

Chapa LaVia: "Can you... can your staff get that number to me. I'm very curious 'cause I've been using the number of \$111 thousand per year to fund a child in... in the Juvenile Justice Department. which we should be educating them early so they don't end up there. Also, is the number for their education dollars in this budget or does it appear in... in the Elementary and Secondary Ed line items?"

Arroyo: "There's a school district portion in this and we'll also get you both of those information."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. So, you don't have them broken down?"

Arroyo: "Not in front of me, no."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Flowers: "Representative, you know what really concerns me about this particular budget is that the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice spends \$111 thousand per youth that's incarcerated. And we only spend \$7 thousand for Redeploy Illinois or less than \$7 thousand. And that really concerns

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

me considering that they are under a federal watch. And under the federal watch, there's just a few things that they're required to do and if they were to do that, maybe we can cut back on that \$111 thousand. Just to give you an example, one of the commitments that they said that they would do is to make sure that individualized mental health treatment plans incoordination of treatment would be done. DJJ shall, within 100 days of entry of this remedy plan, ensure uniform policies and procedures are in place. I don't think it has been done importantly, there's supposed to More individualized youth development plan that DJJ is supposed to have implemented. That has not been done. So, this ... as far as special education policies and procedures DJJ is supposed to do that within 180 days. So, all these things that's causing young people to be incarcerated longer, when all we have to do is put together a plan so they can get out. It's not happening. So, DJJ... the seven years that they have been in existence has cost this state millions and millions of dollars. And I believe that we really would have been better off had we not created this program because if this program was not in existence, we would not have the ACLU having a federal watch to watch over the State of Illinois to make us comply with the State Law in regards to our children. So, with that being said, how much is this budget again?"

Arroyo: "GRF is \$121,69... 659,200."

Flowers: "Well, you know what, how many kids are we talking about?"

Arroyo: "Over a thousand."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Flowers: "Well, you... Over a thousand that we're spending \$111 thousand... Mr... Excuse me. I will not be supporting this legislation because there's laws that they should be implementing to get those children out and they refuse to do so. They're keeping them in, but they will not be doing so with my vote today. Thank you very much and I appreciate that."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, what's the difference in FY14 to FY15, the spending?"

Arroyo: "For six... for GRF is about \$6 million, total."

Reboletti: "And what is that supposed to be used for? What's the intention of the department?"

Arroyo: "There's a 2 percent increase in COLAs, collective bargaining and some headcount."

Reboletti: "And what is some head count? What does that mean? Would those be educators for the youth that are there? I know there's a lot of programs..."

Arroyo: "It..."

Reboletti: "...that are not being implemented or carried out."

Arroyo: "For the head count, it's about a hundred... hundred... they want to phase that in... within time."

Reboletti: "But with that head count, who... who would the department being hiring? What... what type of employee would be going to work at DJJ?"

Arroyo: "Correctional officers."

Reboletti: "All correctional officers. No other..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "The majority, I believe."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have it on good authority that we have now appropriated well beyond \$34.4 billion. Indeed, we're just hovering near \$35 billion. Lest anyone have any concerns about the fact that we're now above the agreed upon ceiling that everyone in this chamber thought was a good conservative number. It was... it was an agreement we made. A Resolution that we passed that was while not, maybe not, binding in all respects but certainly needs some level of honoring. I think three weeks after we made that Resolution we ought to honor it right now. I think we ought to stop this process, stop spending money we don't have. To go forward and continue to appropriate dollars makes a sham..."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 80, the ink on it is barely dry and we're going to blow right by it if we continue to appropriate more dollars. I know we haven't gotten to higher education. There's still other Appropriation Bills, but the fact of the matter is, right where we are right now proves our process is fatally flawed and we should not venture forward any further. I highly suggest we turn this process off. We stop and we start doing it the right way. The way families and businesses conduct themselves which is revenue first then spending. Vote 'no'. In fact, vote 'no' going forward on all the rest of the Bills. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to let you know that we have blown through our agreed to budget. We're now \$34,800,000,000. And I would say in colloquial terms, as most people are familiar, we're breaking bad. Thank you very much."
Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke, Sims. Mr. Clerk, please... take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

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

passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, when this backwards process began, we were to spend about \$34.5 billion. Now, we've reached that limit and here is the agencies and the functions of State Government that we have not yet funded, so I assume that these folks will receive zero dollars for the rest of the year because we don't have any more money based on an almost unanimous Resolution about spending levels. Let me go through these agencies and groups. Under the public safety banner the Department of Juvenile Justice would not be funded. The Illinois State Police would not be funded. Military Affairs would not be funded. The Department of Labor would not be funded. The Appellate Prosecutor would not be funded. And for those who talk about the need for reforming and spending on higher education, we can tell all of our universities that they're shut down as of next month. All universities, zero dollars. I can only imagine what tuition would be. ISAC, zero.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

ICCB, zero. IBHE, zero. Imagine what student loans would be if the families of the state had to bear the entire burden. This General Assembly should receive a zero based on this process. Start over. There's wet marks all over your papers, the grade is F. This place is a disgrace right now of what we're doing with peoples' tax dollars."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to congratulate the men and women of this House for doing their duties and following their constitutional obligations. We have met our revenue number which we passed unanimously 118 to 0 back in February on a \$34.5 billion budget. Congratulations, men and women of this chamber. Job well done. I got a sneaky feeling we're not going to finish though. I just want to point out a few things. One of them, specially, is a thing called the Constitution of the State of Illinois. It's generally called the foundation of what we do here in the State of Illinois and in this building. Section 2 under the State Finance Act, Section (b), the General Assembly by law shall make appropriations for all expenditures of public funds by the state. Pay attention to this. Appropriations for a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during that year. Ladies and Gentlemen, by a vote of 118 to 0 we approved, under House Joint Resolution 80, that \$34.5 billion. Now, a few votes back on House Bill 6084, Representative Scherer stated that if you voted against this Bill it would be a crime. I voted against it. I guess I have committed a crime.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

But I will tell you this. Last January, two Januarys ago, we were all on the same stage over at Sangamon University. We all took the same oath of office and that we were going to follow the Constitution of the United States, but also the Constitution of the State of Illinois. Representative Scherer, your vote which you just took, how would you characterize your vote? Now, that we have completed our work, Mr. Speaker, I move that pursuant to House Rule 66 that we adjourn until tomorrow. And I am joined by 5 Members of this side of the aisle and my colleagues and request a recorded Roll Call vote pursuant to Rule 49."

Speaker Lang: "The Minority Leader... the Mi... Can I state the Motion and then I'll recognize you? The Minority Leader has moved that the House stand adjourn. He's within his rights to make that Motion. Mr. Reboletti, do you have something you wish to say about the Motion?"

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I ask for a verification of that Motion.

I ask for a Roll Call vote and a verification of it."

Speaker Lang: "Both of those will be acknowledged. The Motion is, by Mr. Durkin, that the House stand adjourned. This takes more 'ayes' than 'noes'. Those in favor of the Gentleman'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 43 voting 'yes', 71 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. House Bill 6089, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Reboletti, you're correct. Do you persist? Mr. Clerk, please read... I assume you want to verify the 'no' votes, Sir? Mr. Clerk, please read the 'no' votes."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Clerk Hollman: "The following Representatives voted against the Motion. Representative Acevedo; Representative Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Berrios; Representative Bradley; Representative Daniel Burke; Kelly Burke; Representative Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Cloonen; Conroy; Representative Representative Costello; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Monique Davis; Representative William Representative DeLuca; Representative Representative Dunkin; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Franks; Representative Gabel; Representative Golar; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greq Harris; Representative Hernandez; Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Jackson; Representative Jakobsson; Representative Jefferson; Representative Jones: Representative Kifowit; Representative Lang; Representative Lilly; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mautino; Representative Mavfield; Representative McAsey; Representative Christian Mitchell; Representative Moeller; Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman; Representative Representative Phelps; Representative Riley; Representative Representative Scherer; Representative Rita; Representative Sims; Representative Smiddy; Representative Representative Soto; Representative Tabares; Thapedi; Representative Representative Turner;

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Representative Verschoore; Representative Walsh;
Representative Welch; Representative Williams;
Representative Willis; Representative Yingling;
Representative Zalewski and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my Motion for a verification. I assume here that with 71 people who want to spend zero dollars, I guess we should be able to move forward if we're going to continue in the Order of Budget Bills."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman withdraws his Motion. House Bill 6089, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill. 6089, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6089, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6089 is a Bill for the State Police. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Mr. Speaker, can you please excuse JoAnn Osmond and Renee Kosel from the Republican side, please."

Speaker Lang: "That will be done, Sir."

Sullivan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, would you agree with me now that we have now spent more than what the Resolution, which passed unanimously at 34 and a half billion dollars, would you agree that we've exceeded that amount right now?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "I... I can't hear you. There's too much noise in here.

Dennis."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, would you agree with me that we've just spent over the \$34.5 billion that this General... this House agreed upon back in the spring that we were going to allocate for all of the departments and all of the agencies? Would you agree with me, Representative?"

Arroyo: "The General Assembly hasn't spent anything yet."

Reboletti: "Appropriated, Representative."

Arroyo: "Appropriated."

Reboletti: "How's that?"

Arroyo: "This is the step... the first step in the process. You have another chamber and the Governor, so..."

Reboletti: "Well, I... I appreciate that, Representative, and I hope the process works unlike the process that we've been engaging in here. So, how are we going to fund the State Police without the tax hike, Representative, when we all agreed that 34 and a half billion dollars is what this state would take in, in revenue to spend for the next fiscal year? Are we going to discuss that at a later time?"

Arroyo: "I could only talk about the \$1.8 billion that is my committee, Dennis. I can't go into what the total amount is going to be."

Reboletti: "Well, I... I'd like to go into that, Representative. We just talked about 34 and a half billion dollars have been allocated based on the numbers that you and others have presented from your side of the aisle. So, now, we don't have a couple billion dollars to fund the State Police. So, again, I'm going to ask, where's the money coming from?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "Dennis, all I can tell you about is the State Police's budget. We gave them the Governor's request. We're going to put two new cad... two cadet classes in the State Police."

Reboletti: "Is there additional dollars here for the State Police this year compared to last year?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reboletti: "How much additional spending?"

Arroyo: "About \$29 million that's GRF."

Reboletti: "What's the reason for the extra \$29 million?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reboletti: "What would that be used on?"

Arroyo: "Excuse me?

Reboletti: "What will the additional \$29 million, that we don't have, what will that be used on?"

Arroyo: "Personal services, major increase in collective bargaining pressures."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. It's extremely frustrating when we've already reached our spending limit and now, we're going to continue down this primrose path and we'll all pretend that there'll be additional revenue somewhere. No one has indicated in this chamber or the chamber across the hall or on the second floor as to how we're going to pay for it. So, it's hard to appropriate dollars in this chamber without a revenue stream. I'm not sure of any family that all of a sudden starts out and says, well, we made \$34,500 this year. I think we'll spend \$37,500 this year and that's just to get started. And maybe we'll figure out, in three months or three weeks, how to raise the additional revenue. This process is a sham. It's the same process that we use when we don't lift

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

the concealed carry Bill. We're going to work backwards to the front. There's no rhyme or reason that we have 65 budget Bills. We haven't done it here in the last eight years that I've been here. I'm not sure what the political reasons are for this. The fact of the matter is that the state's taking in more money than last year and instead of paying down old bills, freezing spending, we're back to the same old tricks. We'll talk about revenue later. Later is now, Representative. We don't have any money so I guess we cannot fund the Illinois State Police."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cavaletto: "Representative, how... how many district headquarters did we close?"

Arroyo: "None."

Cavaletto: "Whoa, whoa, whoa."

Arroyo: "This year?"

Cavaletto: "Last year."

Arroyo: "None."

Cavaletto: "The year before."

Arroyo: "None."

Cavaletto: "Oh, yes, we did."

Arroyo: "I believe we... we don't have the exact numbers now, but I don't believe we closed any."

Cavaletto: "With the..."

Arroyo: "There was some issues with communications that we..."

Cavaletto: "Did we... Yeah, yeah. How many... how many of those did we shuffle around?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "I don't know at this time."

Cavaletto: "Well, there was a few of them that was... that was closed. And we were supposed to save money from those. Did we save anything from that?"

Arroyo: "I don't think so."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Tryon: "Thank you. Representative Arroyo, yesterday in the Public Safety Approp Committee we had a discussion on the record regarding the work group process for the Public Safety Appropriation Committee and you were gracious and actually apologized to the Minority Members for requesting that we leave the work group process. And I actually mentioned to you that the importance of having a Minority in the process is that we challenge you, as a Minority, to produce a better budget, a better budget for Illinois. That's the process. We don't run the State of Illinois. We know that you do. We are the part of that process. In that work group, before we were asked to leave, we were talking about the number of \$38 billion versus \$34 billion. We had not heard in Public Safety Appropriations that we were going to be making a budget with the revenue side of \$38 billion. So, because we weren't there, my question to you, is the intention of what you are passing today to... based on a \$38 billion revenue picture and that you're planning on coming back to make the temporary income tax permanent? Is that what this number was based on and is

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

that the discussion that you had in the work group before we were asked to leave?"

Arroyo: "No. The discussion that we had was to go line by line to see what we were going to put in the line to be able to create a budget..."

Tryon: "Well, now, we had a dis..."

Arroyo: "...not create a Budget Bill. Not..."

Tryon: "Right."

Arroyo: "...not based on no tax, not based on anything."

Tryon: "Okay. Well, we had a discussion about when we were still there was a revenue side of \$38 billion and we were going to have a budget exercise... an exercise in the work group that would prepare a budget so we could see what it would look like with the Governor's introduced numbers. Is that correct? Did we not say that before we were asked to leave?"

Arroyo: "I think so."

Tryon: "Okay. Did we not ask the question, well, are we going to vote on a \$38 billion budget or a \$34 billion budget? And you said, this is an exercise and if we put up \$38 billion budget out, then we'll vote on it. And that was about the time we were asked to leave."

Arroyo: "Mike..."

Tryon: "Did we not have that conversation?"

Arroyo: "I believe that I never mentioned any number like that 34... 38 billion. I've only, in my committee, always mentioned the 1.8, the Governor's request."

Tryon: "But we had that discussion, if we did the Governor's request, will we be driving up the budget to 38 billion? And that... that was the answer we got. So, what... what we're trying

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

to figure out, as we challenge you, is what's... where we going here? Are we going to 38 billion? Are we going to 37 billion? Are we going to 36 billion? And I think that's a legitimate request, not just for the Minority Members, but for the Majority Members and anybody that's watching this process. Do you have the total number that we're going to get to? I mean, who has that number?"

Arroyo: "I couldn't answer that, Mike. All I can answer to you is the \$1.8 billion that the Governor's introduced that we're about to vote on. We're jus..."

Tryon: "Which is... which part of his \$38 billion budget proposal.

Is that not correct?"

Arroyo: "I don't see that in my budget."

Tryon: "Well, that was... that was his intro... that was his introduced revenue and expenditure side."

Arroyo: "The... the intro... the introduced revenue in Public Safety is 1.804857."

Tryon: "Okay. So, that... that budget was based on the... on keeping it the same and making the temporary income tax permanent. Was that not correct?"

Arroyo: "No."

Tryon: "This budget? I think that's..."

Arroyo: "You're talking about the Governor's. All I can talk about is the Governor's introduced, what we're dealing in our committee. We put some things in lines. We move some stuff around. And we put... we gave him his introduced... or his request budget."

Tryon: "Well..."

Arroyo: "I don't know what... what the total amount..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Tryon: "Well, if then, Representative Arroyo..."

Arroyo: "There's a lot of numbers going..."

Tryon: "...we're over the number. If we've exceeded the number in the Resolution on which the budget was supposed to be prepared on, do you know where we're going with your appropriation request now?"

Arroyo: "No."

Tryon: "To the total?"

Arroyo: "No."

Tryon: "Okay. Well, unfortunately, I believe that the process that we work under I've never seen in the time... 10 years that I've been here a Minority group asked to leave a committee. Higher Ed Appropriations, were done without Minority input. And the problem that we're going to have, I think in this budget and the people of Illinois as they watch this process, is the politics now has taken precedent over the process and the policy. And I find that distasteful and difficult for all of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Tabares. Please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6090, Representative Arroyo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6090, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House 6090, Military Affairs. Be happy to ask any questions. Answer any questions, not ask..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "That's it, Representative, military affairs. That's it? Seriously?"

Arroyo: "I could read... I could read all this to you, but I believe you have the same thing, Dennis."

Reboletti: "I do, but the people..."

Arroyo: "I'll be happy to read it to you."

Reboletti: "...of the state don't have it, Representative, those that are watching this right now. They don't have those numbers."

Arroyo: "I'm concerned what we're doing here in the General Assembly. And I believe all the Members have a computer and all the Members have the same thing I have. I could read it to you if it would help."

Reboletti: "Well, I guess we don't have to meet anymore then, Representative. We'll just Skype with each other and we'll look at analyses and then, we'll just vote and that'll be it. But we won't tell anybody what's in the numbers. Why don't you explain the Bill to me, Representative? What does this Bill do? How much does it appropriate?"

Arroyo: "I'm going to tell... I'm going to tell you the funding mechanism of this Bill. We're going to give the Governor's... we're voting on the Governor's intro... request and it's a... I

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

believe the total is 16.351100. I could tell you about personal..."

Reboletti: "Speaker, I can't hear him."

Arroyo: "...personal services. It's going to be 7.84 million. Social ser... Social Security, 600 thousand. Contractual Services is 3.5961. Travel is going to be 23 thousand."

Reboletti: "I can't hear him."

Arroyo: "Communication is going to be..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo, please hold for a second.

Members, we're having complaints of being able to hear the debate in the chamber. Can we please just bring the noise level down a bit? Thank you very much. Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "A lot of these funds also have matching grants from the Federal Government. So, I believe one of them has equipment that went up, EPD. I mean, I could keep reading if... if that's what you want."

Reboletti: "No, I would appreciate that you do that, Representative."

Arroyo: "Okay, okay."

Reboletti: "We're spending millions of dollars."

Arroyo: "But, here, I left off at 23 thousand. Communica... commodities is going to be 128. Printing is going to be 3,600. Equipment is going to be 104,900. EPD is going to be, I believe, 31,400. Operations of auto is 17 thousand. Lincoln... Lincoln's Challenge is \$2.7 million that has a matching... a match 75/25. Officer's candidate... cadet class is going to be several hundred thou... 700. Historic Artifacts, 7,400. Transfer... transfers is going to be 800 thousand. And Cook

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

County Vets' Assistance, 400 thousand. With a total of 16.351100."

Reboletti: "Representative, I appreciate your details. I'm disappointed that it's very loud in the chamber because it's hard to hear. And when you're spending the peoples' money, we should be paying attention to what's happening. Now, Rep... Representative..."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reboletti: "...how much... what's the difference in appropriation from... from last year to this new fiscal year?"

Arroyo: "One point four million."

Reboletti: "Additional spending?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo to close."

Arroyo: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6090 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6090, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6091, Representative Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6091, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House 6091 is the Department of Labor with a budget of 21.74500 thousand dol... million dollars. And we... I believe we have a job training program that we put in there with \$15 million. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "A few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Arroyo, our analysis indicates that GRF line item '15 over '14 is a 68.99 percent increase. It that what your analysis shows?"

Arroyo: "I don't know what percentage... what the percentage is, but I could tell you what the total is."

Sandack: "Okay. Let's do that."

Arroyo: "Okay. The total we have now for the allocation for the...
for the Governor's request is 21.7441500."

Sandack: "And that 21 million-plus number is... well, what is it in compared to '14? What was the total allocation in fiscal year '14?"

Arroyo: "Six thousand seven hundred and forty-one five."

Sandack: "That would be 6 million, right?"

Arroyo: "Six million... six million."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Sandack: "We... That's roughly a 68 percent increase in change. Is there anything..."

Arroyo: "Correct."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Sandack: "...that... Thank you. Does a 68 percent increase seem reasonable to you given the economic circumstances that taxpayers, businesses, families find themselves in right now?"

Arroyo: "Well, I believe that the increases on these job training program that we put in there for the State of Illinois to be able to have job training programs in different communities."

Sandack: "Our analysis indicates that the entirety of the increase in GRF comes from that \$15 million appropriation for grants to state and local agencies and community providers for atrisk community support programs. Was one such instance in the not too distant past, the Neighborhood Recovery Initiative?"

Arroyo: "No."

Sandack: "No?"

Arrovo: "No."

Sandack: "That wasn't a community grant?"

Arroyo: "If it's a community grant, they will be communities, yes."

Sandack: "Yes. And is any of the old NRI money being reallocated here within this \$15 million..."

Arrovo: "No."

Sandack: "...increased appropriation?"

Arroyo: "No. This is for a jobs training."

Sandack: "Jobs training. If I remember what the na... Neighborhood Recovery Initiative was, that was for antiviolence and antigun programs, right?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Sandack: "But I think the Auditor General and what was been revealed from other sources indicated that, in some

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

instances, that money didn't really go for that purpose. So, what instances of... of confidence should we have that this money is going to be appropriated well?"

Arroyo: "Well, the Department of Labor is going to do a better job than the other agency I believe."

Sandack: "Very good. To the Bill. We're well beyond \$34.4 billion and now we're just going to add \$15 million year over year to the Department of Labor. While it may be arguable that this is an... a necessary increase for state and local agency community providers, et cetera, we don't know how we're paying for it again. So, we're continuing to appropriate dollars in a completely irrational way. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Kay: "Representative, for legislative intent here, I want to follow up on Representative Sandack's questioning to you about the 15 million, which, in fact, is the entire amount of the increase that is represented in House Bill 6091. Are you stating, for the record, that the \$15 million will not be used for NRI, the Neighborhood Recovery Initiative and/or... and/or the Violence Prevention Authority?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Ives: "Representative Arroyo, can you tell me, how did you come up with the nice round number of \$15 million? How did you derive that number?"

Arroyo: "We had some... we had some money left over and some of the money that we took out of other agencies that we didn't think that they had... that needed sufficient money. We took that and we put it in there for job training."

Ives: "So, did people come to you with a proposal, you added them all up and it just rounded out nicely to \$15 million? Not 13 thousand... or 13,587,000 or something like that? Just a nice round number like \$15 million?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Ives: "Is that what you did? You added up all those people that had proposals out there and you came up with \$15 million. Is that how you came up with this number?"

Arroyo: "No. We came up with this number 'cause a lot of Members said that we need a job training program. We need a job training. There's a lot of young individuals that need to get into job trainings programs, get into apprenticeship programs and..."

Ives: "Well, why isn't it 20 million?"

Arroyo: "I... I think that we... if we would have had it, we probably would have put it in there, but..."

Ives: "Well, I mean..."

Arroyo: "...we didn't have it."

Ives: "...Let me..."

Arroyo: "So, this is all we had."

Ives: "Let me put it this way, your side of the aisle has a habit of doing this. This is exactly what Speaker Madigan did when

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

he had his millionaire's tax. In testimony, he flat out said, 1 million sounded like a good number. He had no… no way of saying that that was the right number. So, how do we know \$15 million is the right number for this program?"

Arroyo: "We don't know. I... I..."

Ives: "Exactly."

Arroyo: "We don't know."

Ives: "Okay. So, tell me now, how you qualify for a grant like this? Where's the criteria?"

Arroyo: "That'll have to be..."

Ives: "Where's the written criteria?"

Arroyo: "...that'll have to be developed after this Bill is passed."

Ives: "Well, that's not how we do things, that's not how we should do things. I know that's how you guys do things. It's not how we should do things. It's not what these taxpayers expect. Can I have the criteria for qualifying for this grant program? And who you spoke to since you told me... you just told me in public record that you actually talked to people that had proposals."

Arroyo: "I never... I never mentioned..."

Ives: "I'd like to know who they are..."

Arroyo: "...I never mentioned anybody..."

Ives: "...where they reside, how much they want?"

Arroyo: "...that had any proposals. I said we in the committee never talked to anybody... and I'm putting that on the record..."

Ives: "Well, then who gets the money?"

Arroyo: "...never talked to anybody that had a proposal."

Ives: "Who gets the \$15 million?"

Arroyo: "That... Don't put words in my mouth. Those are your words."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Ives: "Who gets the \$15 million, this nice round number?"

Arroyo: "We're going to develop the program after we pass this budget."

Ives: "Oh. There we go again. Let's pass the budget to find out
 what's in it. You cannot make this stuff up. You can't... I
 hope people are watching. This is appalling, quite frankly,
 appalling. It sickens me. Vote 'no' on everything."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6091 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6091, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6098, Representative Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6098, a Bill for an Act con... making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6098, Appellate Prosecutor, Appellate... Appellate Defender, Appellate Prosecutor and Juvenile Inquiry Board were all... put all in one... in one Bill together."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Cavaletto: "Representative, could you tell me the 6.2 percent increase, what does that amount to? How much money is that?"

Arroyo: "For which agency?"

Cavaletto: "Well, I don't know. It just says Appellate Prosecutor and Defender each increase 6.2 percent."

Arroyo: "Well, I could give you the numbers for every... for every one if you could identify..."

Cavaletto: "What... what..."

Arroyo: "...which one."

Cavaletto: "Well..."

Arroyo: "Appellate Prosecutor, Appellate Defender?"

Cavaletto: "How much... Yeah. Appellate Prosecutor. What... how much is it going to increase?"

Arroyo: "For GRF?"

Cavaletto: "Yeah, it would be GRF. Uh huh."

Arroyo: "There's about a \$5 thousand increase on GRF."

Cavaletto: "Five thousand?"

Arroyo: "Five hundred... five hundred thousand."

Cavaletto: "Five hundred thousand."

Arroyo: "Yes, per prosecutor."

Cavaletto: "Does that... that's ... that's an increase from the total amount on the Appellate..."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Cavaletto: "...Prosecutor?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Cavaletto: "I have Appellate Prosecutor at totally... I think you allocated about 6 million for that. Is that right, total?"

Arroyo: "Six point six... six nine."

Cavaletto: "Six point six nine. Okay. And the Defender?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Arroyo: "Twenty-one point five nine nine."

Cavaletto: "How much did you come up with there?"

Arroyo: "What was the question?"

Cavaletto: "The increase for the De... Appellate Defender."

Arroyo: "Six percent."

Cavaletto: "What?"

Arroyo: "Six percent."

Cavaletto: "Yeah. Well, what... how many dollars is that?"

Arroyo: "I can't hear... I can't hear you, again."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Members, can we please..."

Arroyo: "One point two million..."

Speaker Turner: "...bring the noise level down in the chamber."

Arroyo: "...four nine four hundred."

Speaker Turner: "They're having a hard time hearing the debate.

And this is a very important Appropriation Bill. Can we please bring the noise level down? Thank you very much."

Cavaletto: "Yes, Representative, that's 6.2 percent increase for the Appellate Defender. What is... what is that number?"

Arroyo: "It's 1..."

Cavaletto: "What is the increase?"

Arroyo: "...1.249400."

Cavaletto: "One point two million, right?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Cavaletto: "One point two million. Okay. What is that money going to be used for?"

Arroyo: "Personal services, head count."

Cavaletto: "Personal services, head count. So, are we increasing personnel or a 1.2 increase in salaries?"

Arroyo: "It's a collective bargaining increase."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Cavaletto: "That's a collective bargaining increase?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Cavaletto: "For the Appellate Defender? So, they're in... they're in the union? That right, then?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Cavaletto: "And the Prosecutor also?"

Arroyo: "The Appellate Prosecutor had... some of the union think that they had to take a collective bargaining also. An overall increase of 6.2."

Cavaletto: "Well, yeah, that's what I got here that, you know, Appellate Prosecutor and Defender each increase by 6.2 percent. That's what I have. And the Appellate Prosecutor I have down as a budget for 2015 the total GRF is... I'm just going to say \$6 million. That's what I have."

Arroyo: "You're probably correct."

Davis, M.: "And you said it was 372 thousand for the Appellate Prosecutor. Now, I ask you for the Appellate Defender. And what is the money being used for. That's all I've asked."

Arroyo: "Collective bargaining."

Cavaletto: "Collective bargaining? So, all that's going to go for salaries?"

Arroyo: "Probably."

Cavaletto: "Probably?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Thank you."

Arroyo: "You're welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti. Shhh."

Reboletti: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think at this point the Comptroller could no longer issue any checks because the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Treasury couldn't pay for them. And... and in regular speak, for the average folks of the State of Illinois, they would be bouncing checks right now and that act would be criminal. So, here we are. We don't have a revenue stream. The state's broke. And you're still spending."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your inquiry."

Kay: "We have... at least I have... spent a week talking about the constitutionality of what we're doing. I talked about it today. Leader Durkin talked about it. And we continue on doing things that are not constitutional, which means we have now become lawless. I'm wondering... I'm wondering if you'd ask the Attorney General to come in and opine on what we're doing as to the appropriateness as to continuing this process another day."

Speaker Turner: "We'll take that under advisement, Representative."

Kay: "Well, I... and I would appreciate an answer before we leave today."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo to close."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6098 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk,
please take the record. On a count of 61 voting 'yes', 51
voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6098, having
received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

passed. House Bill 5379. Mr. Clerk, can you please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5379, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time no a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Arroyo, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to adopt the House Amendment 1. The Amendment 1 was a request from the agency. And this has no GRF."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5379. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5379, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5379, Illinois Power Agency, also does not have no GRF."

Speaker Turner: "Nothing further, Representative?"

Arroyo: "I would like to get an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 5379 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5379, having received

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6023, Representative Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6023, a Bill for Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 6023 is the Bill that we discussed in committee. And it's with the State Universities Civil Service System. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is... Excuse me. We have a request from Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative, you're seeing a 4 percent increase in this line item. Can you explain what that is going to be for?

We don't have any explanation in our analysis."

Dunkin: "Yes, Representative. It's for one new personnel."

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

Dunkin: "One additional personnel."

Sullivan: "So, we increased the budget by 4 percent for one personnel from the previous year."

Dunkin: "It's \$51 thousand. It's a relatively small budget overall. As you know, the State Universities Civil Service System it's... it's scope is all of the 11 schools statewide so."

Sullivan: "Thank you for that very thrilling explanation."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin to close."

Dunkin: "I would ask for a favorable vote."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6023 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6023, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Arroyo, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to thank the Public Safety Committee for the hard work they've done. I want to thank both of the Members on both sides of the House. I want to thank the staff for the fantastic job he's... they've done. I don't think I've ever... I've ever done something like this to call 20... 15 or 20 Bills at once. It's not easy, but you know, I didn't come here to have anything easy. But thank you guys very much and I want to thank Jack Franks for not questioning me on my... on my Bill. Thank you, Jack. Thank you, everybody and thank you to the caucus."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6024, Representative Dunkin. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6024, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 6024 simply funds Illinois Student Assistance Commission. And I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Hammond."
- Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hammond: "Representative Dunkin, in the... in this particular Bill there's a \$2.3 million GRF increase. Can you tell me what that increase is for?"

Dunkin: "According to here, the House Amendment adds a line for funding for outreach and training activities."

Hammond: "And this outreach and training, is it going to be done specifically by the Illinois Student Assistance Commission?"

Dunkin: "I believe so."

Hammond: "So, obviously, if you are appropriating \$2.3 million, you feel that the Illinois Student Assistance Commission is capable of doing outreach?"

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir. That's what they do. As a matter of fact they do an impressive job. They're at most of your high schools. All across the State of Illinois they are communicating with faculty, with staff, with students. There's anything from championship game or playoff to an activity, a rally at the school, they have a strong presence there across the state in most of our high schools."

Hammond: "And I believe you just answered the other part of my question. The Illinois Student Assistance Commission, they perform this outreach across the entire State of Illinois. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "Correct."

Hammond: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin to close."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Would ask for a favorable vote on House Bill 6024,"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6024 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6024, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6025, Representative Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6025, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "House Bill 62... 6025 simply funds the Illinois Community College Board. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Representative Dunkin, could you look at page 8 of this Bill for me. Page 8 specifically grants to 18 community colleges the veterans' grant. And I'm just wondering how you get on this list to get some money for your veterans."

Dunkin: "Representative, you know, we have a very robust veterans' grant program and multiple categories of our State Government. We are big veteran supporters here in the state and that's the... this is the Illinois Community College Board is the entity to administer this particular grant."

Ives: "Yes. So, there's 40 community colleges, correct?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Ives: "Okay. And there's only 18 that are specified in getting some of these veteran grants. So, how did... how was this list made up? Who... How did you get your college on this list?"

Dunkin: "Representative, it's based on the number of veterans that the school serves. So..."

Ives: "That is not correct."

Dunkin: "Excuse me."

Ives: "That is absolutely not correct. So, how did you come up
 with this list?"

Dunkin: "Representative, it's based on the number of veterans at the school, that particular community college serves."

Ives: "That is not true. That is not... that is absolutely not true. In FY13 the DuPage... College of DuPage served over... well over 500 veterans. We got no money. We got no money in '13, none in '14 and we're not on the list to get any in '15. We're one of the highest percentages of... we're one of the colleges that has the highest number of veterans that attend. And we have no money coming into us. So, how is this list made up? 'Cause we asked the College Board... the Community College Board. We asked them and they said they did not make this list. So, who made the list?"

Dunkin: "Representative, the College of DuPage is the wealthiest college... community college in the State of Illinois, the wealthiest."

Ives: "I will tell you this..."

Dunkin: "So..."

Ives: "...we spent \$823 thousand on unfunded mandates for veterans and we got zero dollars back, zero. Are you saying that we're

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

going to... we're going to just keep rolling on unfunded mandates?"

Dunkin: "Representative, I can't speak to unfunded mandates. I can speak to us..."

Ives: "This is an unfunded mandate."

Dunkin: "We are... we are supporting our veterans and that's what this legislation here speaks to. And this budget is directed towards community colleges across the state that serves veterans, older students, younger students, a myriad of students all across the state. And so, that's why I would ask for your support in this legislation, quite frankly."

"I'm absolutely not supporting this. Community college advocates and we're... this is from the community colleges. They're seeking to restore funding of the Illinois Veterans Grant for FY2015. For the past several years, state funding for the mandated Veterans Grant Program has been mostly only occasional funding eliminated with for а institutions coming in limited amounts. Community colleges enroll about two-thirds of all the Illinois veterans in higher ed. Illinois law provides that institutions of public higher education must enroll veterans into classes where there is space available. Tuition is waived if the student is utilizing the provisions of the Illinois Veterans Grant. For many years, the state reimbursed the colleges and universities for the amount of lost tuition, but has not reimbursed for the last five years. Unless you're one of the special people and you're one of the special community colleges that gets the special grant money when this is a mu... You found \$15 million for some ... for some program you can't even justify."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "You found money for raises for IDOT workers..."

Dunkin: "Representative, there..."

Ives: "...that were political hires."

Dunkin: "Representative, let..."

Ives: "And you can't fund..."

Dunkin: "...let me educate you on what this does..."

Ives: "...a mandated item."

Dunkin: "Representative, if you want to ask me a question I will respond."

Ives: "I want to know how the list was made. Who made the list?"

Dunkin: "So, the… first off, not one veteran here in this state, the State of Illinois, is turned away. This merely is a reimbursement to the schools in the state of community colleges. There are GI Bills. There's… there are a host… a whole host of veterans' grants that are…"

Ives: "Yes. Okay."

Dunkin: "...applied to veterans who qualify. So, this is not a net loss for any veteran. This state is..."

Ives: "No, it's not a loss for the veteran..."

Dunkin: "...this state is one of the most vet..."

Ives: "...but it's a loss for my taxpayers."

Dunkin: "...vet-friendly states in the country. I know you know that. So, this dol... these dollars here directly go to the schools who... that serve veterans."

Ives: "Oh, I'm all about serving veterans. I understand that. I'm
 a veteran."

Dunkin: "So, that means..."

Ives: "But if you represent with..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "...you'll be supporting this legislation then, correct?"

Ives: "...if you represent Waubonsee Community College, if you represent the College of DuPage, if you represent Harper College, you all have veterans going there and your colleges are having to pick up the slack for a mandated state requirement. Something that... that only if you're a special college, apparently. I just want to know, Representative Dunkin, how do you get on this list? How do you get the funding? 'Cause when we called the College Board they said they didn't make the list of people who get these grants."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "I'd... li... You know what, we'd like... we'll take anything. We'll take \$50 thousand."

Dunkin: "So... All right, so..."

Ives: "We'll take the average of all the 18."

Dunkin: "...so, is the... is the question that you want your college funded?"

Ives: "Absolutely, I want my..."

Dunkin: "All right. So, that means... so, if we can get your college funded, that means you'll support this legislation?"

Ives: "Not if it over... it already exceeds our spending limit."

Dunkin: "Is that a yes or no, Representative?"

Ives: "No, I won't... I won't."

Dunkin: "So, what's your..."

Ives: "I won't."

Dunkin: "So, what's your... what's the end goal here..."

Ives: "But if these people are getting money, then I want my...

Representative Dunkin, can you answer the guestion?"

Dunkin: "Representative..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Ives: "How did you get on the list?"

Dunkin: "Listen, I..."

Ives: "How do you get your college on the list?"

Dunkin: "I would like for you to answer my question as well. This is a form letter that the Illinois Community College Board comes up with every year to fund community colleges."

Ives: "We asked them..."

Dunkin: "There are also..."

Ives: "...they said they did not make the list."

Dunkin: "...there are also... there are multiple veteran's grants at the state level and at the federal level that you're pretty familiar..."

Ives: "Did the Senate Democrats make the list?"

Dunkin: "...that you probably benefited from that we are making sure that our veterans receive. So, every ti... it'll take millions of dollars to fund every single... 43 community colleges in the State of Illinois. But there's not one veteran in this state, not one, who will be denied and has been turned away from any community college or any state university or college if they want to attend high... any higher institution across this state."

Ives: "Well, I'll tell you what. Our property taxes are rising.

And when you have pushed down unfunded mandates..."

Dunkin: "Did I answer your question?"

Ives: "When you push on down unfunded mandates that make... that we have to pick up as taxpayers and then you let other colleges get a break and we don't get the same break when we have almost 600 veterans at the College of DuPage, one of the

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

highest number in the entire state, and we get nothing and have gotten nothing for five years now."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "And then..."

Dunkin: "...those things... those..."

Ives: "I just want to know why you get the special treatment for
 certain colleges. And you don't seem to want to answer that
 question."

Dunkin: "Representative, all of those veterans that you're speaking of, those 600, now here... I want to know if you did your research on this. Every single one of those veterans were not turned away. Every single one of them received a waiver."

Ives: "I..."

Dunkin: "They received a waiver..."

Ives: "Okay. You know what..."

Dunkin: "...and they attend the College of DuPage, Rock Valley College, community colleges in Chicago. Not one veteran was turned away."

Ives: "Representative Dunkin, that's not the point. The point is,
 is that we are not getting any compensation for those
 veterans."

Dunkin: "That's..."

Ives: "That is the point and yet..."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "...18 pe... 18 colleges are. So, who made the list? Because the College Board says they didn't come up with the list. I want an answer on who made the list. That's what I want, 'cause to me this looks awfully political."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "Representative, I respect... I respectfully agree and understand that you have a complete different perspective on it... on this. Here's what I do know, and what Members of this Body should understand. Every veteran in this state... every veteran in the state has the opportunity to go to any community college. They use waivers. They use grants, the GI Bill, et cetera. And so, none of them..."

Ives: "Yeah."

Dunkin: "...are turned away."

Ives: "I know."

Dunkin: "I think, if you're fighting the veterans, this is one of the Bills that you want to support. Other than just talking..."

Ives: "Well..."

Dunkin: "...about it, be about it."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I'll tell you what, if you're a Representative from McHenry Community College, Waubonsee, College of DuPage, Harper, Danville, Elgin, just to name a few, if... you should... you should absolutely vote 'no' on this until your colleges get some compensation for an unfunded mandate from the state. Something because other colleges are getting it and they don't seem to care about your taxpayers at all."

Speaker Turner: "Members, there are many people seeking recognition on this Bill. Can we please keep the noise level down so that those interested can hear the debate? Next we have Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Hammond: "Representative Dunkin, obviously, we've already vetted the, no pun intended, the veterans grants that are included in this that are not done fairly. You made the statement, of course, that no... no veteran is left out. Well, no, no veteran is left out, but many of the community colleges are left on the hook. And when we did hear testimony from a number of the universities and community colleges, reimbursement for the veterans grant... grants were paramount to their priorities. But we'll move on from there because, Representative, included in this Bill for the Illinois Community College Board is an increase of \$3.9 million for what is referred to as the 'reenrollment program'. Can you tell me, what exactly is the 'reenrollment program'?"

Dunkin: "Representative, Minority Spokesperson on the committee, this program is a program that addresses the bridge between the students... nontraditional students or older students who some who may be disabled or who were displaced from their jobs, some were fresh out of high school and they want to attend college. And so, there are a number of programs in our state that really close the gap from high school to college and see to it that these individuals get an opportunity to go to a higher... level of higher education that they would like to attain all across the state. So, these are programs that address those particular concerns and issues."

Hammond: "And what was the incentive to increase them by \$3.9 million?"

Dunkin: "Representative, we increased the overall higher education budget by 2.82 percent because we, many of us, feel very strongly about higher education and we want to see to it

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

that we could add additional dollars to these particular programs to see to it that everyone gets an opportunity to the greatest extent that we possibly can."

Hammond: "Representative, when we spoke about the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, we spoke about the fact, and you agreed that, in fact, they cover the entire State of Illinois. Do the entities in the reenrollment program that is getting a total of \$6.9 million, I believe... \$6.3 million, do they cover the entire State of Illinois?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Hammond: "The entire State of Illinois? I want to... I want to be very clear here, Representative. Does the reenrollment program and the entities that are within that program, cover the entire State of Illinois, from Antioch to Cairo?"

Dunkin: "We have programs in Peoria, programs in Rockford..."

Hammond: "Is that a yes or a no, Representative?"

Dunkin: "...programs..."

Hammond: "Do they cover the entire State of Illinois? Is it available to every taxpayer that desires to avail themselves of the reenrollment program, yes or no?"

Dunkin: "Representative, every... every specific corner..."

Hammond: "Yes, Sir."

Dunkin: "...of the State of Illinois is not covered..."

Hammond: "Thank you."

Dunkin: "...which is obviously impossible. But we... since I've been chairman, we've expanded this program to..."

Hammond: "Representative..."

Dunkin: "...outside of Chicago, central Illinois..."

Hammond: "We have..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "...northern Illinois."

Hammond: "We have nontraditional students. We have poor students. We have minority students at every corner of the State of Illinois and the taxpayers of Illinois deserve to take advantage of these programs, if you desire to fund them. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Cavaletto: "Thank you. Representative, I just... just got off the phone from the President of the college of... Kaskaskia College in Centralia, Illinois, and they have not received any veterans funds in the last three years. Could you explain that, please?"

Dunkin: "Representative, as chairman of the committee in the last several years, I have tried my best to spread as many resources out as possible to as many community colleges as we possibly could... can. You know, the fact is, every college... community college is not going to receive a certain level of funding. Now, with that being said as it relates to veterans, every veteran in the state is not denied, is not turned away from attending any community college. They either receive a... a tremendous amount of support with the GI Bill, part of this reimbursement of some of the Illinois Community College Board, or they get a complete veterans waiver. So, there's really no veteran that's really on the negative side of receiving an education here in the state."

Cavaletto: "Well, I'll just say this. The colleges have picked up... Kaskaskia Colleges have picked up the tuition of every

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

veteran who wanted to and they paid for it themselves. But the problem we have is we have 11 percent unemployment rate in our area where these veterans are not working. They can't get a job. So, I would expect some of that money to flow down to Kaskaskia College in this next school year. I would expect that to happen. If that's state dollars, then we should share in that money. Thank you."

Dunkin: "Yes, I agree with you 100 percent, Representative. And I'm hoping..."

Cavaletto: "Thank you."

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir. And I'd like to work..."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Dunkin. Representative Hoffman."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Hoffman: House. So, we started this process, I guess, maybe after caucus at about 10, 10:30 and you know, I understand and I respect the ability and the necessity of the Minority Party to go through these plans that we put forward, to criticize them, to ask questions about them, but I also would think that you want to engage in trying to come up with a plan for the State of Illinois... a budget plan for the State of Illinois. It's easy to stand over there and be critical. It's easy to stand over there and to... try to make ... make light of the Majority Party as we try to govern, but where's your plan? Where is your plan? Now, I was thinking to myself on Friday... I was thinking to myself on Friday as I was... before I was going home, pretty soon the Republicans they got to come up with a plan, don't they? So, I went over to my office here in the Stratton Building. I asked Judi, who works for me, I said, Judi, somewhere the Republicans must have sent a plan over

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

here. She said, I haven't seen a plan. So, I said, well, it's got to be on my desk here, 'looked on my desk. There's no Republican plan on my desk. So, what did I do? I drove home. I went right to my district office. I said, Stacey, did you get the Republican plan here at the district office? She said I haven't seen a Republican plan. So, you know what I did? I said, well, I got this PO Box, maybe they sent it to the PO Box. That's where their plan has to be. So, I got my little key out. I drove to the ... the post office there Collinsville. I bent down... it's just a little PO Box couldn't hold a big plan, but I didn't think your plan would be very big. It would be a small little plan. So, I opened the PO Box. I peered in there. There's no Republican plan. No plan, none. So, I... I'm thinking, what am I missing? What am I missing? I got to go home, they had to send it to my home in Swansea. It had to be there in Swansea at my new home. So, I go home and my wife's there. I said, Laurie, have you seen the Republican plan? She said, I haven't seen it. Well, then I look down. I look down and there's my Maltese. And I said, Willie, did you eat the Republican's plan? But he wouldn't do that to you. He's a good dog. He would never eat your plan, I'm telling you. You know what your plan is? Your plan is to not have a plan. Your plan is to criticize us. Your plan is to say okay, well, here's what we should do. We should have this slow spending authority and what we should do ... what would happen under that? We saw what would happen under that in committees. Education would be funded at 65 percent of the foundation level. It would decimate our schools. It would hurt our hospitals. It would decimate our nursing homes.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Higher education would be decimated. What will we do when we plan to close 10 prisons? That's your plan. It's the wrong plan for Illinois. We're moving forward."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rosenthal."

Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Shhh. Members."

Rosenthal: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Rosenthal: "Representative Dunkin, I understand that the... that the 1.215 million 500 thousand for our General Revenue Fund for your veterans grants is to... is to app... for the program itself and all the associated costs with it. The question is, when is..."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Members. Excuse me, Representative."
Rosenthal: "Yes."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we still have a lot of debate going on and we'd like everyone's attention. So, could we please bring the noise level down and be respectful of your colleagues.

Thank you very much. Shhh."

Rosenthal: "I understand..."

Speaker Turner: "Please continue, Representative."

Rosenthal: "...that the associated costs for the grant program. The question is, the veteran's tuition waivers that each college and junior college absorb theirself. When is that cost going to be picked up by the State of Illinois? I know that the Governor is a big proponent and supporter of veterans and I admire him for that. We all... we all thank the veterans for their service, but I happen to serve on the Lincoln Land Community College Board. We serve a lot of veterans. It's

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

going to cost the school between 800 million... or 800 thousand and a million dollars in tuition waiver for their veterans. Each... each college and university absorbs those tuition waivers. When is the State of Illinois going to provide the funds for those waivers?"

Dunkin: "Representative, I share your concern as well. And as chairman of this committee, I've been working in that direction to make sure that we move in that direction to make sure that some of these community colleges and universities receive those dollars. Under the recommended budget... the not recommended budget, there was actually no reimbursement dollars there. So, under this particular line item, this budget here, it actually gets us closer to reimbursement and to as many community colleges as we possibly can."

Rosenthal: "Well, in the case of what we're doing, we are giving...

we're giving money for associated costs, which is about 10

percent of the cost of the waiver that they are. And it's

only for selected colleges and as Representative Ives said,

how do you get on that list? I'm not sure. But the bigger

question is, when is the State of Illinois going to

appropriate the funds for the tuition waivers that these

colleges are absorbing theirself?"

Dunkin: "Representative, as chairman of this committee, I make it a goal to move in that direction every single year."

Rosenthal: "I think it's... I think it's an admirable goal. We need to continue to work on that. Thank you."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think that we've had a lot of discussion today about the Illinois veterans grant line. I think it's important that we remember that many of the colleges that receive modest bumps in this grant line are colleges that had been cut significantly over the years. Many of the colleges that received, again, modest bumps in this grant line are colleges who are having to face significant amounts of students who are coming into that community college system going into foundational level courses, going into many remedial courses in English, in math, and sciences. These are also colleges ... many of the colleges that receive, again, that modest grant line are colleges that are dealing with issues as it relates to retention, course success, diversity issues. So, I think that we have to be mindful of the holistic picture that our community colleges are facing. Obviously, we can't do all that we'd like to do in this year, but if we continue to work together, we could hopefully make that happen. If we invest in our young people, we invest in our workforce and ensure that they have a quality education for the 21st century. These are the things that we have to talk about doing, 'cause if we're not educating our people who... who have a true desire to work and to take care of their families we're sending them into the prison system, period. So, why we... while we're continuing to talk about a line that's probably about \$1.7 million, this is more than a \$2.3 billion budget. Let's be mindful that modest increases in a few schools does not mean that we aren't doing our job. It means that if we continue to work together in the future, we can all, hopefully, if we can get the revenues where we'd

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

like them to, if we can educate our people and hopefully, send them into the workforce to get some of the smart manufacturing jobs, we'll be able to do the things that we need to do for all of the colleges. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Brauer: "Representative, do you realize that when we came into this chamber together that all veterans' grants were paid for by the State of Illinois?"

Dunkin: "It's a different fiscal situation, Representative."

Brauer: "Yes, it is."

Dunkin: "But I didn't know that. I didn't know that."

Brauer: "It... it is. And that's part of our problem. I had a junior college President, she was retired a colonel, and she asked me how come we're not taking advantage of the G133 waiver from the Federal Government. Are you familiar with that?"

Dunkin: "Yes, I am."

Brauer: "Okay. How come we're not taking advantage of it?"

Dunkin: "You know, I might know the answer to that exactly. That's at the federal level and I know..."

Brauer: "Yes, it is. It's federal money. We're leaving it on the table because ISAC doesn't want to mess with it."

Dunkin: "Yes. You know, the Illinois Veterans' Grant is for Illinois soldiers..."

Brauer: "Yes."

Dunkin: "...Illinois veterans..."

Brauer: "Yes."

Dunkin: "...not... not federal soldiers."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Brauer: "That's correct."

Durkin: "To sort of verify."

Brauer: "But that G133 waiver will reimburse us for those tuition dollars."

Dunkin: "I would love to work with you, Representative, to help make that a part of our reality for our veterans."

Brauer: "Well, I... I think it's important because, you know, that's the one thing that we have been missing. Representative Hoffman asked us where our plan was, and..."

Dunkin: "Well, that... this is a great start. I will be happy to work with you to help our Illinois veterans receive the federal grants as well to the greatest extent possible. And to have the Federal Government reimburse us as a state."

Brauer: "Well, we're going to have to have a little more time than 24 hours when this stuff is introduced and given to us and say, take it or leave it."

Dunkin: "Sure... well, I..."

Brauer: "You know, if you want to look at the last five years' spending, we've gone from 27 billion to 30 billion to 33 billion to 34 billion. We agreed on 34 and a half billion for the budget and now, we're looking at 38. It makes it hard for us to be part of the plan when the plan is tax and spend."

Dunkin: "Is that a question?"

Brauer: "No, it's a comment. I'm just waiting for your response."

Dunkin: "Well, I... I'll answer whatever questions you may have for
 me. I'm..."

Brauer: "Do you think that's a good plan to have that increase from 27 to 38 in four short years? Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Moffitt: "Representative Dunkin, just very briefly and ask your...
your assistance. Can you tell us the criteria that was used
to decide which community colleges are being reimbursed for
their veterans' grants? There must be some criteria. Could
you... could you tell us what the criteria is?"

Dunkin: "Representative, we know that every community college can use this type of assistance. The Illinois Community College Board, they come up with a formula of how it is that they're going to reimburse other community colleges. So, what we are here today to do is to appropriate dollars to the Community College Board and with this particular line item for veterans, to make sure that they do their due diligence by way of their formula of allocating resources to community colleges all across the state."

Moffitt: "Is it being applied fairly and evenly uniformly?"

Dunkin: "Absolutely."

Moffitt: "Then are all community colleges being reimbursed?"

Dunkin: "Representative, we are trying to fund them with the available resources that we have. Obviously, we can't fund every single community college, but that's why we've increased the community college budget to a great extent, at this point, and would love to have your support on solutions to help try to get to that to a number where we can fund as many community colleges as possible."

Moffitt: "But it seems like it would be applied uniformly that we would... regardless of where you lived in the state... that community colleges would be treated the same. I think... I mean,

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

I know you're a fair person. I would think you would want that to apply."

Dunkin: "I would."

Moffitt: "That a veteran, wherever they lived in Illinois, would be treated equally. Would you agree with that?"

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir."

Moffitt: "Would that be our objective?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Moffitt: "Will you help make that happen?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Moffitt: "You're in a unique position to look into this further."

Dunkin: "I would love to work with you to work in that direction..."

Moffitt: "Would..."

Dunkin: "...to get as many community colleges funded as possible."

Moffitt: "Would you be willing to work with... I'll work with you."

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir."

Moffitt: "Maybe we should hold hearings on why this isn't applied...

First, is it being applied uniformly? You know, would a veterans' grant in one part of the state be treated the same as another and are all having equal opportunity to, in terms of being... the reimbursement that they receive... a community college reimbursement they receive for the veterans they serve. I think you... you would want that applied uniformly and treated fairly."

Dunkin: "Representative, you and I are on the same page and I would love to work with you. And that's why when we met throughout this entire Session..."

Moffitt: "And..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "...yourself like other Members, you know, we have that as an option to work together and to come up with a meaningful solution or something that we can live with that's fair so as many community colleges can take advantage of funding opportunities. So, I would love to work with you. I would love for your vote on this Bill as well..."

Moffitt: "I think it's important that we're..."

Dunkin: "...to support our veterans."

Moffitt: "Right. That we treat veterans across the state the same on an even basis and criteria that we can define. I think you would want to help us do that, wouldn't you?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Moffitt: "Representative, you would want to help us do that, wouldn't you?"

Dunkin: "I would love to, Representative, as I stated earlier."

Moffitt: "And it it's not being..."

Dunkin: "You know, keep..."

Moffitt: "...if it's not being done now, would you help us change that?"

Dunkin: "I would love to work with you, Representative. Keep in mind, the recommend... the Governor's recommended budget... excuse me... the recommended budget had zeroed this line out. We, who voted for the Bill in committee, put the moneys... moneys, over a million dollars there... almost a million dollars in this line for our veterans. So, I would love to do that, but I also need... we need your help right now in supporting our veterans, Representative. So, a 'yes' vote to this here goes... And we funded this 100 percent in the recommended budget because it was zero. Now, we have almost a million dollars in

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

this line... \$1.2 million to be exact... so this is a major improvement. Now, do we have enough dollars to fund every single community college, all 40-plus? Not at this time because we're working within the budget. You can see all the numbers that we have before us. And so, I would love your support in voting for our veterans right now on this particular budget, if you will in earnest. I'm sincere about working with you. I would love your sincerity and voting for this budget that funds at \$1.2 million our Illinois veterans. Can you work with me, Representative?"

Moffitt: "Representative, I will certainly be working with you, but my concern is that it's not being applied uniformly. It's not being applied evenly..."

Dunkin: "Well, Representative..."

Moffitt: "...and that community colleges across the state who are helping our veterans and getting... and you've pointed out that none are turned away and I... that's important. We're glad that that's the case, but we want to make sure we're treating our community colleges evenly so that they have money to help veterans in other ways. And it appears that that's not what's happening now. You, Representative, are in a very unique position to be able to help shed light on this and make sure we are treating our veterans and the community colleges that are serving them fairly, evenly, so, regardless of your zip code, you're going to be treated equally. They serve the country equally. I think we deserve... we should treat them equally and you can help us. Thank you."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Sandack: "To the Bill. You know, we've been talking about junior colleges and there was an eloquent speaker who gave a very impassioned speech about a plan and so, I took some notes. And... about our plan. And what I did is I called Judi and Judi told me to call Stacey. Stacey told me to go to a PO Box. The PO Box said... directed me to Mrs. Hoffman and their dog. And instead, where I ended up was at the Jay Hoffman Center at Lewis and Clark Community College where I mailed the plan. It's a wonderful building. I think it's 3500 square feet. You should go see it. It's at a junior college. There's the plan; the plan sits there and here's what the plan is. Stop spending money you don't have, just stop. Stop spending what you don't have. Stop taking more money from taxpayers that they can't afford to pay. Stop making promises like it's temporary when you mean it's permanent. Stop pretending to budget by spending more money than you anticipated or promised you'd spend and then say, oh, well, you don't have a plan. Here's our plan: stop spending money."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the... To the Bill. Representative, I was just mentioning to some of my colleagues over here that Representative Hoffman hadn't blown up for a while and there he came, and for those of us who have been around here for a while, we haven't seen anything like that since you were Floor Leader for Blagojevich. So, you know, what is your plan? Your plan was the temporary income tax, temporary. People quoted in the paper today. I will not support increasing the tax. I want to see it made... expire. On and on and on. All five of you that were quoted in the paper

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

today have been voting for these Bills all afternoon. What's your plan? More deceit of the taxpayers. We've got Representatives over there that stand up and rail and rail and rail. Vote 'no'. They vote 'no'. They're still going to vote for the Speaker next time. Most of these budgets today have passed by 60 votes. I don't know that I've ever seen that. You can barely muster together 60 shameful votes. If 10 or 12 of you vote 'no', you'll go home and rail on the whole plan and still come back and vote for the Speaker. Wink, wink, nod, nod, everything's just fine. That's your plan. Continue to please the taxpayers, continue to spend money we don't have, redistribute wealth. That's your plan. I'll take our plan over that plan."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. You know, since we are... or seem to be stuck in time here, let me go back to the fiscal year of 2009 where I think that budget was out of whack by about \$3 billion, such a surprise, that you guys are stuck on spending more than the revenues that come in. So, in fiscal year 2009, the Majority Leader, the gentle Lady from Hyde Park, got up and dared Governor Blagojevich. She said, you know what, Governor, if you don't like this plan, take out your red pen. You can just zero those things out; you could change those line items. No problem, you deal with it. Fiscal year '10, here's your lump sums, Governor, and then just keep spending like you have all the revenue and hopefully, it will all come together. That was the plan. Isn't that special. So, the plan so far has been to tell the Minority Party to go pound sand, don't come to any meetings, you're not welcome,

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

do not participate. I thought that the road map started with the Resolution. Oh, we'll only spend \$34.5 billion. But that's way past... we blew past that mark hours ago. So, right now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have a collect call from a federal prison in Denver and the former Governor of the state says stop spending like drunken sailors."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Actually, to the process, I quess. Responsible budgeting, that's what we're here to talk about. Responsible budgeting. Well, we did pass a Resolution. Everybody voted for it, even the Gentleman from Collinsville. I guess he was for responsible but... budgeting before he was against it. But that's okay; we've done that before. Let me remind you how we got here. We started off on the right path. We passed a responsible Resolution that said, hey, we need to address the structural deficit that we have, so let's do a revenue number that is reasonable that lets the temporary tax expire. And we did that; it was great. Here we are. And then, what happens? We get a speech that says we're going to tax more, we're going to spend more and we're all going to be for it on that side of the aisle. And that's what we're doing here today. But Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a travesty to say that, where's your plan? We started out with a plan. We weren't allowed to be in actual committees to debate things. And then we get this little thing called top of the chart... top of the... of the... the line items. You have 1.947 billion for group insurance, magically, magically it's 1.346, \$500 billion magically appeared. Oh, my God, it... was it under your desk, Representative Hoffman? Did we find it

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

under your desk? You scared the constituents into believing that we're in a doomsday scenario and all of a sudden you've got \$500 million. Where did it come from? Give me a break. Responsible budgeting, you left responsible budgeting way, way, way back there, your plan the entire time. And now, you want to blame us. For the 10, 12 years I've been down here, when you have no clue what's going on. Unbelievable, but that's fine. Pass this budget, think that you're not going to have a tax increase, you are. It's coming. You all know it, just admit it and go on. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the process. Just wanted to comment on... in the last couple of years, in good faith, I think both sides of the aisles have gone into the original meeting with the budgeteers and the Speaker, come up with a number that we were going to strive to, come up with a Resolution, gone the Approp Committees, went into Room 100 day after day, put all the line items up on the wall, and tried to achieve a balanced budget that we could all live by. That stopped this year. We delayed the budget presentation, remember, when the Governor asked. That was five more weeks into the process. Then we got into it, going into the rooms, we weren't sure if we were operating off the 34.4 or now the 38.1. And things started to go... fall apart by then. But the bottom line is, it's no joke. We can laugh at people when they stand up and make a presentation, but it's no joke when we have 25 percent of the people in Illinois wanting to move out of our own state and we're the people here that are doing the public policy and they're the people around the state in

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

the farmlands, in the met... collar counties, in the City of Cook wanting to leave our state. We've been downgraded 23 times by bond houses over the last five years, 23 times. Those are facts that you can't laugh about. We have the hi... second and third highest unemployment in the United States. Is that something to be proud of? None of us are proud of that because we all know people that are out of work. So, our bottom line job here is to bring jobs back to Illinois, to bring business back to Illinois, and to not drive our friends and families out of Illinois. And the only way we're going to do that is to curb our spending and bring back business, bring back jobs, and stop driving our friends and families out of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tracy."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Tracy: "Chairman Dunkin, back to those questions. Okay. I believe Representative Ives asked you how you get on a list to have your community college receive funding reimbursement for their portion of the veterans' program. Also, I believe Representative Moffitt asked you, what is the criteria? And then, some of those answers you alluded to, well, DuPage College is one of the wealthiest colleges, which means, I think what you meant was, perhaps DuPage is in one of the wealthier parts of the state. However, I know that Carl Sandburg College is not on that list. I know that Carl Sandburg College, located in Galesburg, Illinois, is not in one of the wealthiest areas of this state. They're not on the list. My question is, can you tell us what is the criteria,

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

how do you get on the list? You also said is it the number of veterans you serve. Somebody there has prepared this list and someone there, on your side, has the answer. I just want the truth. How... who... how does this process happen?"

Dunkin: "Representative, we talked to ICCB about the... their funding formula and it's true. All of the community colleges, there are over 40, were not funded. But some of the colleges... community colleges that we did fund, were in Representative David Moffitt's district, Representative Mike Unes's district, Representative David Leitch's district, Representative Keith Sommer's district, Senator Brady's district, Dan LaHood's district."

Tracy: "All good and well. But..."

Dunkin: "So... so..."

Tracy: "...how do you... how does it happen? How... somebody is choosing."

Dunkin: "Representative, I do not work for ICCB. What we did was take a recommended..."

Tracy: "ICCB says they didn't do it."

Dunkin: "Representative, the recommended budget was at zero, zero."

Tracy: "That's not..."

Dunkin: "We've raised... we gave..."

Tracy: "...my question."

Dunkin: "...\$1.2 million to community colleges in this line item.

And again..."

Tracy: "I hope... I will quit questioning. I just want the one answer that has been pussyfooted around. I just want the answer."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "Representative, it's im..."

Tracy: "I just want the truth."

Dunkin: "It's impossible, Representative, for us..."

Tracy: "To tell the truth."

Dunkin: "...as Legislators..."

Tracy: "I just..."

Dunkin: "...to decide on... that every community college is going to get x amount of dollars. That's really not our role. So, the Illinois Community College Board, which exists as an entity, has a formula for allocation, you know, as I recall... I'm trying to recall their formula or what their process was, but Ken Dunkin did not say..."

Tracy: "I never..."

Dunkin: "...this money is going to this... this community college or that community college, Representative."

Tracy: "Okay. That's an answer. But I want to know the truth of who did it. ICCB said they didn't do it."

Dunkin: "Who you talking to at ICCB?"

Tracy: "Their CFL and legislative person. They might know, but they said it wasn't them. And I just thought maybe as the chairman of that committee, you might know."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Tracy: "But you don't know?"

Dunkin: "Representative, what we did in general..."

Tracy: "Do you know? Do you know?"

Dunkin: "What we did in general, Representative, is we made choices... we... on what communities... community colleges would receive funding based off of heavy usage by Illinois veterans.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

That was the general approach toward funding, some, not all of the community colleges in our state."

Tracy: "Who is we?"

Dunkin: "And the goal is to fund all of them. And again, I would love to work with you to get to that dir... in that direction."

Tracy: "I just... you know, we're just trying to get to the truth here with the process. Who is we? Who in your staff talked to whoever to put these colleges in the Bill?"

Dunkin: "Representative, I have..."

Tracy: "You're not going to answer, are you?"

Dunkin: "...tried to respond to you. The colleges that have the heaviest veteran use receive the heaviest amount of investment or allocation at the Illinois Community College Board."

Tracy: "So, somebody discretionarily decided to choose who the winners and the losers are and we don't know. We don't know. I think you know or somebody there knows and you're not telling us. I mean, I think we ha… need a transparent process. I think the people of Illinois need to know why they may have to pay an increase in… in their taxes, their real estate taxes because the veterans' programs aren't funded."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Tracy: "But who decides that?"

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Tracy: "It should be us as a whole. I'm just asking who."

Dunkin: "Representative, we took over a million dollars and pushed it to almost a half of the community colleges in the state."

Tracy: "And we is who?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "And we went from zero... from a zero recommended budget to \$1.2 million. Now, did we get every single college? No."

Tracy: "I feel like Abbott and Costello."

Dunkin: "But with us working... Representative..."

Tracy: "Chairman, who is on first? Who is we?"

Dunkin: "The committee, Representative."

Tracy: "What committee? Who's on that committee?"

Dunkin: "Twenty-three Members of the Illinois Higher Education Appropriations Committee."

Tracy: "So, your 23 Members made these decisions."

Dunkin: "Representative, we participated in public meetings discussing with the Illinois Community College Board. They came before us with their new director. They were at zero when we started out. We started at the bottom and now we're here at \$1.2 million. It's almost half of the community colleges. So, again, I am more than willing to work with you, your Minority Spokesperson, who is standing next to you. If they're willing to participate, I'm willing to work with you and anyone else here to come up with a way that we distribute to the greatest extent possible, to as many community colleges as possible within the limited amount of moneys that we have to work with."

Tracy: "We have 40..."

Dunkin: "Will you work with me, Representative?"

Tracy: "...we have... we have 48 commun..."

Dunkin: "Will you... that... will you work with me, Representative?

Work for me."

Tracy: "We have certainly wanted to, but..."

Dunkin: "Would you work with me, Representative?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Tracy: "How can I work with someone that won't tell me the truth?"

Dunkin: "Now, Representative, you know that's a... that's... you're crossing the line and it's so unnecessary."

Tracy: "I..."

Dunkin: "Now, look, listen..."

Tracy: "I am just asking a fair question..."

Dunkin: "I do not work with the..."

Tracy: "...and I... I'm answering. No, I can't work with someone that will not tell me the truth."

Dunkin: "Representative, you have Republican colleagues who are on the committee with me as well."

Tracy: "But do they..."

Dunkin: "And they..."

Tracy: "They don't know either."

Dunkin: "...and they have participated in the process before. For example, in committee several years ago, and I'll give you a prime example. House Democrats, House Republicans, I want you to hear this, Representative."

Tracy: "I'm listening."

Dunkin: "We worked together, we crafted a budget, we put it on the floor. Guess what? All of them voted 'no' on the budget except one. All of them. All of your... your colleagues on that side said no way, even though we worked in earnest at the committee level, and then you flipped the script on us when we get to the floor. Now, you talk about honesty. I think that was a bit disingenuous to craft a budget that spoke to all of Illinois that we agreed on and you get here and you say 'no'. Nah, psyche. We don't want to... we don't want to participate. We really did... we did that to get to a level of

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

getting whatever we wanted in the budget and then we said 'no' on the floor. So, that's what happened. You can ask your colleagues, ask the Minority Spokesperson sitting next to you. That's what happened. And so, at this point in time, a lot of us really..."

Tracy: "Well, thank you. Wait..."

Dunkin: "...we're trying to get to funding higher education..."

Tracy: "I asked the question."

Dunkin: "...to the greatest ex..."

Tracy: "You're not going to answer the question. So, thank you. I have no further questions of the Sponsor, but I will say to the Bill. We have 48 community colleges; there are 18 being funded on the veterans' programs. And I think it... that's what we're just asking is, what criteria, what test, who made these decisions? It certainly wasn't the 23 Members of the committee 'cause I know my Republican Members of the committee did not make those decisions. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Every year that I've been here and served with Representative Hoffman, I've looked forward to the Jay Hoffman 'it's our plan' speech, where is your plan? And I've heard it and it's gotten better every time I've heard it and a little more comical every time I've heard it. So, let me talk about 'it's your plan' speeches. In '05, your plan was a pension holiday for two years that shorted the pension system \$3 billion. Some analysts say that cost the long-term pension funding \$11 billion. It's your plan in '07 failed. It was based on a gross receipts tax that even you wouldn't vote for. And it led to a two and a half

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

month overtime Session where the Minority worked with you and produced a budget that was based on reforms that we didn't adhere to as we implemented the budget. And then, if we advance ourselves to the 2012, when the new General Assembly took its seat, your plan was based on a temporary income tax. And that temporary income tax, according to the Speaker at the inauguration of this General Assembly, was going to lead us in the direction of a new process called budgeting for results. And budgeting for results would cause us to have discipline where our spending would be disciplined and efficient, and we'd pay off the backlog of our bills, and we would live within our means, and then we would return the tax rates to the people of Illinois to 3.75 percent. That was what I heard at the inauguration. And then when we came to 2013, your plan was based upon pension reform. Pension reform that the Constitution of this state questions whether or not it's even constitutional in the realm of diminishment and impairment. When you take people who are already drawing a retirement and diminish it substantially by as much as 30 percent, that was your plan. And now, we're faced with going to court and defending that plan at a time period when we gave the Governor last year \$2 billion more than he even asked for, put three doors on the Capitol Building that cost \$600 thousand, remodeled the Supreme Court chamber at about \$12 million. We didn't make a pension payment because we chose not to. And now we hear, it's your plan speech this year and it's just another year of a budget process based upon broken promises. Broken promises when it comes to the temporary income tax, broken com... promises when it comes to the adoption

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

of the budget Resolution, broken promises when it comes to the process and we expel the Minority out of the working groups of the Appropriation Committees, that's your plan. That's the plan that Jay Hoffman talks about. And I get concerned when we're talking about Jay Hoffman's dog, because I believe Jay Hoffman's dog would say we need a new plan. A plan that's not based... not based upon broken promises, not based upon taxing more than we are... spending more than we can even raise in taxes. 2010, our budget was \$27 billion; now it's going to be \$38 billion. That's 6 percent a year. That's three times the rate of inflation in the State of Illinois in the country. We cam we have returned our state year after year after year to one of the most financially bankrupted governments in the country when we can't pay our bills, and we have a 5 to 6 billion backlog... dollar backlog of bills. We need a new plan. That's our challenge to you, a new plan. That's what Illinois needs. We need one where we keep our promises and we don't break them."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Welch: "Representative Dunkin, I have a few questions for you. I serve on this committee with you, Chairman Dunkin, and I'm just... I just want to bring some things out. This particular Bill that we're discussing here today, are there community colleges in Democratic districts being funded?"

Dunkin: "Sure. I guess. I mean... yes, yes. And I... we didn't... we didn't look at it as Democrat or Republican."

Welch: "Well..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "Just sort of where the need was."

Welch: "...the answer is yes."

Dunkin: "Yes."

Welch: "Are there community colleges in Republican districts being funded..."

Dunkin: "Yes, absolutely."

Welch: "...being funded? You said that we have not been able to fund every single community college in the entire state, but community colleges throughout the state have been funded, correct?"

Dunkin: "Correct."

Welch: "Who do community colleges serve, chairman?"

Dunkin: "Everyone. Over 65 percent of our student population today attends a community college throughout the state."

Welch: "Some of the questions that I've been hearing from our colleagues on the other side, I just can't believe I'm hearing. Particularly about, you know, the reenrollment program. And I may have missed your answer to that so I apologize for asking, but who does the reenrollment program serve?"

Dunkin: "It serves students who are nontraditional students or may be first generation students in central Illinois, northern Illinois, and Chicago. And it's been proved very effective in bridging the gap from high school to college or university."

Welch: "Thank you, chairman. To the Bill. I want to first thank Chairman Dunkin for leading this committee. And I can tell you, I didn't agree with him on everything because every Friday morning we had meetings at 8 a.m. I can tell you that

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

at 8 a.m. on Friday mornings, I didn't see 23 Members present at this committee. I sat there for three and four hours every Friday morning, starting at 8 a.m., listening to testimony including from the Illinois Community College Board. Let me tell you the story of a woman that is dear to me, my mom, who got her GED and her college degree in the same year from a community college. My mom, who dropped out of Proviso schools to take care of her three boys, but went back, reenrolled, had the chance to get a college degree. You know how many people are out there like my mom that need this opportunity? Yesterday was Alpha Day at the Capitol, the first black Greek letter organization. I am a proud member of that organization. One of the things that we promote is go to high school and go to college. And the reality is that the people in our communities; the only college that they'll have the chance to go to is a community college. That's why we have to fund the community colleges the way we're doing today so people all across this state, in Democratic districts and your districts, can have the right to go to community college, can put their kids through college and law school. This Bill helps everyone. This Bill helps us all to put people in high school and give them a chance to go to college. Let's stop this nonsense here today. Approve these Bills. I ask everyone to vote 'aye' so that we can send kids to college."

Speaker Turner: "Final speaker, Representative Christian Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm standing here, as many others are, as a product of fantastic elementary and secondary as well as higher education. Without that, I

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

wouldn't be here, growing up in Maywood going through what I went through there, similar to the story that Representative Welch just told. But there's a broader point here, I think, about business climate and about our budget. A lot of my colleagues, both on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle, have talked about what it takes to be a good business climate and the reality of our budget. And some people have mentioned the truth, and I'm hoping everyone here can handle the truth, because here is the truth. The income tax that folks are railing against raised about \$26 billion in new revenue. In that time, we spent \$28 billion on our pension system. Now, that number's about to come down a bit based on reforms that passed with Majority Democratic support. But if we account for inflation, because someone else also mentioned accounting for inflation, since fiscal year 2000, general revenue spending is down 30 percent. Higher education down 40 percent, K through 12, 11 percent, human Services 30 percent, Public Safety 20 percent. Now, unless I missed it, according to a study by Crain's Chicago Business, what makes us a competitive business climate is our higher median income, our higher education levels, infrastructure. The things that allow us to invest in human capital and right now, we're living off of the human and physical capital of our ancestors. So, while we're talking about a competitive business climate, let's talk about how we have a budget that's reflective of our priorities that continues the investments that have gotten us to this point, not to throw stones into a wishing well that says, do we need economic growth, let's try a tax cut? As the Congressional

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Budget Office said, across the board tax cuts would actually seek economic growth. Well, that's fine, let's try tax cuts anyway. We need to be responsible about what our budget is, what are priorities are, and how we continue to get better as a state. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin to close."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a favorable vote. This is a... a very noble opportunity for many of us to support legislation that helps the majority or the lion's share of students here in the state. I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6025 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On a count of 61 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6025, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6026, Representative Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6026, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6026 simply appropriates a fiscal year '15 recommendation of \$663.562 million, an increase of about 0.1 percent to the University of Illinois here in our great state. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Last night I drove from Springfield to Champaign to load up my son's items because he will graduate on Sunday from the University of Illinois with an electrical engineering degree. We're very proud of him. We're very proud of the university that has taught him one of the more difficult subjects. We're very proud that immediately coming out of the University of Illinois with that type of degree, three job interviews, three job offers within, you know, just moments. So, we're very proud of that university and I think you should know though that this coming Monday, I will give my son, an ROTC Cadet at University of Illinois, his Oath of Commission, which commissions him as an officer in the United States Army. But casting a pall on this honor, will be my knowledge of the fact that as my son swears to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, professors and others, at the very university that has trained and educated him, are supporting the reinstatement of a known terrorist, James Kilgore, as a professor. Mr. Kilgore is not your average criminal. He's a terrorist's terrorist. Kilgore's were crimes against his country and its citizens. He is a traitor and should... and he should be treated as such. Kilgore should not be educating students. According to the News Gazette, he is a convicted murderer, bank robber, ex-convict, and terrorist linked to a string of bombings that targeted, among others... Excuse me, if you guys could be quiet. This is very important. He targeted, among others, police officers through his alliance with the Symbionese Liberation Army. To hide from authorities, he took

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

an alias and lived abroad event ... until he was eventually caught 27 years later. It is more than likely that he would have never come clean about his past and continued to hide if not discovered when one of the accomplices in the original murder/bank robbery incident was discovered hiding as well. At issue is not whether there should be academic diversity of a broad spectrum of life experiences amongst the faculty at the university. At issue is that there are certainly dozens, if not hundreds, of potential professors just as qualified, who have never taken part in the killing of innocent people in an attempt to fund a revolution on American soil nonetheless. As Christopher Kennedy stated in a letter arguing against the conferment of the title of 'Professor Emeritus' on known terrorist, Bill Ayers, 'There is nothing more antithetical to the hopes for a university that is lively and yet civil, or to the hope of our founding fathers for their great experiment of self-governing people, than to permanently seal off debate with one's opponents by killing them. There can be no place in democracy to celebrate political assassinations or honor those who do.' Allowing Mr. Kilgore to both educate and research at the university is reckless and disgraceful. Using any taxpayer money to fund someone like him sickens me as a veteran and an Illinois taxpayer. Mr. Kilgore was notified that his contract with the University of Illinois will not be renewed; apparently under pressure, that contract is now instead under review. As a Legislature, we must take into consideration how the funding that is given to any public institution is applied by that institution, especially given the fiscal condition of

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

the state. I encourage the University of Illinois to stand strong in their decision to eliminate known terrorists from their faculty roles. I request that the university demonstrate more responsible and constructive choices in hiring faculty for the university. Having a known terrorist on the faculty of our institutions diminishes the reputation of those institutions and their other highly qualified faculty. I ask this Body to take into account the past discretion U of I has demonstrated in hiring professors when we vote on the budget today. I ask you with we... I ask that we withhold their funding until we know that the university will, in fact, not renew Mr. Kilgore's contract. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill. I rise in support of the University of Illinois. As most of you know, that I represent the area where the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is. But I also would like to remind this Body that the University of Illinois has a campus here in Springfield, has a campus in Chicago. It has outreached throughout the rest of the state. It has the Prairie Research Institute, which not only has some of its offices housed at UIUC, but across the state, downstate, southern Illinois. The work that is done there is done in connection with the federal... folks who do research on our geography, our geology. The University of Illinois plays a huge important role. You know, to say that it's the flagship university of the state we've heard, but I think when you understand the expansion... expanse of the work that it does, is so important. There are many Members of this Body who are

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

graduates of the University of Illinois. Yes. There are many Members of this Body who have children who have attended or are attending the University of Illinois. And as we've heard, some of our colleagues across the aisle say, last year some of them were attending their children's graduation. This year we hear them say that they're attending graduation ceremonies for their children. The University of Illinois plays a huge important role to educate the people of the State of Illinois as well as the research that is done there by scientists from... who bring in grant funding from the Federal Government, from other institutions, in the millions and millions of dollars. So, they are really an economic engine for the state as well as the flagship university. I certainly encourage an 'aye' vote for this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin to close."

Dunkin: "Thank you... thank you, Members and colleagues. Just ask for a favorable vote, please."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6026 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6026, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "It's getting worse. House Bill 6027. Mr. Clerk, please put this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6027, 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 Dunkin."

Speaker Lang: "Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like for us to adopt Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Lang: "You want to tell us briefly something that might be in it?"

Dunkin: "Oh, absolutely, Representative. Three hundred eleven thousand dollars of Other State Funds for the... to build a fire protection services at the Southern Illinois University campus in Edwardsville here in Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "So, as I understand from your description, as brief as it was, this is not... this is not changing any of the General Revenue Funds that are in this budget Bill? Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "This is not a General Revenue Fund, correct."

Fortner: "The change is not. I mean, there is General Revenue in the Bill, but this... the Amendment did not change anything related to the General Revenue Fund?"

Dunkin: "That is correct."

Fortner: "And so, the number of 204,541,200, which is what I had as the General Revenue Fund here, that is the same as it was in committee. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "No. That's what we're adopting in the Floor Amendment here right now."

Fortner: "But that... but that will be the... that will then be..."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "The GRF number is correct."

Fortner: "The GRF number."

Dunkin: "Yes. That's... yeah."

Fortner: "That's what I was reading was the GRF number. Okay.

Thank you."

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6027, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you. I would ask that we... Yes. House Bill 627, I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, there's been a lot of discussion about the newspaper at Southern Illinois University. Does this have funds to reinstate the newspaper?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Reboletti: "There was a... a fee on students before. That fee is no longer. Is that fair to say, Representative? I know you're busy chatting with Representative Phelps."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'd like to yield you to Representative Phelps, please."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Phelps: "Mr. Speaker. Representative Reboletti, this was me. I...
it's 98 years old. And I didn't want to punch the students.
We found a way to put this in. I don't ask for much, but it's
something very important to the university. We may not even
use this money. The board did not act on the fee and this was
just a bridge to keep the operations going in the... another
magazine is coming. So, we may not even have to use this, but
we just wanted this as a security blanket, to be honest with
you, Representative. And that's totally honest."

Reboletti: "Thank you both."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Mautino. Please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6028, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6028, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like for us to vote 'yes' on House Bill 6028. This is regarding the Northern Illinois University's budget and our appropriations."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6029, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6029, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 6029 is... funds Illinois State University, which is essentially flat funding. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cloonen. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6030, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6030, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker. I... House Bill 6030 simply allows for funding for Western Illinois University. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative Dunkin, last year there was a Member initiative, if you will, a special project included in Western Illinois University's budget in the amount of about \$600

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

thousand. I don't see a specific line item for that in my outline. Is that project in this year's budget as well?"

Dunkin: "I'd like to yield to Representative Verschoore."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Yeah. I stand up in support of this line item. And what this does, we have the Rock Island Arsenal and it's ... it's our largest employer. And they have the technology group on there where the college students of engineering go to school part-time. They go to work over in the arsenal parttime... or go over there and work with this technology group. One of the things this technology group did last year... this past... maybe it was just yet this summer... they got a call from the Navy, I believe it was, and they had a plane that needed a part. And most of the time it would take two, three days, maybe two or three weeks. Well, they have a... a copy machine now where they copy this part. It can be made almost within minutes. They made this part before and with... had it shipped out in three hours. And that's just one of things that this money is going towards. Another thing is they're doing research in drones and different things like... like that. So, I stand in full support of this. I think, you know, we are fighting to keep this Rock Island Arsenal because there's another Brach coming up. We all know that Brach's going to be back. So, we're trying to do ... We want to be ahead of the ... we want to be ahead of the curve rather than behind it like we were the last time. So, I stand in strong support of this."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond, does that answer your question?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to be sure we had that \$600 thousand on record. Thank you."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Drury, Flowers, Harris, Sullivan. Please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6031, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6031, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 6031 is the line item appropriations for Northeastern Illinois University. And I would ask for a favorable vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Cavaletto, Williams. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6032, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6032, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 6032 simply asks for... basically flat funding for

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Governor's State University. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Reis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6033, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6033, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 6033 simply asks for flat funding for Eastern Illinois University for fiscal year '15. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative... I'm... I'm sorry. I can't... I can't hear. You want me to sit down? I know. You guys have been telling me that for eight years. Representative Dunkin, if I have any questions about EIU will you be yielding your time to anybody? I say, you guys have been yielding to others. Would you be yielding to anybody if I have a questions about EIU?"

Dunkin: "Repre... You can ask me whatever you like, Representative."

Reboletti: "Is there a reason that the funding is flat for my school where I have my bachelor's degree from?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "Well, that was... Is there a... Well, that's why we made it flat..."

Reboletti: "Is there a reason we're flat funding?"

Dunkin: "...because you graduated from there."

Reboletti: "That's... Okay. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6034, Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6034, 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 Dunkin."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 6034... Excuse me. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Lang: "Can you tell us briefly what's in the Bill... the Amendment, Sir?"

Dunkin: "Yes. It simply makes... it's purely technical and making a correction regarding the Medicare and the operating lines of the Chicago State University."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Dunkin: "No dollar change."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner. Yes, the Gentleman yields. Ask your question."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Fortner: "Thank... thank you very much. So, when you say technical change, there's no change to any of the funding lines. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "That is correct."

Fortner: "So, the General Revenue... the General Revenue Funds which I show out of committee were 37,223,400. That is still the correct number through this Amendment."

Dunkin: "Yes."

Fortner: "Thank you very much."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6034, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 6034 simply provides for funding for fiscal year '15 for Chicago State University. And I would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Pritchard: "Representative, is this strictly operating money or is there capital money in this appropriation?"

Dunkin: "This is operating moneys for Chicago State University."

Pritchard: "Is... is there capital money in this appropriation?"

Dunkin: "No."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Pritchard: "So, there's nothing in there for the child care center?"

Dunkin: "Correct."

Pritchard: "Okay. Then our information's incorrect in that regard.

Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative Dunkin, according to our notes here, there is \$500 thousand in the Chicago State budget. You fixing to yield to somebody, are you, Representative. There's \$500 thousand in the Chicago State University budget for, what is referred to as, the financial outreach center... financial assistance center. Is that correct, Representative?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Hammond: "And can you tell me, is there administrative cost within that particular project?"

Dunkin: "Yes, as we know it."

Hammond: "There are administrative costs..."

Dunkin: "Yes."

Hammond: "...so that \$500 thousand does not all go to the students.

Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "There are about 10 employees... You know, I'd like to yield to Representative Monique D. Davis."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

Hammond: "I'm not surprised."

Davis, M.: "I thought the question you asked was... what was your question?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Hammond: "Representative Davis, my question was, the \$500 thousand that is included in the Chicago State budget for the financial assistance center, are there administrative costs included in that financial assistance center?"
- Davis, M.: "Yes, there... there is... there are administrative costs."

 Hammond: "And Representative, do you know what the total administrative cost is?"
- Davis, M.: "I'm not sure of the total, but I think it's maybe...

 I'm not sure. I don't know. I really don't know."

Hammond: "So..."

- Davis, M.: "But what they do... It's a very small stipend for those who work in the center. And what they do is assist African-American and Latino students complete the FAFSA and the grant... MAP grant application and see that they get to the locations on time. When this program started, many colleges in the State of Illinois had 2 percent or less of African-American enrollment and the purpose was, and still continues to be, to make sure that African-American students are in the colleges in the State of Illinois. They go into the high school; they go into the elementary school. They're great motivational opportunities. One of the most important things they do is assist parents and students in completing those applications and getting them in on time and making sure that there's... there's an... there are college applicants from African-American communities."
- Hammond: "And I thank you for that information, Representative.

 I do recall, I believe it was last year, when the individual from the program testified before our committee and testified

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

that she reaches out to prospective students to encourage them to apply for this free money."

Davis, M.: "Well, the free money..."

Hammond: "And I encouraged her at the time to not refer to it as free money..."

Davis, M.: "Well, it..."

Hammond: "...because it is, in fact, taxpayer dollars, your money and my money and the taxpayer dollars of the State of Illinois."

Davis, M.: "I think you remember when she wheeled in a large carton of..."

Hammond: "I certainly do."

Davis, M.: "...applications that they had had contact with these students. Do you remember that?"

Hammond: "I do, Representative."

Davis, M.: "Okay."

Hammond: "And my point is that there are community colleges throughout the State of Illinois, those community colleges do an incredible job of reaching out to prospective students and current students, encouraging them to fill out their FAFSA, quiding them on how to do it properly."

Davis, M.: "That doesn't happen."

Hammond: "And... and so, I think it speaks volumes that we have an individual program of \$500 thousand for Chicago State University and perhaps that \$500 thousand we could do away with the administrative costs and get the dollars for that program, and many of the other programs that are buried in this budget, and get them to ISAC because, as the chairman

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

said, they do an incredible job of outreach. I think our dollars would be better spent."

Davis, M.: "But they don't outreach in certain neighborhoods, Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "No, they don't."

Davis, M.: "There are some neighborhoods they really don't outreach in, believe me. When I look at the number of African-American students in many of these colleges, it is abysmal. When I look at the number of professionals, it is abysmal. The number of teachers, it is abysmal. I cannot be a Legislator and just let that stand and ignore it. And I know for your community, your students are in college. They have all of the information. Our students don't get all of the information. ISAC does not come into some communities in Chicago, in Peoria..."

Hammond: "Maybe if..."

Davis, M.: "...in Harvey, in Ford Heights."

Hammond: "Representative, maybe your community colleges should be doing a better job. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Lilly. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6035, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6035, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 6035 simply establishes funding for the Illinois Board of Higher Education for fiscal year '15. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, would you say, that as we look at all of these Bills for higher education, that higher education is a priority in our spending plan for this next year?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Pritchard: "How much has our increase been in the higher education line?"

Dunkin: "Overall?"

Pritchard: "Yes."

Dunkin: "By 2.82 percent."

Pritchard: "Which is about how much money?"

Dunkin: "About 56 million... close to \$57 million."

Pritchard: "Fifty-seven million dollars."

Dunkin: "Close to it, a little bit under that."

Pritchard: "That's a considerable amount of money, isn't it?"

Dunkin: "That's correct."

Pritchard: "And if we look at the overall spending plan that it looks we're heading towards, that somewhere around \$3.2 billion more than what this House has approved and take the normal percentage distribution that higher education gets, would it seem that a normal distribution with this kind of revenue would be somewhere around \$380 million?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "I'm look... Can you restate that?"

Pritchard: "So, you take 11 percent, which is a normal distribution, times 3.2 billion. It's considerably more than \$54 million. As we look at this overall spending plan, it certainly has exceeded our revenue, but I hope we won't use this as an excuse to say, well, we're funding education with it because clearly we're not in the higher education area. And as a result of that, we're putting more pressure on students. Their tuition and fees are going up. We're not able to maintain the buildings that we have on our campus. So, as we look at priorities in our state, Ladies and Gentlemen, we really have to recognize the fact we're underfunding education and we certainly can't take any credit for this budget."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative Dunkin, this Bill contains, as I'm reading it, a \$1.8 million decrease for the Illinois Math and Science Academy. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Hammond: "Representative Dunkin, would you agree that the Illinois Math and Science Academy is not only unique to Illinois, but is certainly a premier institution and one that the State of Illinois should be extremely proud to have here?"

Dunkin: "Sure."

Hammond: "Can you tell me why there is a decrease of \$1.8 million for an incredible institution?"

Dunkin: "I'd like to yield to State Representative Chapa LaVia."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia. Well, she's not here, so you'll have to yield to someone else, Sir. You want to just muddle through without her, Sir?"

Dunkin: "Sure."

Speaker Lang: "Good, muddle."

Dunkin: "Sure. Well... So, over the last couple years, since I've been chairman, we have increased the Illinois Math and Science Academy exponentially by 350 thousand, 550 thousand and last year 700... close to a million dollars every year of that particular line item. And over those three years, actually prior to those years, we have been discussing some of its diversification of its faculty, of its staff, of its students, as contingent upon us investing more dollars. And they stated that they would love to have the additional dollars to help diversify their student body. And they have not met those goals and objectives and we simply have reduced the moneys that we've incrementally... we incrementally increased them by... by \$1.8 million."

Hammond: "So, in other words, the \$1.8 million is what you have done for increases because you thought they were an incredible premier institution in the State of Illinois over the last three years and now, you have reduced them by that same amount. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "Representative, we have... we have 11 incredible state universities. We have a number of wonderful high schools of math and science all across the state and this is one of our premier institutions, one out of many in the State of Illinois."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Hammond: "When... when you made this agreement, and I'm just going to refer to it as an agreement, to increase the funding for the Illinois Math and Science Academy over the last few years, was that agreement something in writing or was there a Memorandum of Understanding signed between you and members of the faculty or the board at MSA? How was that done?"
- "Representative, as you well attended and are quite Dunkin: familiar with, we have discussed consistently about the ratios of student population diversity as well as faculty diversity in staff. Every year we've increased some based off of those discussions. They have not met those... those goals and objectives that we had discussed, what you were a part of and they came before us several times... Actually, they would come in front of us with students as well to discuss these particular areas of our concern as a committee overall. Which is why every year we've agreed to give them substantial increases that they had no problems accepting because we wanted them to diversify those various components of their student population, their staff, as well as their faculty. And they have simply not adhered to all of those goals that we talked about and all of the moneys that we invested in this premier institution."
- Hammond: "So, Representative, neither I nor any of our Republican colleagues on the Higher Education Appropriation Committee are aware of signing any document or contract to that effect.

 Does such a document exist?"
- Dunkin: "Representative, we didn't sign any document. As a matter of fact, for any of these state universities or any of our appropriations, we don't sign Memorandums of Understanding.

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

What it is, we look to have a clear understanding of goals and objectives of our schools meeting certain charges that we push on them or re... ask, request, fund them for and IMSA simply have not met various objectives that we had discussed for a number of years."

Hammond: "Representative, as we have sat here for what is now over 11 hours today, we have heard the budgets of four other committees. In many of those discussions, I have heard the Minority Chairs converse with the Majority Chairs, speak to the goings on in their working committees, compliment each other for having worked together at least to get to the point where they are at for today's... to hear today's Bills. My question to you, Representative Dunkin, as chairman of the House Higher Education Appropriation Committee, were there working groups for the House Higher Education Committee?"

Dunkin: "Representative, before I respond to that, I'd like to yield to Representative Chapa LaVia."

Hammond: "No."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Hammond: "We're done with that, Representative. I'm asking you a question as the chairman of the committee. Were there working groups conducted for this committee? It's a yes or no answer."

Dunkin: "Representative, you and I, as Leaders of the Illinois House..."

Hammond: "It's a yes or no answer, Representative."

Dunkin: "...we have conducted public meetings to discuss and met with university presidents twice, and sometimes more than that."

Hammond: "Have there been working group meetings?"

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Dunkin: "And that was an open and public working group that we've been engaged in..."

Hammond: "Mr. Chairman..."

Dunkin: "...since January of this year, Representative."

Hammond: "Mr. Chairman..."

Dunkin: "Am I correct?"

Hammond: "...we heard testimony in our committee just the same as the other committees did. My question to you, were there working group meetings for the Higher Education Appropriation Committee?"

Dunkin: "Representative, the Democrats..."

Hammond: "Yes or no."

Dunkin: "...the Democrats, just like the Republicans, we caucus and we talk about a myriad of issues. We discuss everything from transportation to public safety."

Hammond: "Mr. Chairman, really? Do I need to go back to the conversations between Representative Bellock, Representative Harris, Representative Crespo, Representative Senger, I can go on. Representative, I am going to ask the question one more time. Were there working group meetings, singular or plural, conducted for the House Higher Education Committee?"

Dunkin: "Representative, we as Democrats meet to discuss higher education, elementary and secondary education, public safety, human services. We discussed in Higher Education schools like Western Illinois University as well as Community College Boards and a host of other higher education subject matters. So, yes, we talk about higher education to hospitals to de... Department of Regul... the Department of Professional

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Regulations to Department of Health and Family Services. Yes, we have."

Hammond: "So, I would just comment so that the taxpayers of the State of Illinois are fully aware. Four of the five House Appropriation Committees, met, had working groups, some went better than others. The House Higher Education Appropriation Committee, apparently, had at least one working group that the Republicans were not even invited to the table, not even invited. And furthermore, and I can't wait to share this with the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, how did I, as the Minority Chairperson, even find out that there was a working group? I found it out in the ladies' restroom in this chamber. Call it what you want."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Chapa LaVia: "What was the entire budget for IMSA last year, Chairman?"

Dunkin: "The entire budget was about... was a little bit over \$22 million from us."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay."

Dunkin: "Twenty-two million 485 million dollars."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. And how much does a parent pay in tuition?"

Dunkin: "Tuition there is... currently it's \$2,870 and this upcoming fiscal year it's going to increase by 56 percent... 56.8 percent to 4,500 on... in addition to the subsidy, excuse me, the subsidies/allocation of \$22,458,000 that we are giving them."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- Dunkin: "So, on top of that, they're going to... they're going to still charge them tuition."
- Chapa LaVia: "Okay. So, how much is the average household income of a parent that sends a kid to IMSA?"
- Dunkin: "Eighty-one thousand to one hundred and ten thousand dollars per household."
- Chapa LaVia: "Okay. And how much have they raised in private funds in the last three years? Do you have an average?"
- Dunkin: "Yes. They've raised \$2.2 million in fiscal year '14."
- Chapa LaVia: "Okay. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, IMSA is actually in my district. And I have fought tirelessly for the last 11 years I've been here to get more and more dollars on the premise that IMSA would look like the diversity of the State of Illinois. Do you happen to have the numbers on what the diversity of IMSA looks like maybe not including the faculty but you might have those numbers. Can you tell me what the population of IMSA as a residential public school is?"
- Dunkin: "The... you know, I'm currently not looking at those numbers. I... but I think you would have them. I know it's about 656-plus students. Can you enlighten us, Representative Chapa LaVia?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Well, the last communication I have from the acting President right now... let me look through... There is a total of 650 students and 299 are classified as Caucasian, 297 as Asian, 71 as Latino or Latina, 67 as African American, and 31 don't... that wish not to classify what they are. Now, Suzanne Deuchler, who is one of the original Legislators who produced this legislation to create IMSA, called to me last year. She happens to be my constituent. She called me within

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

a... year and she asked me to look at the numbers even though I... I really didn't know the demographics yet. And in fact, we have two Legislators that were here when that was produced and that was Representative Flowers and Representative Monique Davis, Speaker and probably Representative Lou and maybe Frank Mautino, that the way IMSA was set up it was supposed to be diverse and look like the entire population of the state. The last years that I've been fighting for more and more money there was an agreement, a gentleman's agreement, if you will, since Max McGee was there, that they would work really, really, really, really hard to increase those numbers whether it was through FUSION or the children that were on the campus. And I have not seen the ... the results like we'd like to see them. Now, you and I have agreed that we're going to meet with the board of trustees and teach... or try to help them get to the ... get new programs, help them to reach out to the communities, the minority communities, 'cause all of our kids are very important. And the way this ... IMSA was set up is that would be important, but what it looks like right now is that if you have a household income... I don't know about your district, but my district is 27,500 for a household of four. But if you have an income of 82 thousand, you said. Did you say 82?"

Dunkin: "No, 110 thousand for two children..."

Chapa LaVia: "Two children, okay."

Dunkin: "...on average."

Chapa LaVia: "So..."

Dunkin: "A hundred and ten thousand dollars per an average."

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

Chapa LaVia: "My district is 27,500 for a four household. That's mom, dad, and two children, but there's usually, you know, a coup... more children. Is that we have to really work with the board of trustees to work on programs with FUSION and other programs so we can get back where we need to go. Because we want all the children to learn science, math, engineering, technology. Every child in the state should have the same ... same possibilities as every other family that can actually afford to send their kid there. And I know that Carol Moseley-Braun, Suzanne Deuchler and all the others, Emil Brown... Emil Jones and all the people that were involved in pushing this piece of legislation wanted that for IMSA. I want that for IMSA too. I love IMSA. I bet ... you got a couple complaints about the way I feel about it. But I think that, you know, as much as my colleagues are saying we're overspending, we're cutting here. We're cutting them back to 2012, 2011 numbers, right? Well, we need... we're going to help... you and I, as the chairman as one of your Members the appropriation, we're going to sit down with the board of trustees and see how we can help bring them back to those numbers, correct?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Chapa LaVia: "And... and for those of you who question, you know, what's going on with the budget, this is just a game plan. When it goes through the Senate, we don't know what's going to happen over at the Senate. They might lower our numbers. To go back to the question at hand on whether we're overstepping our constitutional boundaries or not. There's a whole other chamber over there that has whole different ideas on what's going on. I'd like to help get the number back up

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

from the cut 10... you know, 10 percent cut. I want to help; I want to help, but education has to be for all children in the State of Illinois. It can't just be for the elite that know about this program or their parents make a lot of money and they're able to pay a tuition of under \$5 thousand. I want to be for all children. You know what, the founders of IMSA were all about all children too. So... so, I endorse this even though it hurts me because I fought so much for this, but I also want to sit at the table and make sure that it's for all children. Whether it's for FUSION or residential, I think that we should always keep in mind that education is supposed to be free, we're supposed to encourage every child, no matter where they come from, for getting the best education so they can be taxpaying citizens of the State of Illinois. And I vote 'yes' on this budget. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays. Mr. Hays does not wish to speak. Those in favor of the Bill will sa… vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Conser… of Postponed Consideration, there appears House Bill 6154, Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Mem..."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir. This Bill has been thoroughly debated. Please proceed."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6154 is the Bill appropriates funding for the Department of Insurance. We did

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

debate this Bill earlier and just asking for another vote. And please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Rita. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1095, offered by Representative Brauer. House Resolution 1103, offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 1104, offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 1105, offered by Representative Martwick. And House Resolution 1107, offered by Representative Berrios."

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. The Chair recognizes Mr. Evans."

Evans: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Evans: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if you look to your feet, you probably have gym shoes on. This has been such a long day it's been a good day to wear gym shoes. On behalf of myself and all of the cancer survivors and folks throughout the state and throughout this Capitol whose families have dealt with cancer, we have folks this year who lost loved ones in our very own Assembly. So, thank you all for participating in Suits and Sneakers today. I'll be thinking about those folks

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

- in my district and my colleagues that were lost in the issues of cancer this year. Thank you all, enjoy your day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Evans. Ladies and Gentlemen... Ladies and Gentlemen, the Clerk's about to make some committee announcements. Please pay attention to the committee announcements. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after Session. Personnel and Pensions is meeting in Room 115. Veterans' Affairs is meeting in 413. Counties & Townships is meeting in C-1. Health Care Availability and Accessibility is meeting in D-1. The following committees were canceled for this evening. Public Safety: Police & Fire is canceled. And Restorative Justice-Higher Education joint committee has been canceled. Tomorrow morning at 8:30 a.m. the Labor & Commerce Committee is meeting in Room 114."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

- Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There has been a rumor that the Boat Drink Caucus could convene at Bob's Buternut Hut around 9 p.m. and that Representative Martwick may be sitting in. So, if you're out and about, join us for that caucus gathering."
- Speaker Lang: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Friday, May 16 at the hour of 9:30 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned until Friday, tomorrow, May 16 at the hour of 9:30 a.m. Have a wonderful evening."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill

131st Legislative Day

5/15/2014

6236, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. First Reading of this House Bill. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 125, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 232, offered Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 852, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 1009, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning law. First Reading of these criminal Senate Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 47, offered by Representative Unes. Senate Joint Resolution 67, offered by Representative Costello. House Resolution 1106, offered by Representative Moylan. House Resolution 1108, offered by Representative Kay. And House Joint Resolution 97, offered by Representative Golar. These are referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."