55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 224, approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 679, recommends be adopted is a Motion to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 165, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 184, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2635, Senate Amendment #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3848, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4113."
- Speaker Turner: "Members should be in their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Roy Rhodes, who is with Abundant Life Church in Alton, Illinois. Pastor Rhodes is the guest of Representative Beiser. 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 Rhodes: "Good morning. Would you bow your heads and let's have a word of prayer. Heavenly Father, we come before You on this day to, first of all, give thanks for each of these, Father, who have answered a call to serve. We pray great blessing upon them, their families, their industries, Father. We pray for great wisdom, great stewardship. Bless them with abilities beyond their ability. Father, we ask You to watch over our nation in every way and on this... especially this morning, Father, we give thanks for the men and women who just yesterday we celebrated, Lord, the laying down of their

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

lives to secure for us these great freedoms that we enjoy. Thank you. May You continue to bless our nation with individuals not only like these who have given their lives, but also these in this room today who have come to serve and to represent us. Bless them and bless this session. In the name of Jesus, the strong son of God. Amen."

- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Ann Williams."
- Williams 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 Turner: "Roll call for attendance. Representative Brown."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal show that Representatives Cabello and Poe are excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Monique Davis, Frank Mautino, and Al Riley are excused."
- Speaker Turner: "With 113 Members present, a quorum is established. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Dunkin, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education, reports the following Committee action taken on May 25, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4146, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4147, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4148. Representative Arroyo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety, reports the following Committee action taken on May

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

25, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House 4153, Floor #1 to House Amendment Bill Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive, reports the following Committee action taken on May 26, 2015: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3231, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 398, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1516. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance, reports the following Committee action taken on May 26, 2015: do pass as amended-Short Debate is Senate Bill 1236. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following Committee action taken on May 26, 2015: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2925, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1827. Representative Kelly Burke, Chairperson from the Committee Higher Education, reports the following on Committee action taken on May 26, 2015: recommends be adopted House Resolution 435, House Resolution 477, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 716. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services, reports the following Committee action taken on May 26, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4158, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4159, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4160. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services, reports the following Committee action taken on May 26, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4165. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 78,

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- offered by Representative Bennett. This is referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Bellock, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Bellock: "Thank you. I just wanted to make an announcement that next week is the week of NEW Leadership in Illinois that COWL sponsors and I've put on the women's desk today, Judy Hsu is going to be the keynote speaker at the dinner on Wednesday night and anything that you can do to contribute to this program. This will be the tenth anniversary of this program that we've started that has been acknowledged nationally as one of the best leadership programs in the State of Illinois for... across the United States and as of next Friday we will have dedicated and graduated 200 women Illinois leaders. So, we're really excited about it, so I hope you put that on the calendar. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Mayfield: "I'd just like to remind everybody and invite them out this evening for Soul & Salsa. It is the Black & Latino Caucus end of session party at the Black Caucus House directly behind the Capitol building. Starts at 6 p.m. tonight, great food, entertainment. Everybody is more than welcome to come out and enjoy with us. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Brady, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Brady: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would you please welcome my Page for the day, Miss Olivia Spears. Olivia, if you'd stand up down in the page area. Olivia is a recent graduate of Normal Community West High School in my district and also will be attending Louisiana Tech University. So, a nice round of applause and welcome to her to Springfield."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol.

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

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the chair."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Reis: "I think a lot of Members on the floor have noticed that maybe there is an intruder on the floor. We've always had guest chairs and a lot of families are going to have guest members come up, but for some reason, all the guest chairs have turned up missing, and I was wondering if the Speaker could find out if the perpetrators have been apprehended and return our guest chairs to the floor."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, we will look into it."

Reis: "Thank you."

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

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An item of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Leitch: "I'd like to introduce to the Body an outstanding Bradley student, Jay Simmons, who will be also working with me this

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- summer and who is serving as a Page today. Please give him a great Springfield welcome. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol.

  Representative Brown."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 118 for one hour."
- Speaker Turner: "The House will recess and reconvene at 1:00. At that time we will do the memorial service."
- Speaker Lang: "I would ask all House Members who can hear this in their offices to come to the floor for the Memorial Day commemoration. The House will be in order. Members will be at their chairs. Would the Members and our guests in the gallery please stand for the presentation of colors by the 114th Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry (Reactivated). Mr. Clerk, please read House Resolution 499."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 499.

- WHEREAS, In accordance with the established tradition of the Illinois House of Representatives, it is fitting that, for Memorial Day, we honor our brothers and sisters who have given their lives in service to our country as the guardians of our long-held freedoms; and
- WHEREAS, No better words have been written to honor those brave souls who were sacrificed long ago or pay tribute to the those brave men and women of today who have continued that fight for freedom than the Gettysburg Address; let us now recite those words so humbly said by our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln: "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in the larger sense, we can not dedicate - we can not consecrate - we cannot hallow - this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us - that from those honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion - that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain - that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom - and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."; and

WHEREAS, Those words from long ago still speak to those brave men and women of today who we now honor; it is all together fitting and appropriate that we, with heavy hearts, again accept the honor of reading the Roll Call of those American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines from the State of Illinois who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the preceding year since the previous tribute; therefore, be it

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that a copy of this resolution and a copy of the ceremonial honor roll and program of the May 26, 2015 reading of names be presented to the families of these fallen heroes."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of House Resolution 499. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. Proceeding to the roll call of fallen soldiers. Mr. Anthony."
- Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Lance Cpl. Steven M. Hancock,
  United States Marine, died May 19, 2014, Coal City, Illinois."

  Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed.
- McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pfc. Aaron S. Toppen, United States Army, killed in action, June 9, 2014, Mokena, Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. I'm humbled. Cpl. Sara A. Medina, United States Marine, died May 12, 2015, Aurora, Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "The Body will take a moment of silence in memory of the fallen. The Chair recognizes Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am humbled to give remarks today with regards to Memorial Day and the words on behalf of a grateful nation are words spoken upon the presentation of the American flag to the family of a fallen comrade. Those are words that come to mind when I reflect on the importance of Memorial Day. However, while most families view Memorial Day as a day to be with family, cook out on the grill, or view a parade I realize that this profound day is heavy in

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

the hearts and souls of the families that have lost so much in protecting the freedom so many have taken for granted. Thus in reflection, I must profess that I have no words that can be said to properly convey the gravity and importance of not only Memorial Day, but of every day that is endured by the loved ones who have suffered through the loss of someone who has given their life for the precious freedoms in the great United States of America. I cannot begin to find the words for the parents of Marine Cpl. Sara Medina, who will never see her have a family of her own to her ultimate sacrifice for our freedoms. There are no words I can say to the brother of Marine Lance Cpl. Jesse Delatorre, who is not here to be the uncle to his brother's child who will never know him because of his ultimate sacrifice. Marines Lance Cpl. Hector Ramos, Eduardo Lopez appreciated life so much that they wanted to give a difference and serve their country. And I cannot begin to say of the potential that they could have achieved that was cut short because of their sacrifice. What can be said to the loved ones of Army Specialist Christopher Patterson, who at age 20, took a leave from Valparaiso University to serve his country only to not graduate because he gave the ultimate sacrifice. And as a wife, I cannot speak any words that could console the wife of Marine 1st Lt. Timothy Ryan, who cannot have a family and grow old with her because he gave the ultimate sacrifice. These are two individuals from the City of Aurora, of which I represent, but there are many more from the great State of Illinois. So on Memorial Day, along with every day of the year that we are given the gift of freedom, we should hold

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

these individuals, who are among the almost one million individuals who have lost their lives serving our country, in our hearts and souls. While I could not pen the words to say about the ultimate sacrifice our men and women have given for my freedom, I can embody their ultimate sacrifice in ensuring that my actions speak louder than any words that can be stated at any ceremony. Thus, I pledge to do all I can to continue to cherish the blessing that I've been given by living in the United States of America, and I will not have their ultimate sacrifice for my freedom be made in vain and I will hope that many others will do the same. Mr. Speaker, freedom is not free and I'm humbled and honored to be able to give these remarks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yesterday there were Memorial Day services throughout our country, and as many of us know, the individual who started Memorial Day, who was the force behind the creation of Memorial Day was none other than an Illinoisan, General John Logan, who went on to become an Illinois Senator. He started it out as Decoration Day, where the graves of Civil War dead would be decorated and it became Memorial Day. And while we recognize in particular and honor the three individuals, who unfortunately lost their lives during the past year, I think it's worthwhile to note that throughout the years how many individuals, how many service members have indeed lost their lives. Seven hundred fifty thousand soldiers in the Civil War and think of that, that's a staggering number in comparison to what our population was at

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

the time. The Spanish-American War, 6,500; World War I, 117,000 service members; World War II, 405,000; Korea, over 36,000; Vietnam, 58,000; 4,500 in Iraq; 2,200 in Afghanistan. Those are the big ones, but Mogadishu, Grenada, Panama, Haiti, the Boxer Rebellion at the turn of the 1900s, American servicemen lost their lives. They didn't come home to their loved ones. They gave all they had in service to their buddies, in service to their cause, in service to this great country. We need to remember and recognize all of them for what they have given us and the freedoms that we have because of what they've done. God bless each and every one of them, and in particular of course, the three service members that we honor here today. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Frese."

Frese: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Forty-five years ago on May 28, 1970, my brother, Pfc. Michael Albert Frese, was killed in action while serving his country in Vietnam. Michael Frese was 20 years old that day when an anti-personnel mine took his life. I was 11. To say that that day has made a lasting impact on my life would certainly be an understatement. There's a very special and personal and private element to these ceremonies for each of my other seven siblings and myself. I would like to thank my fellow Members of this Body for taking time to reflect and to show respect for those who paid the full price by giving their lives for their country. We, standing here today, are the benefactors of that tremendous investment. Let us never forget. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Members, you may be seated. It's difficult at a time like this, but we're going back to the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

regular order of business. On page 19 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 220. Mr. Moffitt. Please proceed, Sir, on your Motion."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, we passed 220, it was a good public safety Bill. An Amendment was put on in the Senate. Senator Sullivan carried it there, that we can help a county with a referendum that was passed. I'd like to call on my seatmate, Representative Frese, as it is his home county, to explain the Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Frese."

Frese: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Regarding this Amendment, as my seatmate had mentioned that Senator Sullivan added this Amendment for the aid of one of the counties in my district. There was a letter of the law that needed to be followed to put a tax referendum question on the ballot. Our State's Attorney felt that we met that. However, the attorneys at the Department of Revenue felt that we were amiss of one particular small item; and therefore, we wanted an Amendment to make sure everything was crisp and clear, so we worked with Senator Sullivan to add this Amendment. This takes care of it and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

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

Bradley: "I've had the opportunity to work with the Gentleman. We need to support this measure and I would encourage everyone on both sides to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "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? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Anthony, Bourne, Brown, Kay, Mitchell,

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Tryon. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 76 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 220. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to remind everybody in the chamber here, in the spirit of bipartisanship, retired State Representative Ron Stephens does a walk across the State of Illinois and sometimes even farther. I think he's walked as far as 500 miles in the past. This walk is for the Wounded Warrior Project and he walks a mile for every \$100 that he is pledged. So, I would ask that any of the Members here consider pledging \$100 or more to the Wounded Warrior Project. I can make sure that Representative Stephens gets those checks and he'll walk one mile for every \$100. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Moving to page 8 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading. Senate Bill 226. Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 226, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 226 is an initiative of one of my very active constituents who does a fantastic job in the community helping those with developmentally disabled persons and their families, Ms. Debra Vines. Ms. Vines is the CEO of The Answer Inc., a group dedicated to helping families with children and adults living with autism. Senate Bill 226 is designed to bring greater awareness to the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

PUNS list and, ultimately, better utilization of that list. The PUNS list, which stands for the Prioritization and Urgency of Needs for Services, was created by the 93rd General Assembly in 2004, and it can certainly be used more effectively. There is no opposition to this Bill after working on an Amendment with DHS and other organizations and I ask for approval."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack. The Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. Chris, I'm looking at my analysis and everything you just said is consistent with it, but I don't think you explained what the Bill does. Other than having everyone's now universal support, a record... just lay out what it does."

Welch: "That's a good question, Representative. This Bill, in addition to bringing awareness to the actual list, the mechanism for that is DHS and the State Board of Education will work with local school districts who will designate a person who will receive training from DHS and ISBE on what this list is and how they can make persons that qualify aware of it. Specifically, they're going to create an online training program."

Sandack: "And so, this is a best practices undertaking. Is there any expenditures to the state for this addition to the PUNS program?"

Welch: "You know, I was asked that question in committee and if there is an expenditure it would be very minimal 'cause it's an online program that can be recreated by existing staff and to address any concerns that may... people may have we did put

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

language in the Bill to say subject to appropriation, but we should be fine."

Sandack: "Thank you, Sir. I appreciate the answers to the questions."

Welch: "Thank you."

'yes', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Jesiel. Please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 125. Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 125, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 125 amends the Humane Care of Animals Act. We amended it in the Senate and the Farm Bureau went from opposing to neutral. We even further amended it for clarification. This does not increase penalties. I am glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, I appreciate that. The Farm Bureau went from opposing to being neutral, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, Sir."

Moffitt: "And the Department of Agriculture is neutral?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Moffitt: "And no increase in penalty? We're just... we're not changing that at all?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Moffitt: "We had some conversation... you know, for a... this talks about companion animals, but for... like in the case of a farm dog, a lot of those are working dogs. They do stay outside and I realize this isn't limited to dogs, but if an animal has a dry place out of the wind, I mean, that is appropriate care. I mean think of dog teams in Alaska or whatever. I mean, they're accustomed to being outside. We're not saying that it has to be a climate controlled facility. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Moffitt: "And you know, with livestock... I think I relate to you...
and this is companion animals, I understand, but in the case
of cattle out on a pasture where they can get out of the wind
are usually healthier than those crowded into a barn where it
might be more prone to pneumonia. Same way with pets. The
proper conditions is what we're really looking for not saying
that it has to be some new, high-priced situation. If
reasonable care is given... that's not your... you're not
concerned about those... intentional abuse is what you're
trying to eliminate, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Representative, yes."

Moffitt: "And thank you for the accommodations you've made to make this a workable Bill. I appreciate that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "A question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Cassidy: "Representative, our analysis describes this as a Class A felony which doesn't exist. Can you tell me what the penalty is?"
- Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry. That must be... this is a misdemeanor. I don't know why our analysis says it's a felony, Representative."
- Cassidy: "So, in your... when you presented the Bill last week it was a Class A misdemeanor, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Cassidy: "And that doesn't change?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

- Cassidy: "I have to say I like what you're trying to do. I'm concerned that we're equating this with a DUI. I mean, this is a... getting up to a year in jail might be a little extreme at a time when we're trying to be cautious about the use of criminal justice resources. I would..."
- Feigenholtz: "Representative, current statute already has this as a Class A misdemeanor. This is not being changed in statute at all. So, I'm not sure what you're asking."
- Cassidy: "Current statute for what? This is a new crime, isn't it? This exposure to extreme heat or cold causing in this injury or death is a new crime, so what is... what current statute is a Class A misdemeanor? Is this not a new offense?"
- Feigenholtz: "There is clarification in Section 3.01 under cruel treatment. It further defines under the definition of abandonment, as you can see, on line 12. The misdemeanor already exists in statute. This is a further refinement of abandonment."

Cassidy: "Got it. Thank you, I appreciate that."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Anthony, Phillips. Mr. Anthony. Please take the record. On this question there are 104 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Moffitt. Mr. Moffitt?"
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Moffitt: "Over here on our side right behind me to the right, former Member of the Illinois House, now, a Member of the United States Congress, U.S. Representative Mike Bost. Let's welcome him back to the House Floor."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Everybody throw something in the air for Mr. Bost. Welcome, Congressman. Senate Bill 418, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 418, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 418 amends the Energy Assistant Act and allows DCEO to spend more money on weatherization and administrative expenses for the state LIHEAP program which offers weatherization and utility assistance to low income individuals. The Bill clarifies through the Amendment that received from DCEO that any unspent funds from the previous fiscal years may be reallocated. Of the amounts reallocated,

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

no more than ten percent of the funds may be spent on administrative expenses. This gives us an opportunity to expand the LIHEAP program and the number of people that they can provide weatherization to. I know of no opposition and would ask for a favorable vote from the Body."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack. Sponsor yields."
- Sandack: "Thank you. Art, thank you for that explanation. I appreciate it. As the program sits right now, how successful or how utilized is this program?"
- Turner: "The program has been very successful and has allowed...
  and has had the ability to help a lot of people, close to
  400,000 households in the state I'm told are served by the
  LIHEAP program."
- Sandack: "And with the expansion of the program... potential expansion of the program under your Bill what's the goal? How many other people... more people will have access to this type of weatherization program?"
- Turner: "I'm not sure of an exact number, but the goal is to help as many people as possible and get the number up as high as we can."
- Sandack: "And thank you for that. Last question, there has been some speculation that DCEO may go under... may be changed in the future as far as how that agency is run. It may not even be around much longer. Where would this program go in the absence of DCEO being able to administer it?"
- Turner: "I guess we have to cross that bridge when we come to it, Rep."
- Sandack: "All right. Thank you."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Switches are just where you left them, Members. Davis, Poe. Please take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Manley."

Manley: "Point of personal privilege, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Manley: "I would like to introduce to the House my Page for a day. She's a constituent. Her name is Rachel Martinez. She is first year at the University of Missouri, A.K.A. Mizzou, and in the gallery is her mom, Sara Martinez. Can you stand up? Thank you and welcome to Springfield. She wants to be a lawyer."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Well, we'll talk to her about that.

Welcome. Thanks for being here with us today. Senate Bill
437. Mr. Mitchell. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 437, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell.:

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is in some ways kind of an operational cleanup Bill for something that our investment funds are already doing. We have emerging manager programs for all of our investment funds and what this Bill would say is in so far is you have an emerging manager who has been managing money for several years, who's done extremely well, who's now graduated from that program and

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

wants to manage as a, effectively, a prime vendor that they would not have to go back through the RFP process given their relationship with the funds. Some of our funds are doing this already. This codifies an existing practice. It's a good Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of the Gentleman's Bill. To those concerned about the RFP process here, just know that this is an instance where we need Illinois companies to do good under existing Illinois law. So, if we want funds to invest in Illinois companies, if we want them to grow and achieve the next level in this market we need to vote for this Bill. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "A question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Christian, I noticed in my notes that there was a 5-4 committee vote. And I'm not asking you to glean the minds of the opponents, but obviously, it wasn't a clean sweep at committee. What objections were voiced at committee with respect to this Bill?"

Mitchell, C.: "So, as I understand it, Ron, what happened was there were some folks who felt okay, this is circumventing the RFP process. We don't want to do that. We want to be as transparent as possible. The response to that is look, these are emerging funds that have done business with the fund for many, many years, generally, at least three or four, and what happens is because they've just gone from emerging manager status up to potential prime vendor status they don't

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

necessarily have the same length of service, for example, as a larger fund might potentially from out of state. So, what this would say is look, we've got a relationship with these guys. They do good work for us, guys or girls, they do good work for us. We'd like to keep working with them. So, this is a practice we're doing already. Some legal folks inside the fund said we do this already. We think it's perfectly fine. We want to clarify it. This is clarifying language."

- Sandack: "All right, so two things there. So, if we're doing it already are we violating our statutes right now?"
- Mitchell, C.: "It's not... I don't think... the understanding of the lawyers for the funds is that this is in no way a violation. However, to make sure out of an abundance of caution that we are in the right, let's do this language to clean it up and make it clear."
- Sandack: "All right. And then the next backup question, Christian, is 'emerging'. 'Emerging' means what? It means they're on the ascendancy, they don't have a track record and... but they're doing what we think they should be doing, so let's give them a break. Help me out."
- Mitchell, C.: "Well, no. So, how it happens is so let's say... so right now you're a small fund. Let's say you're a woman or a minority owned fund. You don't have the scale to do \$100 million in assets, you come into the emerging manager program say with \$50 million. What happens is you go to a large firm, say a Mesirow. Our TRS, SURS, whoever it is gives a \$500 million allocation. Their job is then as a manager of managers to go out and find, you know, ten folks who do \$50 million each. They do well, they get their returns, these folks grow

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

because not just of our capital, but others. Now, they're at a hundred million or something. They're out of the emerging manager program. We know these guys. They do really, really good work. We want to actually being them back as a prime vendor. This allows them to do that. They've already gone through the process, so instead of going back to the process and starting at a disadvantage, potentially, with firms from say out of state, they can just pass on through."

Sandack: "Allright, thank you for the very detailed explanation. To the Bill. I certainly understand the propriety of the Gentleman's request. I am perplexed a little bit whenever someone says we're already doing this and out of an abundance of caution those darn lawyers told us we should codify it, but we're not in violation. And then the other side says we ought to codify this because we're already doing it. Folks, I would look very carefully at this because while I think it's well intended I think what the Gentleman said in the first answer to my question that it's going around best practices and or RFP expected practices for getting vendors to give... to get state business. We ought to do this with great circumspect. So, thank you for the answers to the question though, Christian."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Mitchell, could you explain once again what's the criteria for an emerging manager? To what level of investments can they actually be in charge of and still be considered an emerging manager?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Mitchell, C.: "So, an emerging manager, Representative, manages less than 10 billion in assets under management."
- Ives: "Okay, so I hope everybody in the room heard that. You can be managing up to... you can manage up to \$10 billion and be considered an emerging manager which means that..."
- Mitchell, C.: "Representative, just a clarifying point, you also have to be a DBE. So, that's minority, women, veteran-owned business for example. So, there's your..."
- Ives: "You know what. Well, let's just talk about that in totality
  then."
- Mitchell, C.: "Let's."
- Ives: "Who cares if you're a minority-owned business? Who cares if you're managing \$10 billion? Are you considered a minority who doesn't understand money? Is that a problem? Ten billion dollars and you want to circumvent the RFP process."
- Mitchell, C.: "So, Representative..."
- Ives: "That's what we're talking about here."
- Mitchell, C.: "Representative, I want to be clear, I'm not sure your skin color changes when you manage a certain amount of money..."
- Ives: "And I'm sure it doesn't matter..."
- Mitchell, C.: "...or your gender. Just want to be clear."
- Ives: "...if you're managing \$10 billion. You're more than capable of going out and getting that business yourself. Ten billion dollars you're managing and you're not capable of providing for yourself in this realm? That's outrageous. Now..."
- Mitchell, C.: "Okay, so Representative, I'm not... so, talking briefly about economies of scale and not to get too wonky, \$10 billion isn't a lot of money in the investment..."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Ives: "Ten billion dollars is not a lot of money?"

Mitchell, C.: "...in the investment world. Let's try to be clear, Representative, with what we're talking about. In the investment world \$10 billion for a certain size of fund is not a ton of money. So, what we're talking about is still emerging managers. Let me also just, to clarify, 'cause I think answering part of the last Gentleman's question will help you here. The municipal fund is the only fund that had questions about this. They wanted to be absolutely sure within legal guidance that they were fine. Again, this is an existing practice. This isn't circumventing a process..."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Let's just add this from committee because when the proponents of this came forward they also said that emerging managers would have difficulty and it would be overly burdensome to come into our state and actually try and compete for this business when they're managing \$10 billion. Does that make sense to anybody here? That they shouldn't have to be able to compete at the same level as anybody else for this type of business. Now, this Bill was so controversial that one of your Representatives actually excused himself from committee. After the vote was taken, came back to committee 'cause he didn't want to vote on it and you subbed somebody else in. That's when you know you've got a problem. You're circumventing contracting law. You're circumventing the RFP process that is put in place to protect us, so that people don't get business that they have no right in not competing for. That's what this Bill is about. You vote for this Bill, you vote to circumvent the bidding process. And if you're... if \$10 billion is not a lot of money

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

to you, I'd like to know what is a lot of money to you. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I understand what you're trying to do, and understand the money and the amounts."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you for understanding what I'm trying to do,

Representative. I appreciate that."

Franks: "I do. It's a big help. My question is, are there any other times that we don't request a formal RFP when we're doing things for state bidding on investments?"

Mitchell, C.: "So, I believe the answer to that question is yes.

Let me see if I can get from staff any specific instances."

Franks: "Okay."

Mitchell, C.: "So, part of the nuance here that I think the last Gentlewoman doesn't understand 'cause she's never managed a fund is that what we're talking is folks who actually already have a relationship with the funds. So, they've been managing the fund's money for three, four years, they've done an exceptional job. And what they're saying is, look, rather than put these people back through the loop where you have a situation where you've got businesses that might have more assets under management giving them economies of scale or might have more years of experience or years in existence. We know these folks do good work, they're right here in the State of Illinois, they're doing good business with Illinois companies. We want to make sure that they can stay and continue to manage our assets."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Franks: "Is there any requirements of a minimum return or something? What is it... how do we define they're doing a good job?
- Mitchell, C.: "Yeah, so now we're kind of getting into their investment policy which, you know, for TRS is like 600 pages long and other places, but there is a set of criteria. The board reviews those sort of things kind of year over year and if you end up not doing well, you end up on a watch list and after a couple years you get phased out assuming you're not meeting the rate of return benchmark for say your asset class."
- Franks: "So, this wouldn't be available to people who are on a watch list for instance?"
- Mitchell, C.: "That's correct. This is only available for folks who are doing a good job, doing the right thing, and who have managed our money well."
- Franks: "And it's my understanding that there are other institutions... some of our pension funds are already doing this and you're trying to codify this existing practice?"
- Mitchell, C.: "That's correct. So, most of the funds think that they're fine doing this, they believe they're fine doing this. There's one that kind of had a question, so to fulfill all righteousness the idea was make sure the language is codified in statute."
- Franks: "Okay. I understand what you're trying to do. I was concerned with the RFP process as well, but I think you've answered the questions very well. So, thank you."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor." Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Harris, D.: "Representative, as you know, we've had some lengthy discussions in the House Revenue & Finance Committee over management fees and the issue of emerging managers has come up in that, so I understand what an emerging investment manager is. Just for clarity, a report is given to the Governor by all the systems at the end of a year on their emerging investment managers, who they are, how they perform, and that's stated in the record every year, correct?"

Mitchell, C.: "That's correct, Representative."

- Harris, D.: "All right. So, help me understand though... let's say I'm an emerging manager. I get 10, 15, 20 million dollars to manage from a fund. As I read the Bill, what you're now saying is that if I take part of the investment funds that I have under my control to invest, if I place part of that with a manager of managers. In other words, another entity which takes funds from all different managers that that then is exempt from the Procurement Code? Am I under..."
- Mitchell, C.: "I don't think that's... that's not inherently correct. So, manager of mana... so, sometimes depending on the fund and we heard how diverse our funds are in the Revenue Committee. For some folks, rather than investing directly with emerging managers to kind of mitigate risk, especially if they don't have in-house staff. For example, one of the systems was noting they entirely used manager of managers. Some of those folks choose to use managers of managers to fulfill their emerging market requirements. And so, in that case, that money would be passed through, but again, what

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

would be happening here, Representative, would not be that manager of managers coming back to the systems and saying we've quote unquote graduated. It would be one of those emerging managers under that program who has reached a certain threshold would then want to move into being a... I'm saying prime contractor, that's not quite the right word, but you get my point."

- Harris, D.: "No, I understand. And once they have... if they're a successful minority emerging manager they can move up and they can get into the larger..."
- Mitchell, C.: "Correct, so it's almost like going from being a subcontractor to a prime."
- Harris, D.: "...but my question is why are we excluding or adding an exemption to the procurement requirements for contracts that an emerging manager might use with a manager of managers?

  I'm not sure I follow that."
- Mitchell, C.: "Yeah. So, what it is, effectively... so when you talk about the criteria used for selecting an investment manager, generally, what you'll see is a situation where assets under management because it sort of gives you an economy of scale, matters and gets you points. You'll see situations where you have to be established as like a prime money manager for a number of years. That also gives you points. So, you're looking at places like New York and California that have a highly evolved financial sector that might actually compete and potentially take some of those away. So, what we're saying is the firms have a relationship, we know that they're running the money well, so what we want to make sure is that our Chicago-based emerging businesses

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

continue to have a leg up and have a shot and so, this would say we have an established relationship. Let's just advance you up through our process."

Harris, D.: "Okay. I follow what you said. Staff just whispered in my ear some additional clarification so that was helpful. I appreciate your answer. I still have a concern about the exemption from the procurement process, but your answers were helpful. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bradley: "Representative, you've had the opportunity to participate in hearings regarding the investment manager fees in the State of Illinois?"

Mitchell, C.: "Yes, Sir."

Bradley: "And the state has five pension funds, correct?"

Mitchell, C.: "That's correct, Sir."

Bradley: "And there is over \$80 billion in those pension funds?"

Mitchell, C.: "I believe that number's correct."

Bradley: "And that \$80 billion that's in those pension funds, they currently use investment managers correct?"

Mitchell, C.: "That's correct."

Bradley: "What are the yearly fees that the State of Illinois is paying to outside investment managers pursuant to the information you've gathered?"

Mitchell, C.: "I believe that number's about \$500 million."

Bradley: "Five hundred million dollars a year..."

Mitchell, C.: "Yes, Sir."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Bradley: "...being paid to outside investment managers? And you're trying, simply, to ensure that a program that's already in effect is properly utilized with regards to that \$500 million of outside fees being paid to outside investment managers, correct?"
- Mitchell, C.: "I'd like to see some of that money stay in Illinois, Representative."
- Bradley: "To the Bill. We should support this bill and we should support the effort that Representative Mitchell is undertaking here."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think there's been some... I would like to try... some clarity to this discussion today. Let's just say, for example, the pension... the Teacher's Retirement System is currently contracting with Mesirow or maybe GTCR. If the pension fund wants to give one of those companies an additional \$100 million to invest they can do that without going to an RFP. They have an established relationship with those companies that can just simply give t.hem more oftheir dollars t.o invest. What. Representative's Bill is doing is saying that that same rule applies to the emerging managers. They're doing a good job, the pension systems are happy with the investment returns that they're getting. They'd like to get them some more money, and they can simply give them that additional money, but when they transition from being an emerging manager to exceeding the dollar limits, they don't have to go back to through an RFP process and compete against the Mesirows and the GTCRs of the world. They can continue to sort of ... to operate with the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

relationships that the pension systems have with them already and they're happy with. This is simply a clarification. There's only one of the pension systems that thinks that there's a problem as the Sponsor has said. Again, I think this is just a matter of fairness between the emerging managers and the great big players that are out there. Thank you and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I would like to join in the support of Senate Bill 437. Senate Bill 437 is, as the analysis says, is simplifying the process for pension funds to hire emerging investment managers which happen to be minority women, disabled people, and minorities in order to get into the pension business. There's enough to go around, and it's only fair that this type of pension service is spread all around to create jobs for people such as myself that invests into the pension. And if there's some people out there that want to become emerging managers, it should be simplified so they can do so. They have to follow the same protocol and the same rules and the same educational qualification. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The reason why we objected this Bill in committee and why we're asking for a 'no' vote here on the floor is just we're questioning what some of the consequences are of circumventing the RFP. Are taxpayers going to end paying more and higher fees? Are we going to end up hiring firms that are not bringing a proper return on investment to the funds? Is it really the duty of

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

the fund to hire specific people based on artificial criteria? Or should we be judging firms based on merit, based upon their ability to bring a proper return on invest to the funds? And so, for that reason, we want to stick up for the taxpayers. We want to support the funds and that's why we're asking for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico would like to yield his time to Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To that last point. I have all due respect for the Sponsor... or for that last speaker, but make no mistake about what that comment just was. You are putting arcane, non-real concerns about RFPs and the qualifications of the managers above Illinois businesses who wish to take care of Illinoisans' money. That's what this Bill is about. If you vote 'no', you vote to put money in the hands of New York and California investment bankers. So, that's fine. You can vote 'no', but don't make this about whether it's in the best interest of RFPs or the qualifications of the managers we're talking about here. That's what the Bill is about. It's about qualified managers getting a chance. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this House Bill and I've listened to the comments of some of our colleagues on this matter. I just wanted to point out just for the record that representation of African Americans and Hispanics in the investment banking community remains miniscule. One to two percent, maybe, is represented in this industry, and so I think this Bill does two things. It

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

reclaims money that really should be kept in Illinois and it opens up opportunity beyond the one to two percent for minority firms in investment banking and pension funds. So, if there was ever a time and I've seen many Bills passed that either raised or lowered the requirement for an RFP, certainly, this is one that we should stand together on to make sure that we move the dial for these companies, Hispanic and African-American companies, that only represent one to two percent being generous. And so, I think we should certainly stand in support of this and the board should be flashing green for this Bill. Thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Representative Sandack.

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. A question of the Sponsor and the Gentleman sitting to his left."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "There was a rather elaborative and very demonstrable statement made that voting 'no' would be voting against the Illinois taxpayers because this Bill protects Illinois investment bankers and investors? I just read the text. I don't see one word in that. Would you please show me where that's in the text of the Bill?"

Mitchell, C.: "I'm not going to show you, Representative. I want you to listen to what I'm saying 'cause I think you're a person who does that and I mean that sincerely. Every single one of these funds has a fiduciary duty, right? They have a fiduciary duty so above all criteria and everything else they

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

have to get a good return for taxpayers. Now, our funds are doing this stuff already. There was one fund that had one question about making sure that they were completely fulfilling all righteousness. Had it not been brought they'd still be doing it, but we encourage people to do the right thing which is why we have this Bill in the first place. But ultimately, these are folks who are already qualified; we know they do good work. As Elaine said, with the prime firms we can do this already. We increase their allocation. There is no need to even ask or send these people back through an RFP process. All we're asking for is the same chance to do that for these emerging managers. Why that's important for Illinois, Ron, is that we're talking about..."

- Sandack: "Christian, I... yeah, but I asked a question about the
   text of your Bill."
- Mitchell, C.: "But it's not... it's about the effect of the Bill, Ron, not the text. It's about the effect of the Bill. The effect of the Bill is to protect smaller companies that reside in Illinois and make sure that they can keep money in their hands..."
- Sandack: "So, there's an Illinois carve-out in here? That's what I'm looking for now, right? Because your seatmate and you have now implied twice that this is going to protect Illinois businesses...
- Mitchell, C.: "Okay, there's..."
- Sandack: "I don't see that in the Bill."
- Mitchell, C.: "...there's no place in the Pension Code, Ron, where the code is explicit in the way that you're describing. It

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

doesn't exist. It's about what it effectively means, what it effectively does."

Sandack: "And then how does it effectively mean it's better business for Illinois businesses?"

Mitchell, C.: "It's means..."

Sandack: "I don't know. I'd like an answer to my question."

Mitchell, C.: "Representative, I'm going to answer your question.

I just want to make sure I'm doing it as accurately as possible. So, let me... I said this before but I want to walk back through it. What we are saying is we have firms, generally smaller in size that's why they're in the emerging program, and they're usually a DBE. They're generally locally located. When you throw them back into the RFP process it means that you've got a firm that's just getting on its feet competing against the Mesirows, the GTCRs, et cetera. We know that they run money. What we talk about in government programs, as it related to these sorts of things, is making sure that people are succeeding, that they're getting on their feet, and that they're getting off what we might call the dole, whatever it is. This is an example of that working well and saying these are folks who we have watched and shepherded through the process who we know can manage more money, who have managed the money they have well, giving them an opportunity to do so without making them compete against guys who have in the field much longer, who have greater economies of scale, et cetera. That's what it is. And so, effectively, that means we are protecting smaller companies that are generally in Illinois. That's just effective based on the roster of managers that we have."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Sandack: "To the Bill. The Gentleman that just gave that answer is an articulate, smart young man. The Gentleman to his left is an articulate, smart older man in comparison. Neither one answered my question because read the Bill lest you think I'm exaggerating. It's about nine lines in additional text. It has nothing to do with small, Illinois businesses. So, the idea that this is going to protect, enhance and/or carve something out for Illinois business, count me in. It's not in the Bill. So, the effect, the desire, the intention may be there. Let's make the words match the intentions and the desire. It doesn't do what it's promoting... it does... it just isn't, folks. Words matter. Read the Bill lest you think I'm exaggerating. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell to close."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you. We've had a lively debate on this. I just want to note that to do the Gentleman is calling for would actually call for us to violate the Constitution as it relates to special legislation. So, we literally can't do what the Gentleman asks for. This is a simple Bill. It's basically a cleanup Bill that is in response to the concern of a single system that wanted to make sure that the practice that they believe they should be doing can continue going forward. These are folks who are already qualified and have been qualified by an RFP process. What we are doing with this Bill is bringing parity between our emerging managers who are trying to get on their feet and establish great companies and some of the big boys who are out there and have been doing this for a long time who have structural advantages in New

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

York and California. This is a good Bill. Everyone should be voting 'yes'."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Drury, Franks, Thapedi, Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question... on this question there are 48 voting 'yes', 65 voting 'no' and the Gentleman asks to be... to have this Bill placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 509, Mr. Cabello. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 509, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 509 is a Cigarette Tax Act Bill. It classifies cigarettes that are state stamped, but not properly city stamped as contraband cigarettes. This is an initiative of the City of Chicago. It clarifies that if a package of cigarettes lacks a tax stamp required by any political subdivisions of Illinois, the package shall be classified as having been improperly tax stamped. Again, this is an initiative of the City of Chicago and I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote and will answer any questions."

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? Batinick, Phillips, Tabares, Wallace. Please record yourselves. Tabares, Wallace. Please take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 547. Mr. Thapedi. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 547, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 547 closes a loophole in the law relative to excavation projects in Home Rule municipalities with populations in excess of 1 million people. Current Illinois law requires that 48 hours prior to beginning an excavation project of any size or of any depth the excavator or digger must first make a safety call to the Joint Utility Locating Information for Excavators also known by its acronym, JULIE. Senate Bill 547 closes this loophole by allowing mega municipalities to regulate underground utility damage within its borders and levy fines where appropriate. With respect to legislative intent, the Bill contemplates that an alleged violator would only be subject to one fine. Additionally, when the City of Chicago develops its enforcement plan it must enforce violations uniformly among all underground utilities including the departments of water and sewer. There is no opposition. I ask for green votes and I'm available to answer any and all questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Phelps: "Hey, Andre, I'm not opposed to this Bill at all, but if you can do us all a favor and we'd really appreciate it. Tell

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Chicago if you can help them out and make sure that their digger program meets federal standards..."

Thapedi: "Yeah."

Phelps: "...because they have not done that yet and what I'm worried is that's going to hurt the programs we have down south called JULIE. And then, you know, if you have a dig in with the federal standards I think it's \$200 thousand that it costs for that. So, if you could relay that message to Chicago please try to meet that federal standard with their digger program."

Thapedi: "And you're referring to FARMSA, correct?"

Phelps: "I'm sorry?"

Thapedi: "I think it's called FARMSA, correct?"

Phelps: "Right."

Thapedi: "And I'm talking about the federal regulation that you're referring to... no, absolutely..."

Phelps: "Yeah, they need to and the DEER program in Chicago has not met the federal standard."

Thapedi: "Absolutely and I can tell you this, Mr. Phelps, that as far as the negotiating aspect of the Bill, the City of Chicago is willing to work with all interested parties because enforcement is the key. Enforcement is a real challenge. The City of Chicago recognizes that and they're going to take the appropriate roles and the appropriate measures to make sure that those are done appropriately and consistently as you're speaking with JULIE and FARMSA as well."

Phelps: "Well Andre, like I said, I trust you. You're a great guy. I appreciate it. We just don't want a federal takeover.

That's what we don't want."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Thapedi: "Understood."

Phelps: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

"Representative, I think as a member of the Public Utilities Committee, I think both of us, Representative Phelps and I wanted to just stress as much as we can that this is a larger issue for the rest of the state and that where you can bring other interested parties into these negotiation as you move forward that would be good for all involved 'cause this is a big issue. As you do know, if Chicago doesn't get their act together this could cause serious problems for the rest of the state because we lose our standards and the federal government takes us over. That's not something we want in the rest of the state and we'd hate to have Chicago cause those problems. So, obviously, I'm regurgitating what the previous speaker said, but it is that much of an issue that we want to make sure that happens. So, I appreciate your comments and I know that you're going to follow through on that. I appreciate it."

Thapedi: "Eddie, I hear you loud and clear. I heard Brandon loud and clear. The City's listening. They hear you loud and clear. It's going to get done."

Sullivan: "Perfect. 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? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 voting

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 626, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 626, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 626 is an Agreed Bill between the rental car industry and the insurance industry. The rental car industry would like to introduce a new line of rental vehicles that cater to the needs of a wide variety of businesses and private individuals by offering specialty vehicles at selected locations. These vehicles are more expensive than anything currently found in the rental car fleets; however, the current laws of Illinois do not such special vehicle rentals to be feasible. The rental car industry and the insurance industry have agreed to language that makes this high end vehicle rental possible. Taxes and fees that are currently applied to vehicle rentals would also apply to these specialty rentals. What does the Bill do specifically? The Bill divides vehicle rental in to two classes: those vehicles with the MSRP below 50,000 and with the MSRP above 50 thousand. All laws and taxes concerning rental vehicles below 50 thousand continue and are not changed. In the new class of rental vehicle above 50 thousand, three changes are made. Statutory cap of 1,350 for a collision damage waiver which is the insurance you buy from the rental company is removed. The statutory limit on damages paid by the renter's personal insurance company is raised

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

from 16,5 to 40,000 in 2016 with annual adjustments thereafter. And the statutory limit in the event of theft paid by a renter's personal insurance company is raised from 2 to 40,000 in 2016 with annual adjustments thereafter. The 50 thousand dividing line, currently, one vehicle rental company has a fleet of 25 thousand cars in the metro Chicago area. Not a single vehicle in that fleet exceeds an MSRP of 50 thousand. In fact, 98 percent of the fleet is under 40 thousand. The average price of a car in the fleet is 20 thousand. Since no current vehicle in the fleet costs more than \$50 thousand that's what we came up with, that dividing line. I'd be happy to answer any further questions and ask for a favorable vote from the Body."

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields to Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. Art, you anticipated one question, the 50,000 demarcation."

Turner: "Right."

Sandack: "Is the number in the statute indexed for inflation?"

Turner: "Yes it is and I can give you some details on that, Ron. On October 1, 2016, for the next three years, the amount will increase 2,500 above the prior year's maximum and on October 1, 2020 and for each year after, the maximum amount will be increased a thousand dollars."

Sandack: "Is there any sunset in this Bill as Amended?"

Turner: "Not that I know of. No, I don't think so, Representative."

Sandack: "All right, because obviously the market could change..."

Turner: "Sure."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Sandack: "...and well, I'm glad it's indexed and I support the Bill because of many reasons, but that being one as well. It may make some sense to revisit it after a while depending on how and where the car market goes."
- Turner: "I'd be happy to follow up with that. Thank you,

  Representative."
- Sandack: "Thank you for answering the questions, Art."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Gordon-Booth, Moffitt. Please take the record. There are 78 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Ford."
- Ford: "Mr. Speaker, for the record, Senate Bill 509, I voted 'aye'. Please let the record reflect that I intended to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions, Sir."
  Ford: "Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 627. Mr. D'Amico. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 627, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 627, basically, expands the use of a BAIID device requiring the use by more DUI offenders if they are issued a restricted driving permit. I'll be free to answer any questions."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "John, can you walk through some of the steps when the BAIID device would be utilized in excess or in addition to when it's typically used now?"

D'Amico: "Yeah, I mean, one of the other parts of the Bill that we're doing too is when the arresting officer would pull over somebody for a DUI they would read them the warning and what was happening is when they would go to court the people would deny that this warning was read. So, this warning signature is being put on the ticket itself. So, that takes away one of the defenses that the attorneys were making. And basically, what it does is for first offenders, you're going to have to choose whether you want to drive or whether you want to sit out. If you want to drive, you have to put the BAIID device in your car. If you want to sit out depending on what happened, you either sit out for 6 months or 12 months for first offenders. Second offenders will have to have it automatically."

Sandack: "And the device is paid for by the defendant or the offender, correct?"

D'Amico: "Yes."

Sandack: "So, there's no expense associated with this from our perspective?"

D'Amico: "No."

Sandack: "Thanks, John."

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

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

voted who wish? Please take the record. 115 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 653. Representative Mussman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 653, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Mussman: Bill 653 is an Agreed Bill with DCFS and AFSCME. There is no opposition. It requires DCFS to create a training academy to improve and modernize the introductory training module required of all frontline investigators and supervisors. The training will include mock training facilities such as houses, medical facilities, court rooms, et cetera. which models the simulated interactive training successfully being utilized by our children's advocacy centers, and which will also focus on enhancing cultural competency to provide tools and supports to ensure that child welfare workers' response to an engagement with families and children of color are conducted in a manner that is responsive and respective to the beliefs, attitudes, languages, behaviors of the families receiving the services. It is subject to appropriation. There is no increased costs from implementation and this is an important step to improving and retaining effective DCFS staff. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Representative, how do you define cultural competency...
and who will be teaching this cultural competency?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Mussman: "So, that is not defined in the Bill. It is up to DCFS to determine what methodology they're going to use to have the trainers. Right now the training, I believe, is provided inhouse. I think that they are partnering with the university to study how they want to put together their curriculum."
- Flowers: "Let me ask you this. Has the department ever tried a program like this before?"
- Mussman: "Well, they already have a training that has existed for decades. They're modeling it on existing training already being utilized by the children's advocacy centers. They have not tried this before, but it is something that they've been moving toward for guite some time."
- Flowers: "But you just said that they do have something similar in place..."

Mussman: "Well, they..."

Flowers: "...and they have had it for decades..."

Mussman: "They already have a..."

Flowers: "...and we also know for decades what they have has not been working, so we're going to try it again."

Mussman: "Well, we're going to try something new now. That's the problem."

- Flowers: "Now, what are we going to do different here? Did you not have the cultural competency in the first program that you've had for decades?"
- Mussman: "I don't... I can't speak for the program that they've had. I've obviously not been through the training. I think I would argue that maybe the cultural competency was not a strong enough component. And remember one of the biggest differences, as we've talked about in committee, is that this

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

is going to be interactive. It's not going to be just in a classroom any longer. They're actually going to have to practice going into a house or going into a courtroom and interacting with families which they haven't had a chance to do before and I think that's not been as effective for a training module."

Flowers: "So... but there's many moving parts and pieces to the department. It's not only what happens in the courtroom. It's not only what happens in the streets. As far as the hiring is concerned... who does the hiring? And I remember in committee you stated that there was an exit review. As to the people that were leaving, did they not tell you what the problem was as to the reason why they were leaving DCFS because of the incompetency of the progress or the work that was going within that department?"

Mussman: "I think..."

Flowers: "Did they not tell you that they were overworked? Are you not hiring more people? Are you not giving them better, up-to-date equipment to work with, so they will have the opportunity to focus more on the children? And more importantly, are they still able to work... or go to school fulltime while they should be working and taking care of the people in which they are contracted to serve? And what about the people that DCFS contracts with? Who's going to train them?"

Mussman: "So, third party contractors are allowed to participate in this training, although it is not mandated as part of this Bill. This Bill has nothing to do with or does not cause any of the DCFS trainees to take independent other classes. That...

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

that's nothing covered in this Bill and I believe someone had told me that was an exercise that had ended a number of years ago. It does not cause increased staffing. There's nothing in this Bill to do that. I agree that DCFS has many, many problems that do need to be addressed. They are not all going to be answered in this Bill. This Bill is one step forward in making sure that the six weeks of introductory training they do have is better and more effective and that is one of the things that was cited by a number of people who had chosen to leave their positions in DCFS, as they felt that they were not being successful because they had not been properly trained for the environments in which they were being placed."

Flowers: "So, explain to me again about the cultural competency.

Who, in DCFS, will be teaching the cultural competency? And who..."

Mussman: "That is not specified in this Bill. It is up to DCFS to make those decisions within the rule-making process."

Flowers: "Well, to the Bill. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, DCFS has had a lot of problems and I guarantee you that this particular legislation that's calling for an academy for the training of DCFS workers... If you do not have people that's already trained when they come out of the schools, when they should know what type of jobs that they're going in to, I don't think any type of training program that you're going to have within the department... that's the department teaching itself how to do what it's been doing which has not been successful. So, I think what you really need to do is take this Bill out of the record because it's giving a false sense of protection that it's doing something

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

for the children. You're not talking about the contractors out there who have allowed these children to leave these centers unattended. You're not talking about the case workers that's making sure that the children have all the necessary tools that they need in order to be... their families to become whole. You're not talking about the programs like the Intact Family that should be utilized to keep children from coming into DCFS, making them wards of the state in the first place. You're not talking about helping the family. When you're talking about cultural sensitivity I would like to know what the definition is because there's lots of impediments to a family losing their children and not necessarily because they're bad parents. They just happen to be poor, they just happen to need some help and this Bill is not talking about that. You're talking about training some people that should not have their jobs because to me... well, thank you very much. I appreciate you. And I will not be supporting your Bill, but I understand what it is that you're trying to do, but I've seen it before. I've been to this party before. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack. The Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. Michelle, is your Bill... you've mentioned twice that it's subject to appropriation. Is it within the budget Bills that are coming maybe this afternoon, tomorrow, the next day?"

Mussman: "So, DCFS is always allotted a line for training because it has always needed to train its frontline staff. I do not know what that individual line item is or if it is lumped into a lump sum that DCFS would be receiving, but they have not intentionally received an individual line item that would

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

support this particular initiative. They will simply work it into whatever budget they already have."

Sandack: "Well, that's kind of responsive. What I asked is in the budget Bills that are coming from your side of the aisle, will there be an allocation for \$2 million, approximately, for this program?"

Mussman: "I am not aware of that, no. They already receive a training stipend. If possible within the budget they would continue to receive money to complete their training again this year, but there is not extra money put in specifically to address this new training variety."

Sandack: "Thank you. To the Bill. Particularly folks, I guess, on my side of the aisle, but to anyone that has an interest in what we're going to do the next couple days with the budget, this is a well-intended program that costs approximately \$2 million. There was a fiscal note on this Bill in the Senate. The Senate... the Republicans voted 'present' because the note really wasn't answered and they kept saying... they wouldn't decide if it was subject to appropriation or not. The Sponsor has very candidly admitted that it's not... that it is subject to appropriation and is likely not in the coming budget Bills. So then why vote for something we're not going to pay for. I would suggest a 'no' vote is absolutely in order because we shouldn't be doing things or making promises unless we're going to pay for those services. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Wallace: "Representative Mussman, to echo some of the thoughts that have already been put forward. I guess I'm trying to understand how specifically will the curriculum be written and then how... since DCFS already has appropriated funds for training how will they execute this training?"

Mussman: "So, the Bill does not specify how the curriculum will be written. They've already been partnering with the university to develop a modified curriculum. They will develop that curriculum within the rules process. It is not laid out within the legislation. And I'm sorry, could you repeat the second part of your question?"

Wallace: "So, you're saying that this is subject to appropriation and they already have dollars for training?"

Mussman: "Right."

Wallace: "Okav."

Mussman: "So, they already have six weeks of training that is the introductory course that all their frontline workers go through. So they would like to slowly use whatever existing funds they have to migrate into doing this newer model with more simulations as they are able to do that within the realm of whatever allocation we give them. So, they have been pursuing this for a number of years. They are committed to following through on this, but we would like to put a little teeth behind and make sure that they do stick with this plan. We think it is very important. We think it is a disservice to our families and to our workers that they have not been trained, I think, as well as we know now we are capable of training them or that they should be trained. And, again, this is not helping the families and it's not saving the state

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

money. When we have a high turnover, we lose a good \$10,000 per employee having to have them replaced and retrained. So, it's in our financial better interest to make sure the employees that we do have are trained well and they're acting successfully."

Wallace: "Thank you. To the Bill. Winnebago County, outside of Cook County, has the largest number of children who have had phone calls and then their families indicated in those phone calls who've since been taken into custody. I rise in support of the Bill with the hope that those who are developing the cultural competency curriculum will be taking cues from Northern Illinois University who's done extensive research in the area of implicit racial bias. We need to start to look at the historical context of families, what their beliefs and attitudes and behaviors are within the broader scope of things. And then hopefully this training will allow new case workers to challenge their own mainstream thinking about what normal and what a normal family looks like so that they can investigate these particular cases without all of the biases that they bring into the room. And hopefully that will lead to fewer indications, fewer removal of ... you know, we'll reduce the number of children who are removed from the homes based on socioeconomic stereotypes, racial stereotypes, any other form of stereotypes that may exist about certain families. I am urging every single Member within this Body who also represents a portion of Winnebago County to vote 'yes' for this Bill because the children in our county especially and specifically have been... their case workers and their families have pleaded for this type of training. So, again, every

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

single Member from Winnebago County I'm asking for an 'aye' vote on this particular Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, I rise in strong of this Bill. It came through the committee and I believe most of the people voted for it in committee. This is... we have had a lot of problems with DCFS in the past and I don't want people to think that just because DCFS has problems this is a bad Bill. This is a Bill that really tries to set up a training academy where we are going to train the people who work in DCFS to do a better job. I think this is an important Bill. As we all know, if you're taught to do better you will be able to do a better job and really be able to work with the children who are in DCFS. This training academy will be doing mock kind of work, so people can have the experience of actually going to a home and seeing what it's like to work under a lot of pressure. So, I really encourage everyone to vote 'yes' for this Bill. I think it's a good Bill and I think it will improve the department and improve the care that they give to our children."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman to close."

Mussman: "I want to thank everyone who spoke today. I know there are many concerns about DCFS and how we can do a better job protecting our families. I also want to thank the Members of the committee. I know that we had a very spirited debate on both occasions and I do want to point out that it did pass in a bipartisan fashion on leave. So, I think that this is a good proposal for all of our districts and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

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? Andersson, Durkin, Sullivan, Tryon, Verschoore. Please take the record. There are 97 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 661. Mr. McAuliffe. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 661, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 661 is a simple Bill. All it does is has a physician offer to any Baby Boomer that was born between the year 1945 and 1965 to offer them to take a Hepatitis C screening test. I've talked to many of you on the floor. I'd be happy answer any of your questions that you have."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Mike, I just have a couple of questions for you with respect to legislative intent and my first three questions are going to be foundation based. So, this Bill is based upon CDC guidelines that recommend screening for Hepatitis C. Is that correct?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

Thapedi: "All right. And then the CDC drafts guidelines on a number of serious diseases, afflictions, and conditions, correct?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Thapedi: "Okay. What is the process the CDC follows when crafting its guidelines?"

McAuliffe: "I don't have the answer to that."

Thapedi: "Can someone tell you so that we can make it part of the record, so that we have some legislative intent on that?"

McAuliffe: "One thing I could say is if this Bill would pass, it sunsets in 2020, so this would not be here forever. This Bill is for a particular group, for those who are born between 1945 and '65. This won't stay on the books forever. This would sunset in the year 2020."

Thapedi: "Understood, understood. But you don't know what the process is that the CDC follows when it's formulating its guidelines, correct?"

McAuliffe: "No, I just know that this is part of the standard of care though for physicians."

Thapedi: "It's a part of the standard of care?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

Thapedi: "What is the standard of care?"

McAuliffe: "Standard of care says that... the standard of care lets physicians know what they should do. So, the CDC came on a recommendation saying that all Baby Boomers born between the year 1945 and 1965 should be offered a test for Hepatitis C screening."

Thapedi: "So, that's the standard of care for what type of physician?"

McAuliffe: "I'm sorry, for which?"

Thapedi: "You said that is the standard of care. My question is what type of physician, what specialty, is that the standard of care for?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

McAuliffe: "For primary care."

Thapedi: "For primary care physicians?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

Thapedi: "Primary care physicians only?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

Thapedi: "So, if you're a liver specialist, that's not the standard of care for you in your practice?"

McAuliffe: "Well, if you're a liver specialist, by the time somebody with Hepatitis C would see you they would already have gone through the channels."

Thapedi: "Mike, do you know how many guidelines have been issued by the CDC this year?"

McAuliffe: "No, I don't."

Thapedi: "Do you know how many guidelines have been issued by the CDC period?"

McAuliffe: "No, I don't."

Thapedi: "Now, CDC guidelines are recommendations meant to be used as a clinical tool for physicians and other health care professionals, correct?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

Thapedi: "And would you agree that CDC guidelines are not written with the intent that they be mandated into law?"

McAuliffe: "I would... and I just heard that there's 7,500 CDC guidelines. I don't think we could put every single one of these in statute. But again, I think that we can do one that has a sunset date, and that's the key, that sunsets in 2020."

Thapedi: "I certainly understand that, but isn't it true that of the thousands of CDC guidelines that you mentioned and I think

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

that you brought up the figure of 7,500 that very few of them are actually mandated into law, correct?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

Thapedi: "And do you know which ones are mandated into law right now? Strike that. Here's a better question. Isn't it true that the only mandates are for HIV testing for pregnant women and post-partum workup for newborns? That's it."

McAuliffe: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "Mike, how does a physician rule out whether or not a patient has Hepatitis C?"

McAuliffe: "Well, I would say in this Bill all they'd have to look at is their age."

Thapedi: "That's the only way that they can rule it out?"

McAuliffe: "Well, before they used to do it on risk factors, but the CDC said and what I'm asking in this Bill is anyone born between the year 1945 and '65 is offered the test."

Thapedi: "And that is a mandate, correct?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

Thapedi: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise to support this initiative, Senate Bill 661. The primary argument against this Bill is that the Medical Society simply doesn't like mandates and the passage of this Bill would create what they would describe as a slippery slope. I understand that we need to let physicians do their job and that the General Assembly should not be getting in the middle of all CDC recommendations, but this case is different.

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Offering screenings is already the standard of care. The medical community agrees with this. The CDC agrees with this. While our doctors are an invaluable asset to our communities they have failed us related to Hepatitis C screening. This is something the medical society admitted has negotiations. This is also something that data shows us to be true. As evidence, a simple and inexpensive screening, a \$20 finger prick blood test, has been used for 25 years and it's nearly 100 percent effective. Yet, 75 percent of the population infected do not know they have this disease. This is unacceptable. We know who needs to be screened, the population who have been born between 1945 and 1965, my contemporaries. For the most part, those who served in Vietnam who were given inoculations, injections, may have stood in line with two hundred of their contemporaries injected with the same needle, subjected to Hepatitis C, unwittingly, no fault of their own who may have in later years suffered liver cancer like Mike McAuliffe's father-in-law. How dare we ignore the opportunity to screen the population, to afford a cure. How often do you hear somebody get on this floor and say there's a cure for a disease that has been killing people for a number of years. How dare we ignore the chance to save individuals in our society. It might be a member of your family. It might be somebody you know. How dare we ignore the opportunity to afford people to be diagnosed and cured today. Ladies and Gentlemen, please make this a conscionable decision. It's not because of Mike McAuliffe's father-in-law, it's not because of individuals we may know. It's about our society. I think it's our duty, our responsibility to do the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

right thing and vote in favor of this Bill. Thank you so much for your attention."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in full support of the Gentleman's legislation. As long as I've been down here, I've seen people present legislation that they believe in, but I have never seen anyone present legislation that they truly believe in like the Sponsor today. And so, looking at the proponents and opponents it has given me a clear-cut decision on whether or not I'm going to support this legislation. So because of the Sponsor and the work that he's done on this type of issue since I've been here I rise in full support of Senate Bill 661 and I thank the Sponsor for being diligent in his efforts."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, looking at the proponents and the opponents, it seems that most of the opponents are physician organizations or doctor organizations. Is that correct?"

McAuliffe: "That's correct."

Harris, D.: "What is required of a physician if he or she sees a patient born between 1945 and 1965? What is required of the physician?"

McAuliffe: "All that it would require is that they offer the screening test to them?"

Harris, D.: "So, they don't require the patient... we're not injecting ourselves in that physician/patient relationship.

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

We're not saying that that doctor has to say you must take a blood test. We're simply saying... the doctor would simply be saying there's a possibility, it's offered to you, do you want to do it? Correct?"

McAuliffe: "That's it. That's correct."

Harris, D.: "And it's a small blood test. A finger prick could determine whether or not an individual has Hepatitis C, correct?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "And, as I understand it, individuals who are Vietnam veterans and the reference was made earlier by one of my colleagues that those individuals who are Vietnam veterans who stood in line, who got those injections, who got those tattoos from needles that weren't clean and may now be infected with Hepatitis C that the Vietnam veteran community, potentially, 1 in 5, 20 percent, 1 in 5 could potentially have Hepatitis C? Is that correct?"

McAuliffe: "That's absolutely correct."

Harris, D.: "How do we not protect our citizens who fall into this category? And we're not interfering with the physician/patient relationship. We are simply saying that the physician has to ask a question of the patient. Do you want to take the test? There is a possibility that it's out there, that you might be in that category for Hepatitis C. But there's no force being applied. There's nothing that says they have to do it. It's a question that has to be asked. Sounds perfectly reasonable to me to save someone's life, especially, the life of a Vietnam veteran who may not know at

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

all that he or she is infected. This Bill deserves a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

"Thank you. To the Bill. I rise in strong support of Senate Bill 661. I further rise to urge you to support this important legislation which will enable Illinois to fight the silent epidemic of Hepatitis C. Hepatitis C is responsible for 44... I'm sorry, for 34 billion in annual costs nationally. If left undetected and untreated, Hepatitis C can lead to cancer, spread the disease to others, liver failure, and death. In fact, Hepatitis C is now responsible for more deaths than HIV. You heard that 1 in 5 Vietnam veterans are infected, but did you know that African Americans are infected at over twice the national average? About 30 percent with HIV and AIDS are also infected with HIV. In Chicago alone, 52 percent of those infected are African American. For 25 years, tests have been available to detect Hepatitis C, but unfortunately, 3 of 4 people infected do not know their status. Clearly, the system has failed. This Bill will serve as a vehicle to help people know their status and receive lifesaving treatment before it is too late. Knowledge can be power. I urge you to empower the citizens of Illinois with that knowledge by voting 'yes' on Senate Bill 661. Some say that we should not require health practitioners to do this. I say we are in an epidemic and we must make changes. When thousands of people are infected in Illinois and do not know, we must make a change. When 20 percent of our Vietnam veterans are infected, we must make a change. When African Americans are infected at a high rate, we have to make a change. When there are multiple cures

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

available... when there are cures available that cure up to 99 percent of the patients not only do I say why not do this, I say we must do this. I'm asking that we no longer keep Illinois in the dark, that we go on the road to where we're actually saving money and that everyone in this chamber vote 'yes' for Senate Bill 661. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

"Representative, I'm just still trying to understand Fortner: some of the rationale for why the broad age group? And there are many different things where different medical tests, medical procedures they're typically based on usually a basket of factors and we've certainly heard some of the factors in the discussion as far as status as a veteran who in the military, received transfusions, needles. These are certainly factors that, you know, I could understand, but when I look at the statistics on the number of cases that are being diagnosed and the likelihood it looks like it's actually a pretty small percentage of that overall population who are in the age bracket born between 1945 and 1965. So, I'm just trying to understand why is the offer being made to such a wide group without getting into some of the other factors?"

McAuliffe: "Well, the studies that I got, they said 50-75 percent of all the people that are being identified now with Hepatitis C were born in that cohort, the Baby Boomers."

Fortner: "No, no. I understand that, but that's flipping the statistics the other direction. That's saying of those who

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

have it, are they in that age bracket? So, that's... the age bracket is certainly a factor, but based on the diagnosis rate, the number of people in that age bracket who have Hep C are probably only, you know, one or two percent if I'm looking at sort of the few thousand cases being diagnosed in Illinois per year which is the numbers I've seen recently."

McAuliffe: "Well, I mean, there's a new risk factor with younger people, but this Bill's not going to address that. All I can say is ever since we started the task force I've had people in Springfield, Chicago, everywhere I go they come and tell me my father died of Hep C, I didn't tell anyone. My mother had Hep C, she got Hep C in 1968 after she had a miscarriage. Every single person that's told me had fallen in that cohort or I mean that birthdate. I even had an officemate, his mother died of Hep C. So, all I can tell you is people born between '45 and '65, and 75 percent of the population in Illinois do not know they have it. If you had cancer or anyone had cancer I think you'd want to know. That's all I'm trying to do. Be aware. A lot of times we go to medical doctors, we think we're healthy, we walk out clean. If I had cancer, I'd want to know it. If there's a test to do it, give it to me. That's all I'm asking."

Fortner: "Sure and to the Bill. I certainly appreciate what the Representative's trying to do to get those who are at risk tested so they're aware. I just remain a little bit concerned with the use of statistics. The fact that 75 percent of those who have it haven't been tested is a different statement than what percentage of the population would be offered the test actually have it. That number's a much smaller number, and I

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

think we should be clear that we're going to be casting a pretty broad net as to who would be tested as opposed to using a lot of the other factors that I think are absolutely valid risk factors that one might want to take into account. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm looking at your opponents. Is Blue Cross Blue Shield... are they still an opponent?"

McAuliffe: "Blue Cross & Blue Shield told me that they are neutral."

Dunkin: "They're neutral. Okay. And... just out of curiosity, why is the Illinois State Medical Society against the Bill?"

McAuliffe: "The Illinois State Medical Society is against all mandates."

Dunkin: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand in strong support of this legislation. This is a new phenomenon of having a drug... actually, having a cure for legislation to help a specific, designated population that was born between, you know, pretty much the Baby Boomers from 1945 to 1965. It makes a big difference when we have a cure, a drug that can actually help its patients and have little to no side effects. That's almost unusual. Seventy-five percent of this population don't even know that they have Hepatitis C. Here we are in 2015 and we're still talking about a population or people who are isolated based off of mistakes from physicians or hospitals. I think this is great legislation. It does what it's supposed to do and that is to

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

really reduce or cut down significantly those individuals who are impacted negatively as it relates to Hepatitis C. Hepatitis C, not only is it curable, but if it's not curable you can die from it. So, this is a part of the solution. I urge strong support, and FYI, the AIDS Foundation of Chicago supports this legislation, the Illinois African American Coalition, American Nurses Association of Illinois, the American Liver Foundation of the Great Lakes Division of Illinois, Society of Advanced Practical Nurses. This is the type of legislation that our state should be really advocating and pushing for. I'm proud of the Sponsor for making this a part of our conscience raising as it relates to health care. I would encourage my colleagues to do an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I'm trying to understand this Bill. Can you tell me exactly what it's mandating?"

McAuliffe: "It's mandating that a physician offer anyone born between 1945 and '65 a Hepatitis C test. Just offer it. They don't have to take the test. You could say no."

Franks: "Can't they do that now without requiring a law?"

McAuliffe: "The CDC has been around for many years and this has been... I mean, there were risk factors before for Hepatitis C, but now that they found out this Baby Boomer generation between '45 and '65 needs to be tested. Now, right now the physicians even though some of them are doing it, most of them are not."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Franks: "Are we mandating physicians to offer tests on anything else or is this a one off 'cause I've never heard of this before, requiring physicians to offer something?"

McAuliffe: "I believe the previous speaker asked and there was two other mandates. And with this mandate it would sunset after 2020. If we don't catch these Baby Boomers now and at least educate them and you may not even qualify for a drug later on, but you need the… if you have Hepatitis C, it's important that you know and your physician can tell you how to decelerate… attacking your liver 'cause it can lay dormant in your body for a long time. So, if you have Hepatitis C, depending on your age and your lifestyle, you can live for a long time. But again, I think if somebody has the virus and they say 75 percent of the people today here in Illinois and all over the country don't know they have it, you should know."

Franks: "Where's the Med Society on this?"

McAuliffe: "They're against all mandates."

Franks: "Okay. That's... I understand what you're trying to do. My concern though is getting involved with the patient/doctor relationship. Would it make more sense if we simply required additional education by the doctors and have them become more knowledgeable on this instead of simply requiring them to ask for this test?"

McAuliffe: "The Med Society is encouraging their members to do that and there are some physicians that are following that, but there's still too many people out there that have Hepatitis C and enough doctors that aren't properly letting their patients know this. That's why I think this is an

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

important Bill and it sunsets after 2020 and then that's it.
It's gone."

Franks: "Well, the fiscal note that I looked at indicated that it would cost approximately \$8.5 million a year. And I'm wondering 'cause Mr. Sandack was asking on the last Bill, subject to appropriation, et cetera. How would you intend on paying this additional \$8.5 million per year should this be passed?"

McAuliffe: "Well, a lot of that's on guesswork of how much... how many people they're going to find that have Hepatitis C and then if they're going to get... and then with the test. I'd say doing nothing and ignoring it you're going to see rising costs in our Medicaid and Medicare budget. I've seen what happens. When you have Hepatitis C you could look as healthy as anyone on this floor today. In three months you're a shell of yourself. It's like cancer hitting all over you and the cost... not just even the emotional cost, but the cost of going back and forth to a doctor for one patient runs at least half a million dollars."

Franks: "Well, isn't it... don't Medicaid beneficiaries already receive comprehensive Hepatitis C screenings?"

McAuliffe: "Yes, it is paid if they're covered under Medicaid."

Franks: "It's already done. Here's my concern. I'm worried that we're going to start doing more defensive medicine. And you talk about the costs to consumers when doctors are ordering tests that may or may not be necessary, but they do because they're worried they might get sued. And if we have a mandate doing this and a doctor doesn't order the test it could open the doctor up, quite frankly, to some liability. So, by doing

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

this, I think what you're going to see is a huge amount of testing, whether it's necessary or not, simply because then the doctor won't open herself up to liability."

McAuliffe: "Well, again, this testing would only be for people born between 1945 and '65. So..."

Franks: "I get that. And... I think everyone's going to be tested whether they need to or not simply because the doctor doesn't want to get sued. So, my point is, how are we going to pay for it? I'm saying..."

McAuliffe: "Right."

Franks: "I'm not saying it's a bad idea, but if it's going to cost an extra 8 million or 8.5 million or whatever it is a year regardless of what the savings could be if we didn't do it. I understand your argument. How are we going to pay for it?"

McAuliffe: "And I believe those numbers are only for the treatment. I don't think that's the cost of giving the test."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, can you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Franks: "Okay. I appreciate what you're trying to do. I'm very concerned about the fiscal impact especially at a time when we're going to be voting on the budget soon, today and tomorrow. And it's hard to keep adding more and more programs and we can't even pay for what we have. So, no matter how well-intentioned it might be, we need to have a plan to be able to pay for it and that's my concern."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, I rise in strong support of this Bill and I want to just look at a couple of the issues that the Med Society has brought up. One of them is that, well, there's a lack of treatment. Not everybody can get treated once they get tested and this is really a very false reason. Even if they can't get the treatment they can still be counseled by their doctor to be able to not spread the disease and also they can change their lifestyle and protect themselves from the disease continuing. Another reason that the Med Society has given is that it will increase liability and the last speaker spoke to that, and that is absolutely not true. Liability has nothing to do with the Bills that we pass here today. I know that that may hurt our feelings, but it's true. Liability is based on the standard of care. This is already the standard of care. They are already liable if they don't offer this test. And then it was also raised, well, don't people know and people don't know. This is a disease that's a silent, silent killer and everybody between the ages of 1945 to 1965, in that age group, this is where 80 percent of the cases of Hepatitis C are. And I will tell you my cousin was identified as being positive for Hepatitis C and she had no idea she had it, no idea, and it was found by an accident by them doing a test for life insurance. Her doctors would have never tested her for this. So, I think that just by offering the test it allows people to think about their histories and think if there was anything in their history that would make them want to be able to have this test. I think this is a very... what I would say mild legislation. This is offering the test. This is not requiring

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

testing, this is not making anybody do a test. This test is covered by people's insurance. There is no cost to the state and I urge an 'aye' vote. This test can save people's lives. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Just to address a point that the Gentleman from McHenry County raised in his remarks about the cost of this. There's a reason why this is being targeted at a specific cohort, from 1945 to 1965, it's because after extensive research into the prevention and treatment of Hepatitis C it's been shown that testing that cohort specifically produces not only a better medical result, but in fact, a cost effective result that we are saving money that we would otherwise be spending on treating these folks by targeting this specific cohort and testing just them. So, obviously, there's a profoundly important medical reason to support this legislation, but it is also a long term cost savings to our state. To the argument that it would stir up some defensive medicine, I would say that this is an example of preventive medicine. Precisely the type of medicine that we keep advocating for at all levels in this country. I think this is a very important Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe to close."

McAuliffe: "I appreciate all the questions and live debate. As many of you know, I've had relatives die of Hepatitis C, my father-in-law, uncle, brother-in-law. It's a terrible, terrible thing to witness. My seatmate over here, his brother had Hepatitis C. Senator Bertino-Tarrant, her father died of

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Hepatitis C. Senator Sterns, her in-law. Everywhere I go people come to me. This is... there's nothing I can do to bring them back, but their life won't be in vain. Their death won't be in vain. We need to test people with Hepatitis C. They should know just like if we had cancer, we would want to know. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Bryant, Davis, Golar, Hammond, Thapedi, Unes. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 67 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Moffitt: "I think it's appropriate after legislation like that that dealt with blood testing and blood supply. We've got a Member of this Body who has really set a new standard on donating blood and I like the attention of the Body and would like to recognize one of our Members. Next week, Representative Charlie Meier, will be donating his 102nd pint of blood. He's broke the 100 mark. It'll be his 102nd. He has good blood. It tests good, so I think he deserves recognition for that kind of commitment."

55th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "On page 7 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 4165. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4165, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Greg Harris, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris on the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, can we keep the noise down in the chamber?"
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment covers the appropriation for the Departments of Health Care & Family Services, the Department of Human Services, and the Department of Veteran's Affairs. Many of the major portions of this Amendment were already voted on as part of a package in House Bill 4141 several weeks ago that established priorities for this Body and things that we held to be of great value for our community: child care, early intervention, after school programming for our youth, adequately funding community-based mental health and substance abuse services. This budget understands that we need to make cuts. The numbers that are in... the numbers that are in these cuts while funding priority services such as care for the disabled, funding for respite grants, funding for the epilepsy program, restoring the Alzheimer's program and poison control program, restoring immigrant and refugee programs, restoring after school boys and girls clubs, YW and YMCA programs. It also includes \$134 million worth of cuts. There \$134 million worth of cuts in non Medicaid lines in

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

this budget because we understand that everything has to be on the table. There had to be cuts. The operations lines in all the departments are cut by four percent. The personal services lines in all the departments are cut by 2.75 percent. The individual grant lines, outside of the ones I've just mentioned, by and large are cut 2.25 percent and this is commensurate with the 2.25 percent reductions that this House voted on and the Governor signed into law for FY15. Would we like to spend more money? Yes, because these programs which provide safety and security for our children and our families are important, but we also know that we have to cut. As the Speaker has said, we cannot balance a budget simply by cutting our way out of it nor can we balance a budget simply by raising revenue. That it will take a serious effort to raise revenue and also reduce cuts... reduce expenses. This budget also includes the Medicaid program and I will stress here that one of the great concerns in this Body going forward over the last number of years was the growing cost of the Medicaid program because of the growing cost of health care not only in the State of Illinois, but across the country. But this year after our package of reductions in the Medicaid budget we are holding the Medicaid budget for FY16 flat. So, there is no growth between FY16... between FY15 and FY16 in our proposed expenditures. Again, we are reducing the rates 2.25 percent across the board, but we're doing a number of restorations from the Governor's budget as well. There are none of the cuts to rural/critical access hospitals that the Governor proposed. There are no cuts to the inner city safety net hospitals the Governor has proposed. We are restoring the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

poison control center. We are restoring the supplemental rates for sick children on ventilators. We are also restoring the supplemental payments for severely mentally ill children. And to the veterans who we honored today and we honored their memory, the Department of Veteran's Affairs is included in this budget, and at the request of the department, we have funds and given them merged the for-home appropriations so that they can better manage their existing veterans homes. Plus, it also allows investment in staffing up for the new Chicago veterans home which will be opening, I believe, next year. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, we realize that we have to make cuts. We realize that we have to be sensitive. We realize we have to have priorities as we discussed before over the last 11 weeks. Both the House and the Senate have had hearings here, in Chicago, in Springfield, around the state. We've heard from literally thousands and thousands of people about the importance of the autism program, about the importance of early intervention, about the importance of child care, about the importance of preserving services to persons with disabilities and to our senior citizens and protecting our kids by giving them positive, worthwhile activities after school. All of these things are included in this budget. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Davis. Mr. Davis, do you want to wait for Third Reading? Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments, but a balanced budget note has been requested, but not filed at this time."

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

Harris, G.: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask that... move that this note be ruled inapplicable."

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

Sandack: "Obviously, I object to the Motion. The idea that the balanced budget constitutional requirement doesn't apply is laughable. I know that this House, this Assembly and this Legislature in the past has often had unbalanced budgets. I'll remind our colleagues the constitution says, pretty much in black and white, appropriations for a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during that year. I object to the Gentleman's Motion and ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris to close on the Motion."

Harris, G.: "I would point out to the Gentleman who just spoke that every revenue estimate from COGFA or from the Governor's Office of Management & Budget shows that the amount of monies that are expected to be appropriated in this legislation, should it pass, will be available next year. So, we are not exceeding a balanced budget requirement with this Amendment. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "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? Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Gordon-Booth, McAuliffe. Please take the record. On this question there are 66 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. The

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Gentleman's Motion passes and the note is held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further notes or requests at this time."

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4165, a Bill for an Act making

appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the same Bill I described in Second Readings just a moment ago. It really talks about what we value. It talks about valuing and supporting our families and supporting our communities. It talks about supporting seniors and restores proposed cuts to the senior care program, the CCP. It restores cuts that were proposed to services for adults with disability. It fully funds autism and respite care. It restores the indigent burials program which had been previously eliminated in Governor's proposed budget. It flat funds the local health department distributive grants. It restores funding for after school programing in our faith based institutions, the Teen Reach Program, our Boys & Girls Clubs, the YM & YWCAs. It restores the Governor's proposed cuts to the Department of Children & Family Services. It also restores the child care program fully, so that children over the age of seven will still be able to receive child care services. Within the Medicaid program, it restores the proposed cuts to the hospitals which we heard could be debilitating to hospitals across our state. It restores the money to the tobacco quit line and it restores money to the poison control center, the Alzheimer's program, the Sickle Cell Anemia program and we

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

are able to do all of this through the reductions I described before that will also save the state \$134 million over FY15 and hold our Medicaid budget flat. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative Harris, I presume that we're going to go through a number of these votes today on the FY16 budget, correct? How many will we be undertaking this afternoon?"

Harris, G.: "This is the only one that I'm involved in so, honestly, I don't know."

Durkin: "But, collectively, we'll do about eight or nine today?"

Harris, G.: "Again, I know I had to do this one. I just don't know the answer to your question."

Durkin: "All right, thank you. And then we do have... the other part of the budget will be coming over from the Senate. Is that your understanding?"

Harris, G.: "There are portions of the budget in the Senate as well."

Durkin: "Okay. Now, I want to be perfectly clear. You talked about balanced budgets. I just want to make it perfectly clear on the record that based on the conversations... based on the statements from the Speaker yesterday, but also our budget analysis that collectively all the Bills that we will be undertaking today and also when the Senate comes over will authorize or they'll ask for spending of approximately \$36 billion, correct?"

55th Legislative Day

- Harris, G.: "Again, I can speak to what's in our budget. I know that the Speaker did make some remarks yesterday which you responded to and I would support his interpretation of it. I also know that when the Governor introduced his budget it anticipated savings of several billion dollars in pensions which we know were not going to happen. So, therefore, both would have needed some additional work in order to come into full balance. We would need to find more revenue or make more cuts."
- Durkin: "So, the \$36 billion that the Speaker mentioned yesterday and which we will be taking up over the next day and a half are clearly imbalanced based on the revenues which we projected will come in this next fiscal year. Is that a correct statement?"
- Harris, G.: "Yeah, I can go on with the statements that the Speaker made yesterday and that was his assertion that we need to find other sources of revenue. I think other entities outside of these chambers such as the Civic Federation have also made it clear that in order to solve our state's fiscal problems we have to tighten our belts plus we have to find other sources of revenue and the Civic Federation so far as to offer us a menu of possible choices."
- Durkin: "Well, I understand that, but for purposes of today and when we take up the balance of these Bills which are the Senate Appropriation Bills, we still are going to have approximately a 4 billion, \$4 billion unbalanced budget that's going to be sent to the Governor when everybody in this building and everybody in this chamber... both chambers knows that the amount of money which we will be receiving

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

this year is a little over \$32 billion. Now, Representative Sandack made a statement earlier when we stated... made a Motion that the budget act is inapplicable I was fascinated when it was voted down. Now, and I'll reiterate, it's very clear and I... the General Assembly, by law, shall make appropriations for all expenditures of public funds by the state. Appropriations for a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during that year. We have a \$4 billion imbalanced budget that presumably is going to be sent to the Governor. How does that comply with the Constitution assuming that the Constitution is not advisory and it's just a recommendation?"

Harris, G.: "I think when the budget is enacted it has to be fully in balance and I think that the Speaker said yesterday that there is a gap he would prefer to see be filled with some additional revenue. I think we've done some cuts. The Governor may also have input into those decisions as well."

Durkin: "But it says appropriations that's what comes from the Legislature. For a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly. What happens after we pass this is up to the Governor, but for... I'm still trying to get my arms around the why? Why in the world are we sending, for the second year in a row, an unbalanced budget to the Governor? And a matter of fact, our Members made an inquiry about a year ago in the form of an opinion which they asked the Attorney General. This is not... goes back to the Civil War, but this goes... this is about one year old in which Representative Kay, Representative Sullivan, and myself asked for some guidance. A letter asking whether it is a violation

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

of Article 8 Section 2B of the Illinois Constitution for appropriations of public funds in a state budget to exceed the General Assembly's estimate of funds available in the fiscal year. Now, the Attorney General, who we all know just... we put a lot of value in her opinions, and a matter of fact, it was the Attorney General opinion which all of you said my gosh, we can't talk about Right To Work because the Attorney General in her opinion said it's unconstitutional. So, here's what the Attorney General is now saying about the inquiry we have about whether the Legislature can send an unbalanced budget to the Governor. This is Lynn Patton, she's the Senior Assistant AG, runs the opinion's division. It says... this is how she finishes up her letter, although the Governor has granted the authority to reduce veto items in appropriation Bills, we have found little support in the Constitutional language for the proposition that the Legislature can send the Governor appropriations that exceed the Legislature's fund estimate. The General Assembly's appropriation authority is limited by its estimate of funds available. I don't how much more clear this can be of the... what this process is failing and how is failing Illinois day in and day out. I'm going to just make a few more statements and I know my colleagues will join me. I know they'll have many things to say, but I just want to start with this, this statement. We can't draft a budget with magic money that doesn't exist. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, we've all seen this Greek tragedy before and it's really a tragedy regarding year in and in out of unbalanced budgets and overspending by the House Democrats and the Senate Democrats.

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

We've just got to back a little bit. Just a few months ago and a matter of fact, let's start with last May. In May of 2015, the House Democrats and also the Democrat Leadership throughout the State of Illinois acknowledged that that budget was unbalanced. Look at the chaos it created at the end of the calendar year. The minute that Governor Rauner took his hand off that Bible he inherited a \$1.6 billion unbalanced budget. Think about all the promises that were not kept and you knew you could never keep those. Expectations that cannot be met with social service agencies. That to me is a tragedy. But here we go again after what we believe was a promise of bipartisan negotiation going back to the day in which we all took our oath of office in which we were all welcomed back to meaningful discussions and participation in the budget process. And where are we at? We have a budget that's unbalanced by 4, not 1.6, \$4 billion. Irresponsible. So, the question I ask is why can't we pass a balanced budget? One, that's very simple. Spending matches the revenue and taxes that we bring into our treasury. What have we learned from FY15? What have we learned from FY15? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. It's often been said in this chamber that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. Well, folks, if we pass these budgets and send \$36 billion of budgets to the Governor this is insanity. You're insane and history will look upon you unkindly. So, let's start the process."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Okay, so will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

55th Legislative Day

- Bradley: "Representative Harris... Representative Harris, did the Governor send us a budget proposal earlier this year?"
- Harris, G.: "We had one that was introduced. The Governor certainly came and gave his budget address, and then I believe, Representatives on the side opposite introduced his budget."
- Bradley: "Okay, so was the budget that was introduced consistent with the information that was provided to us in his budget address?"
- Harris, G.: "It's my belief that it was."
- Bradley: "And did it have a reduction in the required pension contribution of \$2 billion 2 hundred million?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes it did."
- Bradley: "It had a reduction in contribution to the pension system of \$2 billion 2 hundred million?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes, Sir."
- Bradley: "That is not what the actual payment is this year based on the facts and reality and law as it stands today, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "I understand that not only is that the number, but that the number has increased 536 million over FY15, so that the budget that the Governor produced would've been out of balance by yet another half a billion dollars."
- Bradley: "What did you say? Out of balance?"
- Harris, G.: "Out of balance."
- Bradley: "So, the budget that was introduced, the budget that was introduced by the Governor was \$2.756 billion out of balance with regard to one item, the pension payment. Is that correct?"

55th Legislative Day

- Harris, G.: "If all the other items stood that is my understanding."
- Bradley: "In addition, the Governor's proposed budget had a reduction of group health insurance of \$700 million, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Bradley: "Is that the actual amount that we owe for group health insurance or... what is the actual amount that we owe for group health insurance this year? Do you know it?"
- Harris, G.: "I believe... I'll have to get back to you on that,

  Representative. I believe it's in excess of that amount
  substantially."
- Bradley: "But the amount that we actually owe for group health insurance was \$700 million more than what was proposed in the Governor's introduced budget, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes, and I think he also anticipated taking actions did not have statutory authority yet, so those actions could not have been taken."
- Bradley: "That would require legislation and a statutory change, would it not?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Bradley: "So, the budget that was introduced would be out of balance with regards to group health insurance only of \$700 million. Is that not correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Bradley: "Representative, the Local Government Distributive Fund, that is a statutory item, that by law, we pay to the local communities, is it not?"

55th Legislative Day

- Harris, G.: "Yes, it goes to municipalities, towns, and villages across the State of Illinois."
- Bradley: "The Governor's introduced budget would have lowered that by \$634 million 47 thousand, would it not?"
- Harris, G.: "I believe so, yes."
- Bradley: "The Governor's proposed budget was not based on the reality or status of the law, but yet had a reduction of \$634 million plus, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Bradley: "The Governor's introduced budget with regards to the Local Government Distributive Fund item only would be over \$600 million out of balance, would it not?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Bradley: "Hospital assessment payment reduction. The Governor has in his budget \$400 million less for the hospital assessment payment reduction, did he not?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes he did, Representative."
- Bradley: "That would require a law change that is not taking place, is that correct?"
- Harris, G.: "That is correct. That program is in statute."
- Bradley: "The Governor's budget would be \$400 million out of balance with regards to the Hospital Assessment Payment Reduction Fund only, would it not?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes, Representative."
- Bradley: "Is anyone keeping track? Is anyone keeping track? Supplemental payments to hospitals shorted \$350 million out of balance, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."

55th Legislative Day

- Bradley: "Public utility tax diversions, \$280.7 million out of balance, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "I believe so, yes."
- Bradley: "All of these from the Governor's introduced budget.

  Nursing home rates, \$200 million out of balance, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Bradley: "Community care program, \$140 million out of balance, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Bradley: "Public Transportation Fund, \$127 million out of balance, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "I believe so, yes."
- Bradley: "From the Governor's introduced budget. Teachers' Retirement Insurance Program... Teachers' Retirement Insurance Program, \$108.25.261 million out of balance in the Governor's introduced budget, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "I believe so, yes."
- Bradley: "Determination of need increases, \$98 million out of balance, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Bradley: "Elimination of all services for young adults over 18, \$98 million out of balance, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Bradley: "Specialized mental health rehabilitation facilities, \$80 million out of balance, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "I believe so, yes."
- Bradley: "Downstate public transportation fund, \$75 million out of balance, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Bradley: "Accountable care entities, ACEs, \$60 million out of balance, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Bradley: "Pharmaceutical dispensing fees, \$46 million out of balance, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Bradley: "Adult dental services, \$35 million out of balance, correct?"

Harris, G.: "I believe so, yes."

Bradley: "Medicaid eligibility eliminations, \$31.7 million out of balance, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Bradley: "Amtrak operating assistance, \$16 million out of balance, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Bradley: "Supportive living facility rate reductions, \$15 million out of balance, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Bradley: "Chicago Teacher's Pension Fund, \$12.105 million out of balance, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Bradley: "Renal dialysis for noncitizens, \$9.3 million out of balance, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Bradley: "Kidney transplants for noncitizens, \$7 million out of balance, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Bradley: "College insurance program, 4.624625 million out of balance, correct?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Bradley: "Rate increases for children on ventilators, \$4.6 million out of balance, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Bradley: "Podiatric services, \$4 million out of balance, for drug prior authorization, \$4 million out of balance, passenger rail fund, 500,000 out balance. I don't know. I live down in Southern Illinois, but that doesn't seem like that's in balance to me. Does it to you?"

Harris, G.: "It looks that way in Northern Illinois too, Representative."

Bradley: "So, if you care about middle class people, if you care about the citizens of the State of Illinois, if you care about working men and women and you care about the values that this state has stood for, for years don't get caught up in the rhetoric, don't get caught up in the discussion or the finger pointing over the balanced budgets or nonbalanced budgets and all that stuff because the stuff that was sent to us was not balanced. It wasn't even balanced from day one. It was built upon assumptions that weren't reality. It was built upon taking out the middle class. It was built upon hurting working men and women. It was built upon assumptions that didn't exist in law. It was built upon a false, a faulty foundation. Greg Harris is attempting to put forth a spending plan which is a combination of potential revenue and reasonable spending cuts that protects working men and women, protects the middle class. Stand up for the people we represent and vote 'aye'."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Davis, W.: "Wow, Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure how to come behind that."

Speaker Lang: "Well, you could take a pass, Sir."

Davis, W.: "No. Well, no."

Speaker Lang: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "Let me just... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor, of course, yields."

Davis, W.: "Representative, when you went through your discussion of things in the budget, one thing that I didn't hear and I just wanted some clarity on is your talking about a number of restorations that took place. What about summer jobs?"

Harris, G.: "There are about \$7 million, I believe, for summer jobs for youth that are in this budget."

Davis, W.: "Okay, thank you very much. Briefly to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. We heard the Leader over there describe his version of the events that are taking place there and I can appreciate that, but what I would also add into this conversation is what happens if we make these cuts? You don't hear anybody talking about that. I would argue that some of the cuts particularly in the Human Services budget that are being proposed or were proposed by the Governor. The reality is that they would actually cost us more money and whether or not we know that or not, I actually asked agency directors that question. When I had the opportunity to question them and from the Appropriations Committees themselves, but what happens if we're not providing care to children on ventilators and children's rehabilitative systems in Harvey, Illinois if it closes or has to reduce its services? And these young people who are deemed medically complex have to go home. What

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

happens there? So, at that time, I believe it was interim Director Bassey, who I understand is no longer the interim director. He said, well, if they're at home and something happens we'll dispatch a crisis team, a crisis team. I said, well, sometimes when you do those kinds of things don't they actually cost you more money? He didn't answer, but presumably, the answer was yes. When we have to do things extraordinary to provide services they cost us more money. So, I asked agency directors about their cuts. What will those cuts do in terms of the services that are being provided? If we can't provide them, will they ultimately cost the state more money? Because those individuals who may get cut off Medicaid and don't have access to primary care services, if they wind up in a hospital and go through the emergency room that's going to cost us two or three times more to provide the service. So, is that a good way to go? I think not. What we are proposing are opportunities to provide good services to people across the State of Illinois, give them access to the appropriate care that they need so we're not costing ourselves more money in the long run. So, we can argue about revenue. We can go back and forth, but if we're going to cost ourselves more money where is that money going to come from? Or better yet is more about actually we don't care about costing us more money? Is that what it is? We talk about programs for youth and for individuals. Well, if kids are just running the streets then they're more likely to get in trouble with the law. We have a lot of law enforcements here in the chamber. So, what happens when young people get caught up with the law? If they unfortunately have to go into a

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

facility that's going to cost us more money. Probably more money than it would be to simply fund after-school programs and give these young people something to do after school. So, to the extent in which the Leader says insanity, I think making those kinds of cuts are insane because they're going to cost us more money. They're going to require us to grow things like our corrections budget or maybe you want to grow the corrections budget. I personally don't. We need to be providing opportunities to move people out of the corrections system, but if we move in the way that the Governor wants us to do we're going to be forced with adding more into corrections because hey, people get in trouble you've got to figure out what to do with them. You've got to house them somewhere. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I can appreciate the dialogue about revenue and yes, there will be a conversation about revenue. It's going to be a great conversation about revenue and we hope that all of you on that side of the aisle can join in on the conversation about revenue, but this is about providing services and making sure that we are providing adequate services for the people of the State of Illinois. That 110 thousand people that each one of us took an oath to try to protect, to try to provide services for. How can making drastic cuts to services... how can we do that and still say that we are representing the people in our districts when they need those services. So, Representative, I support what you are doing. Representative Bradley ran through a litany of out of balance issues that were proposed to us, so if those are okay this is definitely much better than that. So, I would encourage everyone to support this Gentleman's measure."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "A few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. Greg, we were here, I think, last week and you had a litany of Amendments on Second Reading. Are you going to move those Bills that you... I think there were 16 Amendments. We went through a couple days worth of work. Are you going to move those to Third Reading?"

Harris, G.: "I think, Representative, that you'll find that..."

Sandack: "It's a yes or no, Greg. Yes or no?"

Harris, G.: "Sometimes things are more complicated than yes or no. I want to give you an honest answer."

Sandack: "You needn't make it that complicated if you don't want."

Harris, G.: "I just want to give you an honest answer, Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "I appreciate that."

Harris, G.: "That those represented values that are included, those that are within the Human Services, Health Care & Family Services, and Veteran's Administration budget that are included in the budgets that see before you... that are seen before. So, right now it is... I do not intend to move them to Third Reading because those are included in the legislation that is before us today."

Sandack: "Okay, so we went through a couple days worth of work and now you got it right, so we're going to move these Bills."

Harris, G.: "Oh no. I think that we found what people really wanted to believe. And just as we went through on the concealed carry debate and other things we found where there's support. We gave an opportunity for the people of Illinois to

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

say, you know, Representative, vote for this, support early intervention, support autism, support after school programs."

Sandack: "So, you contend there was a positive outcome from those two days' worth of votes on Amendments and that reflects the work product in here?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Sandack: "Okay. When did you start drafting this Bill? You know, the budget Bill that comprises 4165?"

Harris, G.: "We've been working on what is in this Bill since the first day about 11 weeks ago that we began hearing testimony from people across the State of Illinois. You know, the early intervention moms and dads, the autism parents, the folks who..."

Sandack: "Greg, can... I'd appreciate just answering my question and not going on to talking points because it's just not appropriate and it really jades the thing. When was this Bill drafted?"

Harris, G.: "We've been working on this for quite some time and, as you know, with all legislation it goes through many drafts. It is fine tuned as more information becomes available. So, I would say that the concepts have been translated into the words that are on paper and it changed many times and it's gone on for a number of weeks."

Sandack: "When did it go to LRB?"

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

Sandack: "When did it come out of LRB?"

Harris, G.: "I am told by our budget director that these Bills are drafted within our appropriations and research staff."

Sandack: "When?"

55th Legislative Day

- Harris, G.: "When? I'm saying that they started drafting and redrafting over the 11-week period that we've been hearing testimony and gathering input."
- Sandack: "They just came out recently though, right? They just got Bill numbers the last couple of days."
- Harris, G.: "Just like the Governor's Turnaround Agenda and other things we've seen that popped out Friday afternoon, I think, after we left."
- Sandack: "All right. You, obviously..."
- Harris, G.: "Did you know when those began being drafted? I remember sitting for 11 weeks in meetings about those also, Representative."
- Sandack: "You'll get to ask me questions when I present that Bill.

  How's that sound, Greg?"
- Harris, G.: "I will count the minutes."
- Sandack: "Me too. So, you obviously moved to have the objection or actually the note put on your Bill that it was constitutionally in firm because we have this crazy thing called a constitutionally balanced requirement. Is your Bill... do revenues and expenditures meet?"
- Harris, G.: "I think that the… if you look at GOMB and COGFA's estimates of revenues there would more than adequate revenues to fund those things that are envisioned in this legislation."
- Sandack: "Well, Representative Bradley asked you about pensions and he asked you about public transportation and LGDS and, obviously, that's not part of this Bill, but he asked you about that. So, the entire budget Bill, whether it's coming from the Senate or originating in the House, will it be a balanced budget?"

55th Legislative Day

- Harris, G.: "He was asking me questions about what the Governor proposed as his budget if you recall."
- Sandack: "Right, but I'm asking you now because you're the Sponsor of 4165. Will the entire budget package, how many Bills it comprises I don't know... I guess we'll see, but in the aggregate, will it be a balanced budget?"
- Harris, G.: "I think yesterday our Speaker gave a public statement yesterday afternoon that said we will have to find additional revenues or would have to make drastic, draconian cuts to meet the spending that we are looking at if all these items were taken in their totality and we paid our full pension obligation. I think he was very clear about his stance on that."
- Sandack: "So, the answer's no. It's not a balanced budget is it, Greq?"
- Harris, G.: "None of the budgets that we've seen... the Governor's budget was not balanced. I think..."
- Sandack: "Greg, I'm talking about what's on the board and what the Democrats are proposing. Please contain the answer to that. The budget the Democrats, whether it's the Senate Democrats or the House Democrats are proposing, it's not a balanced budget, is it? It shouldn't be that hard to say yes or no. What are you sending to the Governor? What you... what the Democrats are intending to send to the Governor is not a balanced budget, is it?"
- Harris, G.: "And then the Governor may reduce it or he may say we should come up with revenue."
- Sandack: "To the Bill. The lengths upon which the Sponsor will go not to answer a question belies the whole process here. Here's

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

the fact and this is something we've dealt with in the past. We just have a new dynamic now. In the last General Assembly we knew, well, we... the folks in charge knew we were going to pass a budget that wasn't balanced, give it to Governor Quinn if he wins and then we'd raise revenue. Here's the only problem, folks. Governor Quinn didn't win and the people of Illinois spoke otherwise. They don't want just spend, tax, borrow, spend, tax, repeat. That has gotten us where we are which is in a world of hurt, so we're going to continue the process? Really? That's what we're going to do? We're going to send Bills back and forth amongst the Democrats only and then give them to a Governor that's going to do what? Veto it. That's rhetorical, Sir, and I'm speaking to the Bill. I'll remind my friends here that the Constitution of the State of Illinois is not permissive; it's not suggestive. It's the fundamental law of our land and it says the General Assembly, by law, shall make appropriations for all expenditures of public funds by the state. Appropriations for a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during that year. This budget violates that notion in its entirety and to suggest it doesn't is ... well, it's just a lie. Okay. It's a lie. This is an unbalanced budget you're sending to the Governor, an act of futility. And I want to speak about the previous Gentleman from Marion's speech... histrionics and theatrics. I'm going to use his words. Quote... and I can't do it with the right drawl, so excuse me, I can't get country lawyer. We're going to hold the line and not spend more than we have and try to pace out some of the Bills, get worker's compensation settled, get

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

enterprise zones figured out, do some other things that are very important to the State of Illinois. He goes on. There's a lot of very tough and some would argue bad decisions that are coming up. We live in tough times. We live in financially desperate times and so the state has to have some policy discussions about long term consequences. The state has gotten into trouble by overestimating revenue. I think it's important working together in a bipartisan way that we are able to come up with a number that both sides are comfortable with. That may be the sanest thing that Gentleman's ever said which deviates completely with what he just did on the floor. The fact of the matter is we've seen no bipartisanship in this process. In fact, some people on the other side have been complaining about secret meetings. You know the secret meetings I object to? This budget. Because it's been done unilaterally and it's been done to try and embarrass. There are no cuts being restored with this budget because it's not a real budget. Talk it all up. Get your two minutes in, YouTube commercial in. It's not a real budget. It's not going to restore anything, and most importantly, it's not going to restore the faith and confidence of the people of the State of Illinois because they know because the Speaker said it yesterday. This budget spends \$4 billion more in money the state doesn't have. So, I guess you can feel good about raising false expectations. We're restoring nothing because we haven't dealt with the entire budget in a macro, bipartisan, fair, reasonable manner. This is, unfortunately, a really bad joke you guys keep perpetuating on the people of Illinois and it's shameful and it's sad and it's wasteful. I,

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

obviously, urge a 'no' vote and, by the way, when you're out telling your constituents we're not spending more than we have, I don't know how you're going to answer that question. Good luck on that though."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Kay: "Thank you. Greg, you've become a lot more articulate with the help of your side of the aisle than you were in committee this morning, so I'm going to ask you to begin, when did we discuss the two largest agencies in our committee, the Department of Human Services and Health & Family Services? When did we discuss that budget?"

Harris, G.: "I believe that we had discussions on multiple occasions, Representative, and to refresh your memory I think, particularly, in Health Care & Family Services budget the CEO of Touchette Hospital which is in your district was one of the persons who came and discussed..."

Kay: "That's not my question. That's the same thing you did this morning. That's not my question. I'm talking about when did we discuss the budgetary items that went into the two agencies that I just mentioned to you?"

Harris, G.: "We had numerous discussions over..."

Kay: "Those were..."

Harris, G.: "...11 weeks, Representative."

Kay: "...that was testimony. That was testimony."

Harris, G.: "And there was discussion back and forth between Members of the committee, between the witnesses and between experts."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Kay: "But we never came up with a number, did we? You did, but we
didn't."

Harris, G.: "Did you? No, I don't believe you did."

Kay: "No, we didn't. Thank you. Do you know why the notes... the fiscal note on the balanced budget was so important? Well, let me give you a little history if I may. You were here in 2002, weren't you?"

Harris, G.: "No, I wasn't."

Kay: "All right. Well, I'm sure some of your friends across the aisle can help you. Did we pass a balanced budget in 2002 in the State of Illinois?"

Harris, G.: "I wasn't here. I do not know the answer."

Kay: "Well, we didn't. We didn't. How about 2003? Balanced budget?"

Harris, G.: "I was not here. I'm not sure you were here."

Kay: "Okay, fair enough. No, we didn't. How about 2004? Balanced budget? No. When did you get here, Greg?"

Harris, G.: "The very end of 2006."

Kay: "We're getting there. 2005, balanced budget? No. 2006, balanced budget? No. Well, you've been here a year now. 2007, balanced budget? You were here."

Harris, G.: "You tell me, Representative."

Kay: "No. 2008, balanced budget?"

Harris, G.: "You tell me."

Kay: "No. How about 2009? No. And here's where it gets interesting. Now, we're not talking about millions of dollars, we're talking about billions of dollars that we're off, like \$4 billion like we're talking about today. Four

55th Legislative Day

- billion dollars we're off budget. How does that happen? You were here."
- Harris, G.: "I think it happens in the same way as when the Governor on that side introduces a budget which is billions out of balance. At least on our side we've said there are two ways, there are two ways to address a budget where expenses may exceed revenues..."
- Kay: "Yeah. Well, that's a pretty big gap."
- Harris, G.: "...you need to find new revenues or you need to make reductions."
- Kay: "Yeah, that's a pretty big gap. By the way..."
- Harris, G.: "And we've made... we've made reductions and I would say and I said this in committee during our discussions this morning I would be very happy to support some increased revenue. And I think the Speaker was clear about that also."
- Kay: "How about... how about 2010? Did we do any better then, in balancing our budget?"
- Harris, G.: "Go ahead and tell me."
- Kay: "No, we didn't. Six billion in the red, in the red. How do
  you do that? Well, you do what we're doing today. You skirt
  the process, right? I'm asking you."
- Harris, G.: "I don't believe the process was..."
- Kay: "You were here."
- Harris, G.: "...I don't believe the process was skirted."
- Kay: "You had the House. You had the Senate. You had the Governorship. You were here. What happened?"
- Harris, G.: "We passed a budget, the Governor signed it, it was implemented and we funded education, we funded human services, we funded Medicaid."

55th Legislative Day

- Kay: "And you passed... of course, that was the infamous midnight massacre where we passed that huge tax increase. Is that not correct? That was about 2010, wasn't it?"
- Harris, G.: "I'll have you refresh my memory."
- Kay: "All right. So, in 2011 what happened? We balance a budget? No, no. How about '12? Did we balance a budget then? No. How about '13? Did we balance a budget in 2013? No, we didn't. And we didn't balance a budget last year."
- Harris, G.: "I'll tell you what we did do though. I mean, for the last couple years we've certainly paid all of our pension obligations and then I believe when the Governor said he wanted a supplemental appropriation this year we went back and appropriated supplemental funds from... monies from sweeping funds at the Governor's request, so that brings us to today."
- Kay: "Yeah. Well, today is no better though from a historical perspective than it was in 2002 because we haven't had a balanced budget since 2001 and you see, Representative, what you're is you're confounding the problem. You're confounding the problem. Instead of fixing it, you're adding to it by using a balanced budget concept that, in fact, operationally doesn't work. It doesn't work. I'm curious to know... I'm curious to know how you think we're going to fill the gap this year since you weren't aware that for at least 11 years we hadn't balanced a budget. How are we going to fill the whole this year that you've created today?"
- Harris, G.: "The budget that we have before us today does not create a hole. I think that at the end of the day there are

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

two ways to change an overall budget when the process has completed itself."

Kay: "That's not true. There is a hole."

Harris, G.: "There are two ways to fix an overall budget process. One is to find some revenue and follow the suggestions of the Civic Federation. The other is to go back to the people who objected so strongly to the cuts and another famous massacre, the Good Friday Massacre, who came out when the autism was reduced by just a couple million, when epilepsy was reduced, when early intervention was reduced. So, there are two ways to do it. I think the responsible way is to do what we're doing here and to cut money and say yes, we would need to do what the..."

Kay: "This is the responsible way? This way? Really?"

Harris, G.: "...do what the Civic Federation says and not pursue an unachievable budget..."

Kay: "Holy smokes."

Harris, G.: "...such as the one the Governor introduced, but to say look, we need to have some revenue and we need to make some cuts."

Kay: "Well, Representative..."

Harris, G.: "This is the spending side and we're some cuts."

Kay: "...to the Bill. Here's what I see. I see, factually, which I'm surprised you didn't know when you ran everything around here you couldn't balance a budget and, obviously, today you can't balance a budget. And what you're saying to the middle class that you really don't care about, you pretend you do, but you really don't care about is we're going to dig you with another great, big tax increase and you're going to enjoy

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

it's because we can do it. We can do it. Let me say this. The way you handle the situation is you bring true numbers to the table both with revenues and with expenses. And the way you grow revenues, Representative, is to bring jobs to the State of Illinois and all we've done the last month is kill, kill any possibility of bringing jobs to the State of Illinois. In fact, we've said you're not welcome, you're not invited, we don't want to reform anything, this is a great state. This is a terrible state when it comes to how we handle our budgets, how we handle our reforms, and how we handle our innovation when it's trying to keep up and compete with other states. We can't compete. We care more about politics than we care about people and that's our problem. And until we get that fixed you're never going to have a balanced budget. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "So, thank you, Representative Harris, first of all for all your work on the budget. We appreciate all that you've done. We've been working for six months, but on the particular budget that is in front of us today, I don't think that we have actually had the working group on the biggest part of this budget, the DHS or the HFS in our working group, have we?"

Harris, G.: "In our working group they came and presented, I believe, on a number of occasions. I believe there were also advocates for early intervention, for autism that came and

55th Legislative Day

- expressed their point of views. I think a lot of these items were discussed both in public hearings and working groups and, you know, also downstairs in the Governor's meetings."
- Bellock: "But, actually, I think the only working group we really worked with where we went line by line was a week ago on the public health budget. Isn't that correct?"
- Harris, G.: "We also went line by line on some of the other agencies the week prior to that if you recall."
- Bellock: "Well, I don't remember..."
- Harris, G.: "So, if your answer's did we go through the DHS budget exactly line by line the answer would be no."
- Bellock: "Okay, so I'm just going to point out the budget process this year that did not come about as we have done in a bipartisan way in other years with Democrats and Republicans by getting together around the table and confirming and putting into a Resolution the actual revenue number... the general revenue number, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "The process this year... no, we did not do that Resolution."
- Bellock: "And then usually when we did the general revenue number we would put in all the items that you mentioned before such as the pension payment, the group health insurance, everything that the state has to pay above the line, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "I don't... my recollection is different,
  Representative. I think we did do a revenue estimate. Some
  years there were Resolutions that had some of the above the
  line items delineated. Other years I don't believe there
  were."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Bellock: "But usually what we did is put... for the last several years is put the lines above the line that we had to pay out then we would come up with the number that would be given to the Appropriation Committees which was the below the line number. And then we would work... try to work in a responsible manner as to what was given to each committee and then we would work line by line as to what would balance within the money that was given in that budget appropriation say to the human service working group, correct?"
- Harris, G.: "And in some years that's the way we did it, yes."
- Bellock: "So, in this case, with everything the way it's been done even after the rush of today I'm not even positive because half of these agencies that are coming through the DHS budget I'm not sure what the positive number is of the total agencies within human service agencies. What is that total budget?"
- Harris, G.: "It is about 5.397 billion in non-Medicaid spending, Representative."
- Bellock: "No, I think that... I'm asking what the total DHS... all the human service agencies... that budget together. That's just the three agencies..."
- Harris, G.: "That's the number... I believe I'm giving you the correct number, Representative."

Bellock: "No, I think it's \$12 billion."

Harris, G.: "That's if you add Medicaid in."

Bellock: "Okay."

Harris, G.: "I was giving the non-Medicaid number."

Bellock: "Oh, thank you. So, is there an underfunding of the Medicaid in this budget?"

55th Legislative Day

- Harris, G.: "No, I believe it is flat funded."
- Bellock: "Well, I just got a message from HFS and they're concerned about this budget that we could have 1.2 billion in unpaid bills in the Medicaid realm. That along with the 6 billion of unpaid bills that we already have, leads me to believe that that's a troublesome course for this... right now in this budget planning."
- Harris, G.: "I've not heard that from the department."
- Bellock: "I've got it right here. I'll send it over to you afterwards."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you."
- Bellock: "I guess the other thing was that I was talking about was that when we went along with the budget process we would set priorities as to what we thought we needed to have in that Bill. And that's something that's been a topic of discussion on this floor today and I want to say that people on my side of the aisle are just as concerned about funding programs for everybody that we've talked about, for seniors, for people that are medically fragile, for children that are in wheelchairs, for all of those people. But at the same time, we're concerned about whether we had that 6 billion or maybe now 7 billion of unpaid bills and then we can't pay our providers, our doctors, our hospitals, our nursing homes, and provide the services for the people on Medicaid. Isn't that a problem?"
- Harris, G.: "I think that we have... that we're appropriating money to pay those bills and I believe we're also anticipating appropriating half a billion dollars, if my memory serves me, to pay down old bills that have been generated in the past.

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

We also could have... this year I will point out that our state budget and our economy as a whole performed better. We actually had a surplus this year to the other Gentleman's point. Our economy, our revenues are beginning to rebound from the great recession. Our state is beginning to get its house back in order. We're doing a prudent thing by continuing to cut the expenses we're proposing and that we still have more work to do and we're meeting our major obligations. We're paying our debt service. We're paying our pension obligations. All of those are good things. We are paying the local government distributive funds. Those are all good things."

- Bellock: "What is the revenue for that, Representative?"
- Harris, G.: "I think that was the numbers that the Speaker discussed yesterday in his press conference."
- Bellock: "Well, I wasn't at that press conference, but... and usually when we're doing our Bill with the Human Service Approp we usually know what we're trying to balance... what we're spending on in the human service agencies along with what we've been appropriated. So, right now I see \$12 billion that we're spending, but I don't see anything on the other side of that."
- Harris, G.: "We can get the COGFA projections and the GOMB projections for you, I'm sure."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. The problem with this budget that we're looking at today and starting down this road is that this budget concerns me that there are going to be a lot of false hopes for a lot of the people that we've been talking about on this floor. We are

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

now going to extend this budget 'cause we all know that this budget is not real and this budget will be extended for week by week while the lives of the people that we're talking about, especially in this budget, the most fragile population in the State of Illinois is going to sit by week by week because this hasn't been done responsibly. And we all know that because people have been in our offices everyday pleading with us to come to a budget that they can live with. We were stalled by a two... at least two-month process in trying to figure out how to fund what was underfunded by the last administration with court reporters, child care, and the corrections officers. It took us almost two months and yet we did, in a bipartisan way, come to an end and resolve that situation. I don't see that happening here now and I see a lot of false hopes going forward and I just want to say that over the last several years we have been downgraded 22 times in the State of Illinois and if it doesn't frighten people what happened to the City of Chicago last week in junk bond status, we do not want that to happen to the State of Illinois. We want to be able to pay our bills, and we want to act responsibly so that we can pay for the people that are on Medicaid. So we can pay our providers and so that we can reinstate our economy and jobs and businesses moving back to Illinois and then have more money to put into all these programs that all of us on both sides of the aisle want to provide for the neediest citizens of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, you and I are both fortunate to serve on the Human Services Appropriation Committee and on that committee, as in every committee, we look at a very specific set of issues, issues related to human services as they're provided. The context changes though when we come here to floor. When we're all gathered here on the floor we all have spent that time looking at specific issues, but here we're called upon to look at the bigger picture. Would you agree with that?"

Harris, G.: "Yes, on a variety of different topics."

Demmer: "That's right because we each come from a different part of the state. We have different backgrounds, different sets of experience, but we're called upon to look at the big picture of how various proposals that we may be very close to, supportive of or opposed to, proposals that come out of our committees, how they interact with other proposals that other Representatives have brought, and how they interact with the overall business of our state. Would you agree?"

Harris, G.: "That's part of the challenge, yes."

Demmer: "I agree and it's a good challenge. It's a productive challenge. And so, I think what we're looking for today is an understanding of how this Bill that came out of a committee that you and I both serve on, how this Bill interacts with other initiatives throughout state, other initiatives... other Bills that Representatives will run today and tomorrow or the next few days. And the concern comes from... we can say, you know, maybe this is just a ten or a twelve billion dollar appropriation and that fits within the balanced budget

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Amendment or that complies with those terms. But when we look at that in relation to every other budget Bill that will be produced here and will come over from the Senate, isn't it your understanding that all those taken together in a big picture far exceed the projected revenue for the State of Illinois next year?"

Harris, G.: "What I would say, Representative, is we have two examples of how this big picture works. The Governor came before us and he said he was going to introduce a budget which he said was balanced based on things that we later found out either were not constitutional that were not permitted by statute, and I think the Representative from Marion read out a list of those, and we came to find out that there were a lot of expectations in that budget would not have proved to be the case. I think we're... our leader yesterday made very clear that the budgets that we're going to be presenting all reduce the amount of money we're going to spend..."

Demmer: "But exceed the revenue projection..."

Harris, G.: "...but that there will be..."

Demmer: "...correct?"

Harris, G.: "...other revenue..."

Demmer: "...exceed the revenue projection?"

Harris, G.: "...but there will be other revenue needed. I think he was very clear in saying that, Representative."

Demmer: "And I think it's crystal clear, when you look at the numbers, spending more than \$4 billion above the... GOMB's projection, above COGFA's projection. We have a significant disconnect between the proposed spending and the revenue the state has next year. So, the other clarification I'd like to

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

look at is there is a difference between an appropriation and the dollars then that satisfy that appropriation, right? The appropriation allows us to make... to spend that money and then we have to find the dollars in order to satisfy the appropriation."

Harris, G.: "That's true."

Demmer: "So, last year when we passed a budget on this floor, many folks on my side of the aisle stood up and said the budget we're passing is out of balance. The budget we're passing does not have sufficient revenue to meet the appropriations that have been passed. We're spending more than we take in. So, do you recall two months ago we met on this floor to look at a supplemental appropriation to the 2015 fiscal year budget?"

Harris, G.: "I do recall that."

Demmer: "Because it was a situation in which appropriations exceeded revenues and so, what did we have to do? How did we solve that supplemental appropriation?"

Harris, G.: "I believe that we solved it a couple ways. One, we found out that our state's revenues had actually exceeded out very conservative budgeting amount for this year and then we were able to sweep some funds. So, I was given some information from the Governor's budget book that shows one of your colleagues opposite was discussing where our financial situation has been for the last couple years, so I think it's interesting to see from the Governor's budget book that in FY13 the state showed a \$996 million surplus. Representative, I..."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Demmer: "Okay, we can... we can go through those and maybe when you close you could address some of the other comments. The question I'm specifically asking about..."
- Harris, G.: "Fifty-seven million dollar surplus in FY14 and an FY15 surplus estimated by COGFA..."
- Demmer: "Well, we're all having our memories refreshed today.

  Thank you for that."
- Harris, G.: "...between three hundred and five... I just thought it was instructive since your colleague..."
- Demmer: "I understand, I understand..."
- Harris, G.: "...asked me those questions to provide the facts..."
- Demmer: "...but the question I'm asking about..."
- Harris, G.: "...because, clearly, these are important facts to him..."
- Demmer: "...the question I'm asking about..."
- Harris, G.: "...I wanted to be sure he understood them."
- Demmer: "...in situations in which we appropriate more money than we have the dollars to fund we end up midway through the fiscal year having to come back to this chamber and make a supplemental appropriation, authorize further funds, sweep over a billion dollars' worth of funds this year, to satisfy that huge budget hole that was passed last year. Yet, aren't we doing the same thing again today?"
- Harris, G.: "I think..."
- Demmer: "We're appropriating far more money than we have the revenue to pay for?"
- Harris, G.: "I think the Speaker's comments were very clear yesterday that we should address these items early rather than late."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Demmer: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think this division on budget math right now is a process we've seen play out many, many times. None of us like to be in a situation in which we hear that child care providers are going to close down, that corrections officers aren't going to be able to be on the job keeping people safe. We don't want to be in those situations, yet a vote on today's budget will put us back exactly in that situation. It's further evidence of a spend now pay later philosophy that's put us in a perpetual crisis mode every year. Every year... every year we have a budget crisis we have to deal with, and it's because we didn't do our job and deal with it in previous years. We've had a lot of comments so far about the process of this debate, and there's a lot of things we could say about that, but you've encouraged us to speak on the substance and so let me speak specifically on the substance today. The substance of this budget is \$4 billion out of balance. The substance of this budget requires a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, it's my understanding, and you may have mentioned it earlier, that the Bill as it's crafted would leave \$600 million in Medicaid obligations unfunded and then that would equal maybe 1.2 billion when you look at the federal match. Is that accurate?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Hays: "The numbers in the Bill... would there be an unfunded liability of about 600 million on the state side equaling about 1.2 billion total when you look at the federal match that would come on the Medicaid?"
- Harris, G.: "Not that I'm aware of, Representative."
- Hays: "HFS has verified that that is, in fact, the case, the \$600 million and the \$1.2 billion when you look at the federal match. My understanding is another Bill is forthcoming that would cut Medicaid rates an additional 2.25 percent, so called Medicaid reform Bill. Is that a Bill that's been filed?"
- Harris, G.: "It is not... the 2.25 percent reductions, Representative, are included in the legislation that is before us on the board today."

Hays: "It's in the current Bill?"

Harris, G.: "The appropriation amounts."

Hays: "Is the substantive rate change included in the Bill?"

Harris, G.: "It is not."

- Hays: "You indicated that the language of this Bill has been underway or it's being... has been in some kind of a working graph form for about 11 weeks. Now, was that on the spending portion? How about the revenue portion? How long have you been working on that?"
- Harris, G.: "I think that all of our staffs work year around on this because it's such an important concept. So, I would say this is an ongoing process almost every day of the year for your appropriations staff and ours to continue to look at and refine ideas."
- Hays: "To the Bill. I recall when we talk about a process including everybody in the Body. I was a freshman in this Body when the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

former Governor asked for a 1.6 billion dollar reform in the Medicaid program because quote, Governor Quinn indicated that the program we had was unsustainable. And I will never forget the Appropriation for Human Services Committee meeting day after day after day, dozens and dozens of times, 60 or 70 meetings. Literally, physically going through that budget on a line item by line item basis, on a bipartisan basis. Representative Feigenholtz at the time was the Chair of the Committee. I will never ever forget her pulling me aside after one of those meetings saying, Hays, you seem to understand this. You seem to be willing to make the tough decisions. I'm going to need your help. Never forget it. As a freshman, the Chair of the Committee pulling me aside saying, we're going to have to make some of these very tough decisions together. So, it's easy to spot a process that is more appropriate because many of us in this Body have lived that process. A process that requires, by statute, the agreement on a revenue number before we even get into Bills of this nature. To my knowledge, in the... my short tenure here, every year until now that has been the case. We have come together. We have rallied around a number that either... and usually, as you know, the House drives this discussion versus the Senate, God love 'em, that the number would be the COGFA number or the number that the House, on a bipartisan basis, would come up with would be pretty similar. We would coalesce around that number and then we would go to the Appropriation Committees. And the truth is reasonable, intelligent, wellmeaning people can have disagreements. Maybe we'll have to agree to disagree on what the priorities are, but one of the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

thing that's not ambiguous is the notion that the revenue and the spending add up. I mean, how can we possibly go forward without knowing where the revenue is? I spent a long time in the private sector in human services running programs for seniors and for those in the margins of society making sure that the local hospital that I work for had a situation where nobody, no one left the medical center without prescription medications. Programs that were recognized nationally for their impact on those most in need. And I have to tell you I do give kudos from this perspective. Finally, after like two weeks of running Bills that you weren't even for and then acting like 'yes' votes was some kind of a victory. Hallelujah! You're running a Bill that you're for. God bless you, Sir. But I do find it interesting that on... just a week or so ago, there was this notion that somehow people on this side of the aisle were against the working class and the common man, et cetera. I pulled a vote from December 3rd of 2013. The number one issue, to my knowledge, since I've been here certainly for public employees and good people, people that I respect on both sides of the aisle working on a reform, but the fact of the matter is on their most important issue, pensions, making sure that the letter of the law of the Constitution, that agreement is lived up to. When the vote was taken 44 Democrats voted 'no'. The Governor they thought they could count on threw them under the bus and then he backed it up to make sure he ran them over, and it was blatantly unconstitutional, slammed down on a 7-0 vote, 7-0. And I chose not to read the names of the Members that day when the gallery was full because I didn't

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

think it would be appropriate, but let's not kid ourselves in terms of what's important, in terms of what promises have been made, in terms of when push came to shove who let them down. When Governor Quinn stopped paying the General Assembly in an out and now attempt to blackmail this Body into an unconstitutional Resolution, I wrote a scorched earth editorial that you personally, to your credit, called me and congratulated me on and said I wish I would've wrote it myself, Hays. So, once again, when we got the numbers at this late hour I went to the old tried and true 2nd grader test. I called the 2nd graders at Catlin Grade School and I gave them the overview of the numbers and I asked the teacher would you run the numbers with the 2nd graders. They're not adding up for me. And so she went to little Johnny and she said, can you add the numbers up? Johnny's didn't balance. So, she went to Susie, a little red-headed, freckled girl, cute as a button. Susie says I can't make these numbers balance. And then she went to little Edward. Now, little Edward's a little ornery and he had extra time 'cause he misses recess regularly. So, he had a lot of time to work on it and Edward says, hell, I can't make them balance and then he had to go to the principal's office. Little Stephanie, Stephanie may be the smartest young lady in the class. She says I can't make these numbers balance. So here we are again. The Catlin 2nd Graders can't make it work and if it can't work for the Catlin 2nd Graders, I'm a 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor, if I may."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Harris, D.: "Representative, I assume you are the leadoff hitter on all of these budget Bills because it looks like we have nine Bills... appropriations Bills in the House and you just happen to be lucky enough to be the first one. Is that right?"
- Harris, G.: "Representative, before the Gentleman who just spoke leaves the floor, I just have to tell you... I just have to tell you that you may have made a mistake. We talked about the Bills I Sponsored that I voted against. I vote for my Bills and with that story you may have mistaken me for Jay Hoffman. And let you know... Ladies and Gentlemen, I know Jay Hoffman and I am no Jay Hoffman."

Speaker Lang: "Now, Mr. Harris, you may..."

- Harris, D.: "Having... with that observation, I will simply say that the Gentleman to your left has a lot more hair than you do. I'm not sure that makes him any more attractive, but he just happens to have more hair. So, you're the leadoff here on the budget I gather, right? So, you get to take all the brick breaks that we get to throw at you. I hope we don't have to go through this nine... eight more times."
- Harris, G.: "I think the debate has been very good."
- Harris, D.: "So, I don't have to listen to the Gentleman from Williamson County give me his emotional harangue seven more times about how the numbers don't add up?"
- Harris, G.: "That would be totally up to him."
- Harris, D.: "That they're out of balance?"
- Harris, G.: "I think they will still be out of balance, but his remarks are up to him."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Harris, D.: "Let me ask you... I'm looking at the nine appropriations Bills that are here in the House and I understand there are also nine in the Senate?"
- Harris, G.: "I haven't counted up the Senate ones, but there are a number over there."
- Harris, D.: "Well, we have a pretty good staff and our staff added up the Bills and they came up to a figure of about \$21 billion... \$21 billion... 9... Yeah, not \$21 billion."
- Harris, G.: "And I see nine..."
- Harris, D.: "Let me ask you how's education funded so far? Do we know?"
- Harris, G.: "I don't believe the Elementary & Secondary Education budget has been filed yet."
- Harris, D.: "So, that's about six and a half billion or potentially more that hasn't been accounted for, right?"
- Harris, G.: "Again, that's not an area I work in, so I would defer the answers. I don't want to be incorrect."
- Harris, D.: "Well, you get to handle the questions because you're the leadoff. So, the transfers out, you know, things like the Local Government Distributive Fund, have they been accounted for?"
- Harris, G.: "They are not appropriated. Those are statutory, I believe, so they are a continuing appropriation. Would that be the right word, Representative?"
- Harris, D.: "Indeed. I'll agree to that. As are the TRS pension payment. That's a continuing appropriation, right?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes it is."
- Harris, D.: "I think it is. Let's say that it is. So, that's about what here... that's about \$3.7 billion. Debt service, we have

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

to pay our, you know, those people that loan us their money they like to get their interest payments and their debt service so, that's a continuing appropriation so..."

Harris, G.: "That is a statutory obligation and a continuing appropriation."

Harris, D.: "That's about \$2.1 billion, isn't it? About 2.1?"

Harris, G.: "And it's something we certainly ought to pay."

Harris, D.: "Right. That's what I thought. You know, the Gentleman from Williamson County said the numbers don't add up. They up because they're add simply expenditures. Expenditures have to add up to revenues and it's really unfortunate that this process has broken down this year. We didn't do a budget Resolution and that's too bad, but guess what? It's no surprise. We're going to bring in, if nothing else changes, about \$32.1 billion, okay? We don't have to do a Resolution. Probably should, but we're going to being in about \$32.1 billion. Let me tell you something, you can pick on the Governor. You can pick on the Governor and say, well, his budget doesn't add up. You know what? His budget does add up. Now, it may add up and forgive me here if I commit a Lèsemajesté. It may add up because he's saying \$2.2 billion is going to be received in pension payments that may not occur, that may not occur, but it adds up. It adds up if you say that \$700 million is saved in group health. Now, maybe that doesn't occur, but I haven't seen any votes on that. I haven't seen any votes on whether or not we want to make the pension changes. I haven't seen any votes on whether or not we want to change Local Government Distributive Fund distributions. I haven't seen any votes on that, but you may not like his

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

budget and I may have problems with part of his budget, but guess what? His budget adds up. The budget that has been put forward here today and you add up all these Bills doesn't add up. It's as simple as that. Now, you know, you mentioned the Civic Federation and I read the Civic Federation report, all 75 pages. I skimmed some of the pages, but I certainly read the executive summary. Let me ask you are you going to introduce a Bill to eliminate the exemption on the sales tax on food and drugs so that it's taxed at the full rate that the Civic Federation proposed?"

- Harris, G.: "No, Representative. If you recall, I think my remarks were they suggested a menu of options at which we might look."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. And so their menu of options includes reinstating part of the income tax increase that decreased.

  Anybody going to introduce that?"
- Harris, G.: "Again, that is part of the menu of options they suggested that I thought was instructive."
- Harris, D.: "My friends, I may not be the sharpest knife in the drawer, but I can count. I can count. And you know what? There are 71 Members of this House that have a 'D' after their name and there are 47 Members of this House that have an 'R' after their name. It is the height of irresponsibility to pass out of this chamber a budget that is, let's even conservatively say, \$3 billion out of whack. If you want revenue it takes 60 votes, 60. I think there are 71. Sixty could pass a revenue Bill out of here and you have increased revenue and you could put out of this House a balanced budget not one that is \$3 billion out of whack. It is the height of irresponsibility to do that. The people of the State of Illinois deserve better,

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

they expect better. And I'll pick up on what my colleague said earlier, it is unfair, especially for those social service providers to pass a budget that is so unworkable, so unstable, and so uncertain as to whether or not they're actually going to get the money that's been appropriated that allows them to provide their services. Ladies and Gentlemen, the wrong way to go. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair.

Representative Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davidsmeyer: "Mr. Chairman, how much time did you spend going through the Governor's proposed budget?"

Harris, G.: "I did not add it all up."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. When one of the previous speaker's was going through that really quickly you seemed to be answering yes very quickly. I didn't know if you had that all memorized, if you had a photographic memory or what was going on. The... my last two years here and I've only been here for a couple years, so my last two years we passed a revenue estimate. The first one I did not support. Last year I supported it. Where's that revenue estimate this year?"

Harris, G.: "As I think it has come up before, that particular Resolution was not brought forward this year."

Davidsmeyer: "What's the reason for that?"

Harris, G.: "You would have to ask one of the Members of the Revenue Committee. I am not a Member."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I would just say you went through a long list of things that this budget that you've proposed restores, and

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

I would argue that it restores an unbalanced budget. It restores business as usual. It restores bad fiscal outlook for the State of Illinois, and it also restores broken promises for future generations. And I think we need to think about what we're doing here. Because of the Constitution of the State of Illinois, I will be voting 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, I've been here for 13 years and I don't actually need to speak to this Bill. I've had many of my Members on this side of the aisle do a far better job than I could on the details, but I can talk about the process. And quite frankly, I've seen this process over and over and over. It's almost my own little Groundhog Day movie and it's unfortunate because they've talked about the different, various budgets that have been unbalanced and out of balance and what are we going to do. One of my good friends on the other side that I came into this General Assembly with, Mr. Davis, Representative Davis said and I quote, 'I want a discussion on revenue.' Okay. The Sponsor said the only way to solve this budget is by cuts or increased revenue. So, once again, we're back to revenue. Well, that's fine. We can have that discussion on revenue, but for the last few weeks we've asked you guys for discussions on how to transform government through the turnaround agenda. We didn't get much discussion, did we? And so, while you want to have discussions on revenue, this Governor has said let's have discussions on how we grow our economy and move our state forward and then we'll talk about revenue. But you haven't wanted to do it, you just want to go

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

straight to revenue. Ladies and Gentlemen, that's the failed policies that have gotten us here in my 13-year career and it's unfortunate. There's one more way, Representative, on how we can make this work, how we can get revenue, and that's grow our economy. A Representative on our side of the aisle talked a little bit about that. Part of this agenda is work comp, enticing businesses to grow our way out of this problem that we're at. We could have tort reform. We can talk about redistricting, taking the power away from the governing elite if you will. There's a lot of things we can talk about, but you don't want to talk about them. That is the rub. That's why we're here today, and that's why we're going to be here all summer probably. You guys don't want to talk about those 'cause it's hard and I get it. You have certain constituencies that are going to be opposed to some of those issues. Do you think our side of the aisle wants to talk about tax increases? We don't. But our Governor said we will if you're willing to talk on your end. Right now there's only one group that's willing to talk about things, putting it all together and that's this Governor and that's this side of the aisle. You guys are the ones that have closed the door on reform and have said the status quo is acceptable to us. We want to have a budget that's 4 billion out of whack and we just want to continue to do what we've been doing for the 13 years that we've been in total control of government. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, November 4 came or November whatever the date was that we elected a new Governor. It's a new beginning. We all get a new chance to try and make it right. Today, you closed the door on making it right and decided we're just going to

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

continue with what we did before, and that's unfortunate. So, Representative Davis, I stand willing to talk to you, but you have to meet me halfway and until you do that we'll be voting 'no' on this budget."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

- Wehrli: "Representative, you stated earlier that you had 11 weeks in which to prepare this 4 billion out of balance budget that we're talking about here, today. Is that correct?"
- Harris, G.: "I think there were 11 weeks of testimony and public participation and hearings and working groups. So, that sounds about correct."
- Wehrli: "Okay. And you've also said that other revenue is needed to pass the budget as you have so indicated. So, lets' talk about the revenue. Do you have 71 votes for a property tax increase?"
- Harris, G.: "Representative, what is on the board here before us is an appropriation Bill for the Department of Human Services, the Department of Veteran's Affairs, and the Department of Health Care & Family Services. We heard a lot today about a lot of other things, but no... I'd be happy to speak to you about the merits of taking care of our veterans or what's in HFS or what's in DHS. The other things are going to be in other budgets or other Bills. It's not what's before us today."
- Wehrli: "But your... Okay. Your Bill as introduced is part of a comprehensive budget that is \$4 billion upside down. Agreed?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Harris, G.: "The Bill that I introduced cuts 134 million out of nonMedicaid spending, keeps Medicaid flat, and it proposes to fund those three departments. There are other Bills that are doing other things including some of the things that have been mentioned on the floor, but I'm speaking about what this Bill does."

"Okay. To the Bill. This budget is... this Bill has been Wehrli: brought forth as part of a comprehensive budget that's \$4 billion upside down. I certainly hope the other side of the aisle has 71 votes in which to pass it. We hear earlier discussions of bipartisanship and trying to come up with solutions and yet here is where we are. Let me go back to the 98th General Assembly before my time here to what many of you will remember as Senate Bill 1 as Amended. And it was eight pages of introduction on why our state is where it is. It was failure after failure after failure, and it was so good that on the ninth page I truly expected that there to be a letter of resignation by Speaker Madigan. When you run a state that poorly with those results, it's time to hang it up. But let me read you two sentences from Senate Bill 1 as Amended. Illinois possesses a lower credit rating than each of the 49 other states. This is a consequence of both atypically large debts and of structural imbalances that will, unless addressed by General Assembly, lead to rapidly growing debts. So, here we are today with the first item of our budget being introduced that doesn't change a thing. It just continues to do more of the same. No talk about work comp reform. No talk about anything that we need to do to make Illinois a probusiness state. Earlier in debate it was brought up about our

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

oath of office and when I first got here I was told that your word matters. And I'll be honest with you, the worst thing... and I've been called many bad things, the worst thing I have ever been called is an Illinois politician. And today is an example of why. A \$4 billion budget as proposed, unbalanced, does not meet the Constitution. My word matters, my integrity matters. I have no choice but to vote 'no' on this Bill and any Bill that leads to an unbalanced budget."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm so sick and tired of being lectured to about where we are as a state. I sat here for the last hour and listened to this Sponsor get his motives questioned about his devotion and his conviction to those less needy in this state. I've sat here and I've listened to a litany of years gone by about unbalanced budgets including those with Republican Governors. I had to actually listen to someone bring up public pension reform where we put more votes on than your side. And you're going to lecture us about fiscal responsibility when we went out on a limb against our core constituency? We're tired of it. We understand there's a new governor. We understand he has a vision for the State of Illinois, but we're not going to let a budget that affects the most vulnerable citizens of the State of Illinois be tied to external items. It's not going to happen on this side of the aisle. The lectures have to stop. You can be against this Bill, you can vote 'no' on the budget, you can say it's bad policy, but don't give us pedantic lectures. It's beneath the dignity of the chamber, it's beneath you and you look ridiculous. Vote 'yes' on the budget. Mr. Speaker."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

  Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."
- Feigenholtz: "Representative Harris, first I want to thank you for your patience and your grace in handling this today. I know firsthand what it's like and I just want to say thank you for everything you've done. Another question I have is... is epilepsy restored in this budget?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes, Representative, the epilepsy program which had been cut was restored as are the three respite care programs.

  Those are in the DD long term care lines."
- Feigenholtz: "And what about the respite program?"
- Harris, G.: "Respite care is in. There are three respite programs.

  They are all within DD care. They are all restored in this budget."
- Feigenholtz: "And there was some rule problems and something with dialysis services. Could you tell me what is in the budget and what the intent is?"
- Harris, G.: "As far as legislative intent, Representative, I'm going to read this 'cause it's a little complicated, and I want to get it right. It is the intent of this Legislative Body that full funding for Medicaid services provided at dialysis centers during fiscal year 2016 is appropriated within the hospital budgetary line. This includes full funding for the add on of \$60 per treatment that federal CMS has previously approved and was mistakenly stricken from administrative rules and the Department of Healthcare & Family Services is once again moving through the rules

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

process. We advise the department to submit the rule to JCAR as soon as possible and without a sunset date so the delivery of these critical services are not jeopardized."

"Thank you very much. To the Bill. So, I've been Feigenholtz: listening to a lot of the comments that Members on the other side of the aisle have been talking about. And just a very short while ago, as I recall, we had an opportunity to vote on some of the Governor's proposals and I don't think that there was one 'yes' vote that came from my Republican colleagues. Is that correct? So, I also have yet to hear anybody on the other side of the aisle publicly say we have a revenue problem and come up with a solution. I haven't seen, aside from what the Governor's offered, any counterproposals, any plans. Where is your plan? Where is your plan? And the question then becomes if you don't have a plan and all you're doing is complaining about our plan, perhaps you should think about the famous words of Loretta Lynn that everybody wants to go to Heaven but, nobody wants to die. Vote 'aye' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's first of nine Bills for a spending plan for the State of Illinois. And I think that it's far and away time that we begin in the last few days to send a spending plan, which is one piece of a budget, over to the Governor. Now, since there's been a change in the administration we had to do a fix. We came in 2015, there was a \$1.6 billion hole and so we worked cooperatively with the Governor to fill that hole and I would say that in

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

filling that we allowed for fund sweeps which we took away from Governor Blagojevich because they were abused. We used the structure of borrowing and repaying to make sure the money went back into the funds they were created for. But since the new Governor asked us not to discuss taxes or revenue until he took office we obliged and did that. The Leaders worked together. I think that the downstater put up quite a bit of money for that. You know, you see that 250 out of the road fund, but we actually put 500 million, a third of that money which is stolen money, from each of those funds into fixing a problem so that the new Governor would not fail. And it was set up partly by his own request to do things that way and we did. So, we allowed for a billion three in fund sweeps. Note that's just stealing money other people have paid to fund what they do, to give the ability for a new Governor to come in and work with this, but he also has to recognize and we have to recognize that the structure that this House has created to work together will allow us to make things continue for the State of Illinois. Today we work on a spending plan. Very simple, it is 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 billion out of whack. Now, when I spent some time with the Governor on April 12, we got a chance to sit down and talk about the new staff that he brought in, some good people from the Republican side, the budget director. I had a major concern with his budget which is about \$4 billion out of whack, too. And so, we had a good discussion on when the Supreme Court comes out with a decision how are going to react to that \$2.2 billion hole because it creates a mess for your potential administration going forward and getting things done and providing valuable

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

services. And I haven't seen an answer to that yet, but it is a driving question. So, I think in that there's a recognition... or there's a need to talk about revenue as well as cuts. We stand ready to do that. Injecting the other items, well, we took votes on those. Many of you voted 'present' and that's fine on those items, but we're at a time where certain things are going to have to happen. We've seen it under Governor Quinn when he didn't want to make payments. The unions will go to the courts. There's certain things we must pay in the course of doing this. There're certain portions of these Bills that should be acted on, and I think our leaders can do that. So, we should go forward and put together a spending plan. The revenue side is going to have to come, but you've got critical dates which will come up in the second week of July, you've got the school payments on the 13th. When those payments don't go out or the schools don't open that is on us. So, we have nine Bills which is a spending plan. We stand ready to discuss the revenues as well as further cuts, but some of the items that have delayed us to this point are bringing us to the end of the budget cycle where we have to take action. Today we will send these over, the Senate will send other Bills, and we will move forward. Is the budget out of balance? Yes, but does it have it be? No. There's \$32 billion... that money will not spend out tomorrow, but there are critical dates that we have to consider for the people we represent, Democrats no different than Republicans. So, I rise in support of this legislation and to the process of doing what we were elected to do. The Governor has his function. He is the executive. He is going to have to deal

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

with the court decision and tell us what he think that means. As I read it, the 2.2 billion can't be used and probably shouldn't have been structured in the budget, but I think they said we have to work out a way to pay that, and those reductions in these plans don't work. So, we need a spending function. That's what today is all about, nothing more, nothing less. We have given sweeps which a third of that came from interest downstate which Republicans or Democrats shouldn't authorize again unless we're ready to set a spending plan, talk about revenues and cuts. So, I join with my friend, the Chairman of Human Services. He has a budget with some cuts, more can be discussed, and I think we should continue on with this process. I ask you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Guzzardi." Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In his opening remarks, the distinguished Leader from across the aisle suggested that history will not remember us kindly for passing this budget. History will not remember us kindly. Was it we who proposed cuts to people with autism and epilepsy? Was it we who proposed kicking kids off ventilators? Was it we who proposed that you shouldn't get a kidney transplant if you need one just 'cause you're from another country? Was it we who proposed that the indigent deceased pile up in morques rather than get a decent burial or are we proposing a budget that will provide the services needed by the poor, the ill, the children, the middle-class families in our communities and saying that you know what? We're going to come back around and ask the Bruce Rauner class in our State to pay their fair share and fund it. Now, look, history won't remember us

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- kindly. I'm not a historian and I have lived through less history than almost everyone in this chamber, but I would respectfully suggest that our budget will be remembered as compassionate and thoughtful and caring in marked contrast to the budget that was proposed by the Governor in February. And yes, let's balance this budget, but let's not do it on the back of sick children or disabled adults. Let's ask the very wealthy to pay their fair share and fund these vital programs. I look forward to that discussion. Many of us clearly do. Until then, let's take a vote that history will remember kindly and vote 'yes' on this budget. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Keith Wheeler."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I thought I heard you mention in your earlier remarks that additional revenue would be necessary for this all to work out. Is that accurate?"
- Harris, G.: "I think I mentioned that this was a press conference that the Speaker had and that was one of the remarks that was made there."
- Wheeler, K.: "Oh, I thought... the words additional revenue stick in my mind, Greg, for a reason. And I'm a freshman, you know that and I ask a lot of questions and I may not understand all the code words and their full implication here in this chamber, but additional revenue has a ring in my ear that it might ultimately take the form of a tax increase."
- Harris, G.: "It could also take the form of... as has been discussed many times, reducing corporate tax loopholes so that

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- corporations who are being very profitable pay their fair share so that people who have kids with epilepsy or people who need respite services can have them."
- Wheeler, K.: "Sure. No, I understand there's loopholes that can be closed. Not \$4 billion loopholes from my analysis but... and I understand there's other forms of revenue, but I still... I'm asking there's the possibility of a tax increase coming."
- Harris, G.: "I'm just saying that... again, I look to what the Civic Federation put forward when they talked about the Governor's introduced budget and their suggested solutions. I think they give us a menu of options that I think could be good guidance."
- Wheeler, K.: "Right. But they're not here in the Body with us.

  We're the ones who are going to decide that, and I'm fearful,

  concerned maybe is a better word that we're talking about a

  tax increase."
- Harris, G.: "And Representative, my job is to present a Bill that has spending in three different areas: Human Services, the Department of Health Care & Family Services, and the Department of Veteran's Affairs. There is a whole nother committee chaired by..."
- Wheeler, K.: "Sure."
- Harris, G.: "...able Members on both sides who deal with the issues that you're bringing up here."
- Wheeler, K.: "No, and I appreciate that and understand that I'm learning the process as we go. But generally, the Constitution tells us we're supposed to have a balanced budget, and I'm just going to go to the Bill here, Greg. Thank you. I'm going to return to a familiar line of reasoning here. One that I

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

actually ran on and my constituents sent me here to follow up on. And we all want business, large and small, to come to Illinois, to invest in Illinois, and for the clear purpose of creating jobs in Illinois. To give our neighbors opportunity to build a satisfying career and provide for their families and, ultimately, as part of their process, grow our state and actually grow the revenues that come to the state government, an organic process of how we grow revenue in Illinois. We've been here for four months... a little more than four months now and have we generally taken up something important to the growth of jobs in Illinois like worker's compensation. We've talked about it, but we haven't generally addressed it. Why would we do that? Worker's compensation reform is one of the most important issues facing the business community in this state and they're the primary hirer of people in this state. Number one, we make Illinois a more attractive place to invest, to grow their business and to hire more people. But two, the other side of that we don't talk about and it goes to the budget process which is why I'm bringing it up right now. There's an analysis that's been done that shows that the State of Illinois and the local businesses and counties in our state would save, not totally spend, we would save \$190 million a year if we had just middle of the road worker's compensation costs in this state. Now, I know it's only \$190 million and it's spread across more than just the State of Illinois's government unit, but it's a substantial amount of money and it would help our budget process while it helps our job creation process. Proposing a budget like the one we're seeing today borders on absurd that

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

a policy of the State of Illinois somehow doesn't affect the budget of our state. I'm told that, again, we would save \$190 million just with average worker's compensation costs. Let's go back to job creation. If we were to make Illinois the best place for a company to invest and create jobs, we've got to beat 49 other states. But when the City of Chicago has a credit rating that has been downgraded to junk bond status, our state's been downgraded more than 20 times. Is that going to be an attractive place for a company to invest and to grow and to hire people here? No. We have the seventh highest worker's compensation costs in the country, but we haven't taken up serious reform yet. That doesn't make Illinois an attractive place to do business. And when we take this approach to the balanced budget process that's unbalanced by \$4 billion, no one's going to take us seriously. They're not going to come here. They're not going to create their company here and to create the jobs that we need. It's a shame and this is a shameful process. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Anthony yields his time to Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Obviously, I've spoken on this Bill, but I wanted to respond to a couple of comments. I understand the frustration from the Gentleman from Riverside having actually given a lecture about lecturing. The irony wasn't lost on me, but let's be clear about something. Holding the majority party responsible, accountable, must not be all that fun. But here's the thing, we're happy to work in a bipartisan fashion. We're happy not to go through what we're being put through right now. This isn't a good process. We're doing the exact same

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

thing we did last session and that last session was an unbalanced budget Bill that we sent over to the Senate. The Senate sent it over to us. The Governor signed it, of course, he did. But we didn't do something that Leader Mautino's now doing. I noticed the nomenclature change. This isn't a budget Bill. It's a spending Bill. Oh, it's a spending Bill. We'll talk about revenue later. That's a new nuance, a very interesting one that makes no sense. We ought to be talking about a budget. A budget that makes sense. A budget we can provide essential Illinois services to those who need it that we can afford and not continue to put an anvil around the citizens' necks because we're killing them in debt. We're making this place continually more unattractive for business, for families. It's growing almost impossible to make a living, raise a family, and get ahead in this state. Why? In no small measure because of the really inattentive, wrongful actions of this General Assembly. So, yes, Mr. Zalewski, I apologize for any lecturing tone, I do, wholeheartedly. I do think, however, accountability and frankly, fairness dictate that we don't participate in a sham. We welcome a real budget process. We'd like to be bipartisan, and you know, the Governor's name's been thrown around here quite a bit as if he's doing some bad things. Lest we forget, the only map the Democrats couldn't change in the map practice... the mapping a couple years ago was the statewide map and he won pretty convincingly based on reform. And what he said is we can talk revenue, but not until we structure and restructure and reform this state, because otherwise we're just doing the same thing over and over again and shocking we are. This 'no' vote ought to occur

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

because no one should be lectured to next year, but we will hold you accountable. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Smiddy."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Over the last Smiddy: several weeks we've heard people talk about compromise and how they said they're willing to compromise and willing to work in a bipartisan manner. Yet, the idea of compromise coming from the other side is, give me everything I want and we'll talk, just talk about maybe some of the things that you want. Well, I've heard that from the other side and how they care about people as well. Well, their budget cut mental health for folks, cut early childhood development, eliminated after-school programs, cut higher education by 31.5 percent, eliminated ARC of Illinois, eliminate Teen REACH and cut breast and cervical cancer screenings. Well, folks, if this is caring about Illinois, I'd hate to see what they'd do to people they disliked. And I've also heard that folks are talking about how they're not liking to be called an Illinois politician. Well, maybe next time we can help him out with not being one. So, I'm here to vote 'yes' for this budget because I want to make sure that we care about the people of Illinois and we have compromised. Unfortunately, the other side hasn't. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Brady: "Thank you. We've heard quite a bit this afternoon in the chamber so far, but I want to try and get to a couple things that maybe you can help me understand 'cause I think it was

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

the Representative behind me that said I may not be the sharpest knife in the drawer, but I like to have a little help on a couple of things. Number one, if this budget's proposed the spending bill is 3, 4, whoever's number you believe, billion dollars out of whack and what happened last year in the budget that you passed was out of whack, and as we got toward the end of this budget cycle in FY15 we had a roughly \$1.6 billion hole. Am I correct with that, Representative?"

- Harris, G.: "I think, Representative, you've been here certainly longer than I have and you've seen the process where during the year things change, participation rates and programs grow, liabilities grow. Very often you come back and you do a supplemental at the request of the Governor and the agencies. And yes, we did that to provide some more funding for the Department of Corrections has been mentioned and also fund the child care program. Those were two of the big ones because demand for high quality child care had increased."
- Brady: "Okay. So, translate that, I think, a budget was passed that didn't have adequate funding last year."
- Harris, G.: "Or that the need grew beyond the need that was anticipated in the budget when it was passed. Also, happily in some years revenue has grown more than anticipated when the budget passed. This year, being one of those years, where we're expecting between 3 or \$500 million more in revenue because our economy has gotten better. So, expenses sometimes change during the course of the year, incomes sometimes change during the course of the year."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Brady: "A-ha. But from this chamber right now you readily admit we are passing a budget that is woefully... you want to pass a budget that is woefully underfunded. So, it doesn't matter what growth there is or isn't. You're starting from the starting gate of a budget that is woefully underfunded. Is that correct?"
- Harris, G.: "The... as I said, what is before us today has adequate appropriation within the revenues we expect."

Brady: "Have we done a K-12 budget yet?"

Harris, G.: "I don't believe so."

- Brady: "Okay. So, I've heard a lot about the kind and compassion that this budget fulfills in services. And as a parent with an autistic son and a profession and a business that was affected by indigent burials, tell me with an underfunded budget that's being proposed right now that we won't be back telling some of those very people that we are supposed to be helping with our kind and compassion that we won't have them facing the same situation that the money will not be there for the whole fiscal year to operate?"
- Harris, G.: "Representative, I certainly hope that we would never do that again and I would certainly pledge to you that I would support the measures that are necessary to bring in additional revenue and to make our budget serve all those people and keep the promises to the people who we have given pension promises to, to our bond holders, to those who we owe debt. Those are all responsibilities I think each of us have."
- Brady: "To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. What we're saying from the starting gate with this legislation for a budget is that there's not enough money to fund it. There's not enough money

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

to fund it. How in the world then do you want to pass something that you just hope magically down the road has funding come to it somehow when we've been through the exercise that we have in this present budget and the problems that we had. How we can do that to some of the most needy people and give them this false hope and this fake façade of a budget and tell them this should give you peace of mind, this should give you hope, this should provide the services you need when we know from the very beginning there's not enough money to fund this proposed budget. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Tryon."

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

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

"You know, I'm heading into my twelfth year in this chamber. Many of you I consider not just colleagues, but friends. And you know, I've listened Representative Zalewski on lecturing and I've listened to this debate unfold today about why this is a good approach to budgeting. There's one thing I have a lot of experience in, 12 years as a matter of fact, being in the minority. You guys have 71 votes. We have 47 votes. The minority, what we do is we challenge you, the majority. We challenge your Bills. We challenge your process. That's what we do to make it a better Bill, a better process and that's what going on here, but this wasn't a bipartisan effort. This is a partisan budget and I've heard several times in this debate, we're going to pass this budget, this is the right thing to do. It's not the right thing to do. There's nothing different in making cuts or passing an appropriation Bill that's underfunded by \$4 billion. You're just trying to

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

pull the wool over the taxpayers' eyes in Illinois. So, we're going to have a partisan budget, but you want to talk about bipartisan revenue. I mean, you're willing to talk about revenue now after you put this budget up makes it very difficult to have a meaningful conversation. I mean, I'm curious as to what your ideas are for revenues. Is it the extension of the income tax increase, returning to five percent? I mean, what are some of the revenue things. Has there been a discussion on your side of the aisle about revenue?"

Harris, G.: "Representative, are you a Member of the Revenue Committee?"

Tryon: "I am. There hasn't been a discussion there."

Harris, G.: "And I think that's the appropriate venue. What we're talking about now is one piece of legislation that has appropriation for three state departments in it."

Tryon: "You know, Representative Harris, I respect the work that you've put into this, but this is, and in your own admission, this is your plan. And Representative Feigenholtz's admission, this is your plan. This isn't our plan and it's very difficult for you to put forth this kind of effort without having a good bipartisanship approach to putting a budget together. Governor Rauner somehow is the blame for this process and this problem of the last 12 years? His approach was to have bipartisan discussions. He put together working groups. You came to some of those working groups. There were suggestions as starting points. He said he was open to making any kind of changes that were reasonable changes to his turnaround agenda, but we didn't have that

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

discussion in the working groups. The working groups weren't too productive because people didn't show up in a spirit of cooperation to talk about some of the reforms that we're hearing. It's very hard not to go back to your district especially in a county where you live next to a neighboring state and talk to the businesses that are leaving... leaving our state. And they're worried about things like workers' comp that were in those bipartisan workgroups that the Governor put forth. You have 71 votes. You can put revenue on the table. This didn't go through any committee. These proposals didn't go through the Approps Committees and get voted on. There were questions, but you can do revenue too and I think Illinoisans have a right to know how you want to pay for this. Having a revenue discussion when we're on the eve of adjournment, that's a mistake. I mean, that's a mistake to us that are here. So, our job's to challenge you to do better. We can do better if we work together. We can do better if we sit down and work with the Governor, but that's not happening. And I'm a 'no'. I can't believe there's 60 votes on your side of the aisle to pass an unbalanced budget that's unconstitutional, that's \$4 billion short. This doesn't sell in the beauty shops and the barber shops or the working man or the man on the street. They're smart enough to see what's happening. The social service agencies are going to know there's no money for these appropriations that you're putting forth. This is wrong. It's wrong to use this process this way. This process can be so much more productive if we're willing to sit down and do a bipartisan budget in a bipartisan revenue discussion, but you can't do a partisan budget and

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

then expect to come back and have meaningful, bipartisan revenue discussion. So, I urge an 'aye' vote and I hope that each and every... a 'no' vote. I urge a 'no' vote. I urge an 'aye' vote on working in a bipartisan manner, but we don't have that option today. But I urge a 'no' vote on this budget because it's just plain wrong."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative McDermed." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. There's been a McDermed: lot of discussion here in the room today about our most vulnerable citizens, and I'm very concerned about our most vulnerable citizens today and five years from now. And my concern is that this group is taking the easy way out, we're looking for a short term fix, we're kicking the can down the road, and we're not worrying about our vulnerable citizens five years from now or ten years from now. Because here's the thing, if we continue to put our state in a situation where we have an unbalanced budget, what about children born five years from now that need ventilators? What about children ten years from now that need early intervention? What about our seniors seven years from now that need services to stay in their homes? We are not going to be in a situation to provide those services for them because people are leaving, people are taking their tax dollars with them, businesses are leaving. And I know that we don't like to talk about that in this room, but the fact of the matter is that's what's happening, people. Denial's not just a river in Egypt. It's happening now whether we want to talk about it, whether we want to acknowledge it, it is real. That is happening. People are leaving the state, people are taking their tax dollars.

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

So, we'll pass an unbalanced budget, so we'll raise revenue. Guess what's going to happen? More people will leave. More jobs are going to leave. So, we'll have to pass more revenue, so more people will leave and more jobs are going to leave. And what's going to happen to those children five years from now or those seniors seven years from now that need our services? This is just shortsighted and really we need to do better than that. I understand there's an election in 2016, but we need to take it up a notch, folks, and think about the big picture. That's what we were elected to do. I'd like to call on the Members of this assembly to do our jobs and to think about the long term and not just June 30th or August 20th. Let's do the hard work now so that we don't have to do it five years from now or ten years from now. People elected a Democrat and... with a Republican Governor for a reason. They expect us to do this hard work. They expect the divided government to work. Let's not ignore that. Let's not ignore what's really happening on the ground in our state. Let's do the hard work and let's live up to what we should be."

Speaker Turner: "Members, this is our final speaker on this Bill.

Leader Lang."

I've listened to a lot of rhetoric in this chamber for a long time, but we're getting near the best rhetoric. This was good stuff. The very first speaker on the other side of the aisle during this debate said in a very broad way the Constitution is the fundamental law of the State of Illinois. The Constitution is the fundamental law of the State of Illinois. And yet, folks on the other side of the aisle speak in glowing

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

terms about a Governor who everyday tries to violate the separation of powers section of the Constitution, ignores the institution of the General Assembly as a coequal branch of government. His goal is to run this place like he runs one of his businesses from top to bottom. He's the boss, we're the middle management, we're his employees. But Ladies and Gentlemen, we're not his employees. If you believe the Constitution is the fundamental law of the State of Illinois then you must also believe that we're a coequal branch of government, and we deserve the respect from the 2nd floor that we try to give the 2nd floor. Someone on the other side of the aisle suggested that when Mr. Mautino called this a spending plan this was somehow worthy of derision, but in fact, this is a spending plan. It's not a budget. It's a spending plan. It's a spending plan that sets out priorities. The Governor did that when he came to us in February and laid out his budget. That was a list of his priorities. These are our priorities and yes, we don't have the money today to pay for these priorities. There isn't a person on this side of the aisle that would argue that we do. But we are prepared to initiate spending... initiate the creation of revenue to take care of the needs of the people of the State of Illinois that reflect our values. Are you? Are you? To you guys a budget is just a bunch of numbers. Take 'em, cut 'em, change 'em, make 'em lower, but the left side of that column that talks about what those numbers represent in terms of services to people are worthless to you because all you see are numbers. The Governor's own budget was out of whack. Mr. Bradley very nicely outlined that by billions of dollars and purposely so.

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

The Governor knew that his \$2.2 billion that he thought he was going to save in pensions wasn't going to be saved and all those other things that Mr. Bradley outlined. So, we heard the Governor talk about revenue and he said very clearly let's hold the General Assembly hostage, let's hold the people of the State of Illinois hostage over the budget, and let's say if you pass these ten things that can't ever pass, we'll talk about enough revenue to fund the needs of the people of the State of Illinois that reflect the values of the people of the State of Illinois. What kind of nonsense is that? What kind of approach is that that says we're going to hold autistic children hostage, we're going to hold epileptic children hostage, we're going to hold drug addiction services hostage over term limits, over workers' compensation reform, over all these other things. We're going to hold the values we hold dear hostage over things that have nothing to do with the budget of the State of Illinois. This spending plan presented by Mr. Harris today are our priorities. They display who we are as a party, and in fact, they display who we are as a people. Many of you on that side of the aisle that spoke so eloquently against this Amendment, against this Bill are not even in touch with your own constituents who would never say don't take care of autistic children, don't bury indigent people, cut the line item for Teen REACH, cut the line items for immigration, cut the line items wherever you want to cut them just to cut them. Because we don't care what values we reflect, we only care about the numbers in the budget, that's all that's important to us. This budget ... or this spending plan proposed today reflects the values and the needs of the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

people who live in the State of Illinois. These don't reflect politicians' needs. These don't reflect elected officials' needs. These reflect the real needs of the people who live in this state who demand and require that this General Assembly address those needs. Our people deserve more than the rhetoric we're hearing today because it's simply rhetoric. Because many of you who spoke against this Bill today are for these values but refuse and are unwilling to say so, because the 2nd Floor won't let you say so or because your Leader won't let you say so or because you don't feel like saying so or because you're afraid of some ad that'll come out against you. What a bunch of nonsense. We have a responsibility to reflect our values and so let me say here and now these are our values. I'm proud of the work Mr. Harris has done. I'm proud of the work that the staff that worked with him has done. They worked tirelessly to put the needs and the values of the State of Illinois on a piece of paper. The transcript of this debate will reflect who cares about the needs and values of the people of the State of Illinois, all the people of the State of Illinois, poor people, middle class people and yes, the upper crust. This transcript will reflect who cares about those needs and values and who does not. It's pretty darn clear from this transcript who cares and who does not. We have a greater responsibility than some of you are willing to admit to. And so, I asked what I asked last week at a hearing on another Bill. We know, because you never stop telling us, what the minority party is against. We know what the Governor's against. The question is, and we all want to know not only on this side of the aisle but, 13 million people

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

who live in the State of Illinois. The question we want the answer to is what are you for? Who are you for? What values do you reflect as elected officials? You must be more than you are today. This can't be all you are. I would reflect upon this. The people are watching what you're doing. They're listening to what you're saying. Vote 'aye' on this important Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Greg Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, it's been several hours, I think, several hours that we've talked and I think a lot of you forgot what we're actually discussing. What actually discussing here are child care services. What we're actually discussing here are services that allow senior citizens to stay in their homes. What we are talking about are services that allow people with disabilities to live independently and with dignity. What we are talking here is about dealing with the scourge of addiction and heroin and meth that plaque our state. What we're doing here is talking about giving adequate mental health services to children and youth who struggle in a violent society. What we're talking about here is giving those kids a positive opportunity to have something to do this summer other than roam the streets and get in trouble or worse. That's what we're talking about here. We have spent hours talking about a whole lot of other things that aren't even mentioned in this legislation. We've talked about workers' comp, we've talked about anti-union agendas. We've talked about the niceties of grammar. We've even talked about lèse-majesté, grammar from a whole nother country. We've had walks down memory lanes of budgets in years

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

gone by, and really importantly to the moms and dads who are hoping, who are hoping that we provide respite care to their families so that their families can remain intact and live good lives. We've talked about House Committee process. Boy, I bet the people back home are really glad to have been educated for hours and hours and hours about discussions of committees here have had in years past. I think those moms and dads who came and talked about their epileptic kids, about their kids who need respite services, they wanted to see us get into action. They wanted us to preserve hope for them. And one of the speakers on the other aisle said well, maybe it's better to take away all hope. Maybe it's better to just cut these items out of the budget like the Governor wanted to do. Maybe let's just cut out the hope of families who want their kids to stay safe after school. Maybe it's better to just take away the hope of families they have respite care. Maybe it's better to take away hope that there would be a hospital functioning in your community. Maybe it's better to take away hope for folks who are trying to get a kid off heroin in the suburbs. Maybe it's better to take away hope from the 41 lower counties in Southern Illinois who rely on Franklin County meth program for substance abuse treatment for their kids or for a spouse. Maybe it's just better to take away all that hope. I don't believe that's right. I think we need to give people hope. I think we need to give people the belief that folks here in Springfield care about the things that will strengthen their families. I think they need to understand who will stand with them to strengthen their communities. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you believe

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- in giving people that hope, if you believe in giving them a chance, if you believe in strengthening families and communities vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4165 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 the count of 64 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 4165, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4158. Representative Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4158, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Crespo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Members, please bring the noise down. Thank you.

  Representative Crespo, Floor Amendment #1."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. The Floor Amendment for House Bill 4158 includes the appropriations for CMS, the Department of Agriculture, Arts Council, Civil Service, ICC, dry cleaners, IDES, EPA, the FPR, Gaming Board and the Independent Tax Tribunal. I'll be more than happy to discuss those in more detail on Third."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4158. 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."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments, but a balanced budget note has been requested but not filed at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is the first of five appropriation Bills for general services... okay, actually, I think... I move that the note's inapplicable."

Speaker Turner: "I'm sorry, Representative?"

Crespo: "The note does not apply. It's inapplicable."

Speaker Turner: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

Representative Sandack on the Motion."

Sandack: "Yes, on the Motion. A question of the Sponsor."

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

Sandack: "Fred, I want to make sure I'm clear. You don't think the balanced budget note applies to the budget?"

Crespo: "Not to this budget. I mean, this introduced budget..."

Sandack: "To which budget?"

Crespo: "...what we have before you does not exceed our projected budget revenue."

Sandack: "So, if we look at it just by a component part, you're going to say revenues meet the expenditures?"

Crespo: "Right."

Sandack: "And how do you go through that mental gymnastics?"

Crespo: "Listen, we have five days left, Mr. Sandack. I appreciate the fact that you mentioned earlier that you are going to file or introduce a Bill. I would imagine. I'm not sure when. So, right now we only have one option. We need to move the ball forward."

Sandack: "I'm just asking how this passes Constitutional muster.

That's all I'm asking."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Crespo: "Oh, this is just part of the process. This is part of the process. There's two parts to this process. The revenue and the spending. We are kind of reversing this a little bit 'cause, somehow, we have not talked about revenue yet and there's been no agreement. So, I would submit to you that with five days left, Leader Sandack, and I appreciate the fact that, I'm actually very encouraged, 'cause you did mention you're going to introduce a budget Bill. But please understand we have five days left. Last I heard there's... the Republicans don't have any appropriation Bills from the Senate. The process will probably take you three days if you were to introduce your budget Bill tomorrow morning. We're running out of time. This is what we have right now. We'll be more than happy to listen to your budget Bill tomorrow if that's when you intend to move it."

Sandack: "I have no idea what that has to do with the fact on the note we put on the Bill. So, we should grab that record and deduce what that means with respect to the note we put on it. I ask for a Roll Call vote on that and I'll remind everyone here we're talking about a budget and when expenditures and revenues do not meet they... that's not a balanced budget and our Constitution requires that a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during the year. We know they don't match. We know it's not constitutional. This note applies. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will 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.

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

On a count of 65 voting 'yes'; 51 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion carries. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Motions are requested."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4158."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4158, a Bill for an Act making

appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

"Thank you, Speaker. As I was mentioning before, there Crespo: are five appropriation Bills in general services: three in the House and two will be coming from the Senate. This is the first one of the five. It's based on appropriations of \$1 billion 145 million 800 thousand for general services with a few exceptions. In the Governor's introduced budget and the agencies' introduced budget were the same, we went with the Governor's proposal. I would add that that amounted to a little bit over 40 percent of what the Governor wanted in this budget, he got. And I also should mention as always this committee left some money on the table and there's approximately 10 million that were not spent. The... House Bill 4158 includes CMS which was funded at the same as Fiscal Year '15. It's also based on the assumption that the group health insurance will work as the Governor wants. So, it's based on his introduced and we wish him good luck with that. Agriculture is at the same level as the Governor's introduced for a cut of \$2,717,000 for Fiscal Year '15. The Arts Council is the same level as Fiscal Year '15. Civil Service Commission, same level as the Governor's introduced for an \$8,500 increase for operations for Fiscal Year '15. ICC's all other state funds, there's an increase for telecommunications

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

oversight. The Drycleaner Environmental Council, same as the Governor's introduced. IDS, the Governor's introduced for a \$4,260,000 cut from Fiscal Year '15. EPA at the Governor's introduced. Gaming Board at the Governor's introduced and the Independent Tax Tribunal, same as the Governor's introduced for a 102 thousand cut from Fiscal Year '15. And, with that, I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Unes is excused for the remainder of the evening."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. The Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. A couple questions of the Sponsor."

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

Sandack: "Fred, I didn't hear you a little bit on the group health insurance savings that are projected in this budget. Could you go through that again please?"

Crespo: "Under CMS the group health insurance... the Governor had a recommended amount. Ron, we went along with that."

Sandack: "So, you took the Governor's number on that?"

Crespo: "Yes."

Sandack: "I thought I heard you say good luck with that, so is that... am I to take that you don't believe in the propriety of the budget provision that you're talking about now?"

Crespo: "What I mentioned to the Governor's staff is that a lot of the assumptions under his proposed Bill..."

Sandack: "Yeah but, I'm asking what you think about it, Fred.

What do you think about it?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Crespo: "We're going to have to wait and see. He's going to have to have to negotiate that so, we're going to have to wait and see if he can achieve that savings. It's the same thing with the pension Bill."
- Sandack: "Do you think this is a good process what we're doing...
  what we're going through today? Is this what you think is a
  good bipartisan process?"
- Crespo: "If I may, we've been hearing about this process since..."

  Sandack: "But I'm asking what you think."
- Crespo: "...a long time. Let me tell you. Let me tell you what I think and let me tell you why I think what I think, Ron. According to the Webster's Dictionary... listen carefully. According to the Webster's Dictionary, the definition of process is a series of actions that produce something or that lead to a particular result. Now, that means the process is not an end in itself. It's a means to an end. Agreed? The process is a big issue here. I mean, let's make this very clear. Would you agree that this is just a means to an end?"

  Sandack: "Yes."
- Crespo: "Okay. So, we've been talking about history here. I'm not going to go that far back. I'm going to go back four years now. Let's talk about the process. We talked about above and below the line and since I've chaired this Appropriations Committee, we've agreed on that process with your side. We agreed on what the items above the line should be, again, individual income tax, corporate income tax, sales tax, other taxes, transfers or troughs in federal sources. We've also agreed on what the mandate expenditures line items should be: pensions, trip/group insurance, debt service, transfer outs,

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Medicaid permanent lapse. And based on that we decided we're going to move forward. A couple years ago when we were working through this process, I'm not sure if you were here or you were still in the Senate, Leader, we asked your folks... okay, we've agreed on the line items. There was some disagreement on the value. What should they be? And we asked your folks, well, go back to leadership, come back to us, let us know so we can move forward. We waited and waited."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Members. Please bring the noise level down."

Crespo: "And that's exactly what we heard. Nothing. So, we figured we need to move the process along and we did that. Last year, if you recall, former Governor Quinn introduced a recommended budget and a not recommended budget. As you can pretty much imagine, when we ran the recommended budget, I figured... it was very predictable this side was going to along with it, but he also had a non-recommended budget. And the Speaker asked me, Fred, can you run the non-recommended budget? And I'm thinking to myself, this side's not going to vote for that. I know that. I figured your side would. Part of the process, you got to be one... for one or the other. We ran the Bill. I got five votes. I saw five votes out there and I'm like, okay, I'm going to see who the Republicans were who voted, who were the five. Plus me, I had to vote for my own Bill. I did that. The Speaker, I believe, voted for that Bill and I saw three other Democrats. They just felt sorry for me. They figured he's a nice guy, let's give him a 'yes' vote. I was disappointed. I felt I had more friends than that, but no Republican votes, part of the process. So, as you can see, we

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

begin to see a pattern, a trend, right? We were following the process that we keep talking about and it seems like the opinion here is that we want to reach the stage of paralysis by analysis. Let's not do anything. Let's just wait. This is the only Bill we have so far. We're looking at the clock. As I mentioned earlier, we were waiting to see what Bill or budget Bill you're going to introduce, and just like last year, Leader, there are two options. I can understand we're not going to get support for this Bill. Let me ask you this. Are you going to vote for the Rauner budget Bill?"

Sandack: "I'd love to."

Crespo: "Okay. So, you..."

Sandack: "I'd love to, Fred. You know, listen, I've been letting you lecture me a little bit and you've gone on... and which is fine because I think you've earned that right. I don't think in your heart of hearts you think that this is a good process. Ends to a mean, a means to an end, notwithstanding. It is decidedly partisan budget... well, will you agree with Leader Mautino, this isn't really a budget? It's just a spending plan. Do you agree with that premise?"

Crespo: "This is a way to make sure, Ron, that the Governor's Administration understand what the needs of the state are. Let me tell you something. I've been part of one of these work groups with the Governor's Office on the budget implementation. We've had tenuity, a lot our arguing, we've had Members from your side, from the Senate. And we listen and we always make sure and they also agree with us, this is not a negotiation. Notwithstanding what Leader Radogno is saying that we're negotiating. We always understood. We're

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

not negotiating. They were trying to explain to us how they arrived to their budget. And I'll tell you this, even the Members on your side were scratching their head and like, wait a minute, that doesn't make any sense. We talk about the folks being buried, we can't afford it. And your Members were asking the Governor's Administration, well, what do you do with the bodies? Give us some logistics there. We'll send it back to the locals, let them figure it out. So, at some point we had these meetings, it was going nowhere. This is the best we can do so far."

"All right and Fred, I don't think this is the best we can do in any way, shape, or form. I'm not condemning you and I'm not criticizing you. I wouldn't want to be in your shoes right now. To the Bill. The Gentleman is just that, a Gentleman. There is no way in his heart of hearts he thinks this is a good process. There is no way in his heart of hearts or any thinking person in their heart of hearts thinks that we are dealing with a balanced budget. This is all about a spending plan with... we'll talk about revenue later. And here's a pretty interesting quote, 'Now, more than ever, we need leaders who are willing to work together to review the budget line by line and identify the items that need to be protected. There is too much at stake in Illinois to let partisan politics get in the way of real solutions.' That wonderful quote was made by the Sponsor of this Bill. These are words to live by. The Bill, however, is a far cry from a bipartisan process. It is a far cry from a budget Bill. It is a far cry from being balanced and constitutional. It is a partisan political budget, strike that, spending plan that no thinking

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

person should vote for and instead we ought to be working in a bipartisan manner line by line, identifying priorities, and actually doing the people's business and the people's work because they deserve it. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Morrison."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

- Morrison: "All afternoon we've had a pretty robust discussion about the flaws of passing an unbalanced budget, so I'm not going to go at length about that. I would just note to the Body that while we're making cuts to the Department of Agriculture... and we agree that, you know, cuts are going to have to be made, but we're cutting agriculture, we're cutting the Department of Employment Security, we're cutting CMS. I would just like to ask the Sponsor why in this environment, in this budget environment, why would we be increasing funding to the Illinois Arts Council?"
- Crespo: "Actually, Representative Morrison, if I recall I did mention that they're being cut flat to Fiscal Year '15. There's no increase for the Arts Council."
- Morrison: "Okay. All right. I might be looking at an old analysis, but anyway, I will have other questions. Are you going to be introducing your other Bills today, the other four?"
- Crespo: "Well, if we have time. You know, we'll see what the Speaker decides."
- Morrison: "All right. I'll reserve some more questions for those other Bills, but I would just ask the Body to vote 'no' on this budget. Thank you."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that he will."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Earlier we talked about making sure that we fund what's important. Do you believe what's in this budget is important?"

Crespo: "Well, you know, everything's relative here, Representative. When I compare general services and we're basically dealing with bureaucrats here, I compare that to human services and education, I would say this is not as important as some of the other committees. As I mentioned before too, we don't use all the money that's assigned to this committee. We left \$10 million on the table to... hopefully, we can use for some of the other committees which I've deemed are more important than this one."

Davidsmeyer: "You know, I served on General Appropriations with you last year and I appreciated how you ran the committee. I appreciate what's going on. I appreciate what you do. I just think that if we're going to stand up here and people will stand up and grandstand and sa... say how important things are I think it's important to step up and fund them. So, if you guys are going to stand up and talk about the importance of these things, why haven't you started talking about funding them?"

Crespo: "I apologize. That was a question I missed..."

Davidsmeyer: "I said... I said if you're going to stand up... your side of the aisle's going to stand up and talk about how

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

important all these things are, why haven't you talked about funding them?"

Crespo: "Well, again, this is part of the process we talked about earlier. Listen, if we look at Governor Rauner's introduced... or quasi-introduced budget that one's out of whack by \$3 billion too. So, here are your options. Either... we admit on this side, hey, this one's short. We just want to make sure that the administration..."

Davidsmeyer: "Very short."

Crespo: "...knew what the needs of middle class folks and what the needs of this state are 'cause we've heard different things out there. The option here is very clear. You can vote for this Bill or you can vote for Governor Rauner's introduced... or quasi-introduced budget."

Davidsmeyer: "I don't think that's our only choices. I think our choices is to come together and compromise. I will say one of the previous speakers earlier made the point that while he may not and while I may not completely agree with Governor Rauner's budget at least he said how we get to that budget. Your budget we don't do that. We don't tell you... you don't tell us how we're going to get to \$36 billion. You just say we're 4 billion short. That's all you say. There was a plan that the Governor offered to get to his number. You guys haven't offered a plan on how to get there."

Crespo: "Representative, if what you're saying is that you're taking a gospel that there's going to be a savings of \$2.2 billion under the Governor's..."

Davidsmeyer: "No, no, no. I... I..."

Crespo: "...and that's part of the plan, what's the difference?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Davidsmeyer: "You guys haven't offered a plan to get that extra \$4 billion."

Crespo: "Well, neither has the Governor."

Davidsmeyer: "He offered a plan which you disagree with and I disagree with as well on that pension portion. I agree with you that that is savings that couldn't be realized, but he offered a plan. That's the point. You do not offer a plan to find that \$4 billion. Correct?"

Crespo: "So, let me ask you would it make the difference, would it be helpful... and not to say we're going to do this. If we were to accept, fine, we'll cash in on that 2 billion dollar savings that the Governor's proposing. I guess that would close the gap, right?"

Davidsmeyer: "No, it wouldn't because it wouldn't be realized."

Crespo: "But that's... Okay. I'm a little bit confused now 'cause you brought that up as part of the Governor's plan."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm saying that was part of his plan. He proposed a plan on how to get to his number."

Crespo: "But it won't be realized."

Davidsmeyer: "You haven't proposed a plan to get to your number."

Crespo: "But it won't be realized."

Davidsmeyer: "You haven't proposed a plan to find holes."

Crespo: "We're playing with monopoly money here. I mean, you even admitted yourself the \$2.2 billion will not be realized and that's part of the Governor's plan."

Davidsmeyer: "So, this Bill cuts group insurance by what the Governor proposed, correct?"

Crespo: "As I mentioned earlier, when we went through the line items here we were trying to go along with some of the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Governor's recommended cuts and on this one... and again, I repeat over 40 percent of what we have in this committee is going along with the Governor. We couldn't meet him at 50 percent, but that's pretty darn close."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, what's your plan on saving that money for group insurance?"
- Crespo: "Well, part of the process here, Representative, is that we work on part of the process. The Senate will have to do the same thing and we're expecting to hear form the Governor. The Governor does have some tools, right, that he can avail himself of as we move this forward? He can put in a line item veto, a reduction veto. It'll come back to us. When it comes back to us let's have..."
- Davidsmeyer: "I understand what the Governor can do but, what's your plan on how to find... how to realize those actual savings on group health insurance?"
- Crespo: "My plan is to continue working with our Governor, our leader, in a very bipartisan fashion and hopefully come up with some kind of agreement to just put this thing together as part of the process."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, your bipartisan process is shoving a budget down his throat and saying work with this?"
- Crespo: "No, as part of our process is following the legislative process which says we will work with the Governor's Office. He has some tools that he can use, right? And he might use those tools, Representative. It might came back to us and then we'll have that dialogue. We'll have the debate and we might go along with it, but it's part of the process. I repeat, five days left."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Davidsmeyer: "As we discussed earlier, the Constitution says that the General Assembly will pass a balanced budget. Do you believe that this budget is balanced?"

Crespo: "I believe that we need to work together on this thing. As I mentioned before, just giving you a historical perspective, an observation, since I've been here, since I've chaired this appropriations committee, we go along with the process and at the umpteenth hour we get no support from that side. Maybe one of your colleagues does support one of our Bills in committee, but as we work through this process it seems like we get stuck and we just don't move forward. We need to cue something up there to move forward. I'm hoping that the Governor sees what we're talking about and uses the tools that he has available to him, and hopefully, we can find some kind of conclusion to this resolution."

Davidsmeyer: "You know, I think that... I think you've been put in a tough position to push a Bill that I don't truly believe that you agree with. I think this is something that you've been given to work with, and I may be incorrect, but I think you understand that we are unbalanced. This budget needs an extra \$4 billion and where you come up with that there is zero plan. There's zero plan and that's all I want people to know. To the Bill. There's zero plan to fund this budget. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Okay. Well, thanks for the couple of questions that I had. I don't feel as special as Greg Harris by the way. And again, I should point out we keep talking about the process and I really know 'cause I do have some friends on the other

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

side that you don't believe in all the cuts that Governor Rauner's putting out there. He does have some tools that he can use moving forward. Balancing a budget on paper is the easiest thing, guys. You have your credits, your debits, your minuses, your pluses and on paper you balance those things. But there's this little thing that gets in the way, right, social responsibility, and you can't ignore that. We need to let this administration know that there's a social responsibility that we need to take into account, we need to factor into this budget. I submit to you that the budget he's proposed, which is the only other option you have right now besides this one, does not deal with the social responsibility aspects that we are sent here to work on. And with that, I'll ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is shall House Bill 4158 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 Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 63 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 4158, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4159. Representative Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4159, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Crespo, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. The Floor Amendment #1 includes the budget appropriations for the Governor's Office, Lieutenant Governor, the Attorney General, Auditor General, Comptroller, General Assembly, Legislative Support, Secretary of State, the Treasurer. And with that, I'll be glad to talk more about this on Third."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4159. 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, but a balanced budget request has been requested but not filed at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "I move that the note is inapplicable."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack on the Motion."

Sandack: "Thank you. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Fred, I'm reading from our law. It's called balanced budget note and I'm happy to walk over and show it to you to make sure I'm reading it right. It says the following verbatim: a balanced budget note shall be prepared and filed in writing for every supplemental appropriation Bill. A balanced budget note shall also be prepared and filed on any Amendment to a supplemental appropriation Bill or any Amendment to that Bill. Explain to me how this note doesn't apply in light of the law."

Crespo: "Well, as I mentioned before, Leader Sandack, House Bill 4159 as Amended does not reach that threshold of what we see as revenue right now, number one."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Sandack: "Your Bill is a supplemental, correct?"

Crespo: "Okay."

Sandack: "The law says in every supplemental appropriation Bill a balanced budget note shall be prepared and filed on an Amendment to a supplemental appropriation Bill or any Amendment to that Bill. Tell me again, I'm holding the law and I'm happy to walk over and show it to you, how it's possible, how there's any explanation other than, yes, this budget note applies."

Crespo: "There's some supplemental here, but it's not a supplemental by definition, Leader Sandack."

Sandack: "What definition are you possibly conjuring now, Fred?"

Crespo: "This is..."

Sandack: "How is it not a supplemental Bill?"

Crespo: "This is just a House Amendment to the appropriation Bills for Fiscal Year '16."

Sandack: "It's a supplemental appropriation. Yes or no, Fred?"

Crespo: "No."

Sandack: "It's not? Wow, okay. To the objection that makes no sense. Ladies and Gentlemen, I guess we can continue to flaunt our rules, ignore our procedures, oh yeah, and ignore the Constitution while we do it. This is the height of arrogance, frankly, when we can't even admit that the law applies when the law applies. We're lawmakers. Shouldn't we follow the laws we make? My goodness, it's really getting weird here. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "You all heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor will vote 'aye'; all opposed will vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 67 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion carries and the note is deemed inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further notes are requested at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 4159 for a third time."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4159, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 4159 includes the Governor's Office and we left that at the Governor's requested amount, Lieutenant Governor's Office at their requested amount for that as well, Attorney General's Office at the same level as Fiscal Year '15, Auditor General at the same level as Fiscal Year '15, Comptroller Fiscal Year '15 and we also have the court reports are funded through PPRT. The General Assembly is funded as we did in Fiscal Year '15. Legislative Support Services, same as Fiscal Year '15 except the Legislative Audit Commission, there's a decrease of 21,500 and the Reference Bureau, an increase of 92 thousand for operations. The Secretary of State, same as Fiscal Year '15 and the Treasurer's Office, same as Fiscal Year '15 with the only exception that we included \$2 million from other state funds as seed money for the Secured Choice Program, which by statute, they have to reimburse back to that other state fund, and I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative McSweeney."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Chairman Crespo's been a friend of mine for years. He's a man of honor, so I know he has nothing to do with this specific revision. Do you realize that this Bill does not cut funding for the General Assembly? We're talking about raising taxes by \$4 billion out of the working people of this state. We're talking about driving jobs out of this state and we won't even stand up and cut our own budget? This is unbelievable that we will not lead by example. Stop the madness. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm going to just a couple of quotes from a couple of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to remind them about budgeting and meeting taxpayers' expectations. Quote: 'I think it's illegal. It's required that we have a balanced budget. That means that the have to match the expenditures. revenues understanding that the budget's going to be 4 billion more the anticipated revenue, so I don't constitutionally we could even entertain that.' That's a good quote. I agree with that quote. More to the quote: 'It is not balanced. We can't in good conscience vote for this. We haven't got our jobs done here, folks.' I agree with that quote as well. Another quote: 'We can't draft a budget with magic money that doesn't exist.' That quote the Lady from Hyde Park made and I agree with it completely. Another quote, a Representative from Will County: 'You can't continue to increase taxes when people are hurting.' I think that's a good quote. Lastly: 'The state cannot afford to spend more money than it takes in and balance the budget on the backs of

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

others. Sacrifices are being made by hard working families across the state. I continue working to cut waste and push for fiscally responsible measures.' Those four quotes were from four people on that side of the aisle. All four of whom... three of the four have continually voted for out of balance budgets that are on the board right now. That obviously is an act of hypocrisy. We are not doing the people of the State of Illinois justice. We're not doing right by them. This process is awful. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Morrison."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Morrison: "Representative Crespo, you said earlier that the Governor holds some tools. What tools were you referring to or what were you thinking about when you mentioned that?"

Crespo: "My understanding, Representative, as part of the process he can veto the Bills once they get to his desk. He can also... has the availability of a line item veto and a reduction veto as well."

Morrison: "Is that... do you want him to do that?"

Crespo: "Listen, you know, what he wants to do... I can't tell Governor Rauner what to do. It's part of the process. I'm just telling you what tools he has available and there's a chance that some of these might be coming back under that scenario that we might have this dialogue, and we might be in agreement with some of his ideas. I don't know."

Morrison: "We're looking at some of the reductions here, and by the way, I want to thank you for correcting me on the last Bill that you introduced about the Arts Council. They were

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

held flat. I would like to argue though that if we're going to cut other agencies that we should make much more cuts or many more cuts in other agencies. To my friend, Representative McSweeney, who mentioned the General Assembly budget. I just find it outrageous that we're asking other agencies to cut, but we're not willing to cut ourselves. In other words, you know, good enough for thee but not for me. Earlier this afternoon we talked about ways of increasing revenue, and what our side would argue is we could increase revenue just by more job creation, more economic activity. I've got a great idea for how we could cut the General Assembly's budget. There are four states in the U.S. that meet... sorry, who's General Assemblies meet only every other year. Is that a proposal that you or your side would consider?"

Crespo: "I can't speak for my side. I do have an opinion. I am concerned that the more time we spend here in Springfield, the more dangerous we are. But that's just my personal opinion, Representative."

Morrison: "And I would agree with you. I think it would be a tremendous pro-business proposal if we were to meet only every other year. Imagine what we would save, what our businesses would save, what the associations would save on lobbying costs if we weren't constantly tweaking the law on them. Anyway, back to the Bill. I would just ask the Body to take a look at the flaws in this budget. It's not balanced. We're holding some agencies flat when they should be cut. I ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo to close."

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

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4159 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 64 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 4159, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4160. Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4160, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Crespo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 for House Bill 4160 deals with the appropriations for DCEO, the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library & Museum, Insurance, Labor Relations, Lottery, DNR, and the Historic Preservation Agency. I'll be more than happy to discuss these in detail on Third."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4160. 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, House Bill 4160. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4160, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. I will start out with DCEO. DCEO we are funding in this plan at a higher level than the Governor's introduced but less than Fiscal Year '15. The additional funds are for more job training. We also felt that we should keep tourism level funded to 2015. Under the Governor's proposal, his cut would mean a 22 percent cut to our convention and tourism bureaus which we believe and the Governor believes too that they're doing a fantastic job. We also kept the LIHEAP funding here at Fiscal Year '15. I'll be more than happy to talk a little bit more about that in a bit. The Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library & Museum is at the same other state level as the Governor's introduced. We did keep it outside of the Historic Preservation Agency. Insurance is at the same as the Governor's introduced as well as Labor Relations and the Lottery also at the Governor's introduced. DNR we left at the Governor's introduced for a 9 million 444 thousand cut from Fiscal Year '15, and we have the Historic Preservation Agency at the same level as Fiscal Year '15 and separate from the Abraham Lincoln Library & Museum. The biggest challenge for us with these Bills was DCEO. Under DCEO's plan, they have to pass close to... 80 or 90 percent of what they need has to go through legislation. We haven't seen anything yet. There were some concerns as I mentioned before on the tourism items, so we made sure that we kept that flat. And we strongly, strongly disagreed with DCEO and the Governor's Office on eliminating the LIHEAP program, and in turn, place a tax on gas meters and electric meters and

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

utility consumption to subsidize GRF. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions of the Sponsor."

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

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative Crespo, I was just perusing Cap Fax and I noticed that your Senator was quoted in today's article. And it said, I'm not going to be supporting an unbalanced budget. Had you heard from your State Senator his opinion on the budget?"

Crespo: "No."

Sandack: "Does it surprise you that he's not going to vote for this unbalanced budget?"

Crespo: "You know, he has a mind of his own."

Sandack: "He does, but I'm just asking..."

Crespo: "And... and... you know..."

Sandack: "...'cause you guys work close together, right? Had you heard that before?"

Crespo: "Again, I haven't talked to the Senator. I'm not sure where he stands on these issues. We disagree on a lot of things and we agree on some other things."

Sandack: "Well, does it surprise you that someone on your side of the aisle thinks the budget proposals are unbalanced?"

Crespo: "I have someone like two seats away from me who feels that way. We're good friends."

Sandack: "Eerily quiet today, by the way."

Crespo: "Yeah. We'll leave it at that."

Sandack: "Yeah, he's in thought. To the Bill. Obviously, again, this isn't any different than the previous Bills presented by

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

the Gentleman and the previous budget Sponsors. This in the aggregate, this Bill and the other budget Bills are out of balance. They are unconstitutional. They don't serve the people of the State of Illinois well. They don't serve the people of this august chamber well either. We ought to be working in a bipartisan manner. We're working, unfortunately, in a very partisan manner. This is a partisan budget. I urge a 'no' vote again."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just going to speak to the Bill. Again, we're going to urge a 'no' vote. But a few things I'd like the Body to consider and those who are observing the debate, when it comes to DCEO. We have made its job so much more difficult in attracting business and attracting private investment in this state by avoiding things like real workers' comp reform, by avoiding property tax reform, by avoiding tort reform. We're making their job much, much more difficult and since LIHEAP was mentioned, you know, we had several House Budget Oversight Committee hearings, and I couldn't help but think about the discussions we had in regards to hydraulic fracturing in the last couple of years. Illinois has ... we are so blessed. We have abundant energy resources that we keep underground, that we do not use to the fullest extent that we can, and that has a direct impact on those residents who need LIHEAP assistance. If you have good energy policy not only do you have economic development, not only do you have more people who are gainfully employed, but you also have reduced energy prices which would reduce the need for LIHEAP in the first place. So, I would just ask the Body, in addition to

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

voting 'no' on this, that we would consider making Illinois a great and attractive state once again by enacting other policies that would help DCEO attract businesses back to Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thanks. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Mautino: "Fred, the DNR budget... a couple years ago we passed the sustainability Bill. There were five funds there which were in the red. They were going towards bankruptcy. We put fees and structures and we dedicated that money. In the course of the cuts to DNR, was any of that money used or is it going now to the best of your knowledge where we expected that money to go?"

Crespo: "Thank you, Leader Mautino. By the way, you did a great job a couple years ago. I know that wasn't an easy Bill. I did ask the director, specifically, about your Bill and the fees that were built into it and he assured me that under his budget proposal, they're not going to touch those funds at all. So, those funds will be used as their earmark for whatever it was their earmark for. But he assured me that with a \$9 million cut in his budget that it wouldn't be impacting the Bill that you passed a couple years ago."

Mautino: "Thank you and I do have a... I received a confirmation from the department just a few minutes ago on there that the \$23 million is in the five separate funds. They are going ahead with their capital programs, their parks, their road improvements in assisting the work. So, I appreciate that you were mindful of that when you put that budget together. I

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

rise in support of your spending plan and/or portion of a budget going forward for DNR and the agencies under general services. I think it's very important that we move on with this process to some of the counts since my name has been used in debate a number of times. I would also like to just state that any of these appropriation Bills, by definition, to the Bill, are spending plans. We have the right, the responsibility to adjust them, to interpret them as they go along. The Governor's budget, as I said, back from April 12 when we met and we discussed the pending Supreme Court ruling was \$2.2 billion out of whack, fatally flawed and with that determination, a reckless proposal. If you look at the health insurance program, the 700 million in anticipation savings I do hope that he gets some of that dollars. I think through the negotiation process he will, but that money is not there. Local distributive funds, \$634 million anticipated savings. I don't know if you intend to vote against all of your cities and put their budgets in crisis. If you do then that money can be used. If you can't, it is a false savings. The Governor's introduced budget, by action of the Supreme Court, not action of his, but by action of the Supreme Court is 2.2 irresponsibly underfunded by action of the court. It cannot be used. If we put it on the board and you voted for it, it would be a false vote on your part of monies which cannot materialize nor can another billion dollars in savings and counted. So, you may talk about imbalanced budgets. The Governor's budget was fatally flawed by ruling and by design. If I put it on the board it would receive 'no' votes and should not. We need a negotiated budget which starts with an

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

appropriation Bill, a spending plan, and a recognition that there are further cuts needed, but there must be revenues. And so, we will go forward in the next couple days and put forward a spending plan otherwise known as an appropriation Bill. Look it up. That's what it is. It is our responsibility. It is our right as coequal Members. And for your information, I'm very proud of this chamber in the last five years going back to when the income tax was passed we changed the way we did budgets. Had Representative Harris and Bradley and this Body and all the Republican and Democratic Approp Members not met for hours on end, you would be looking at \$16 billion in old bills. One of every two dollars would be sitting there and unavailable to be used for what you care about. So, in the course of those budgets we paid down close to \$6 billion in old bills. We will pay down 500 million more this year. Those groups worked together, and though, it was Democrat only budgets that passed them, the work product was good. And it put us in a position to know that, one, we can do these things, we can pass these budgets, and that we should. And so with that, I will support the appropriation spending Bill and those to follow, and I would hope that this Body and our Leaders on the 2nd Floor would act responsibly since the only proposals from both sides and both floors are \$4 billion off. So, that rhetoric is wasted, absolutely wasted and the reality is we have a job to do and a short amount of time to do it, and we have the capability that we have shown in the past that we can do it. It will be difficult, but this is one step in the process and it should continue. Good luck with your Bill, Fred."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Speaker Turner: "Please bring the noise level down, Members. Thank you. Representative Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. A couple of points. I don't want to belabor over much on this, but I mentioned earlier just looking at history, going back a couple years that we've worked on the process together. We've agreed on certain things, but when push comes to shove we couldn't get support on passing Bills in the past. There were always excuses or whatever have you. I ran a not recommended Bill last year ... not recommended budget that Governor Quinn had introduced which was not even half as bad as what Governor Rauner wants. And again, we heard excuses why they couldn't support that. You've got to stand for something and right now this is all we have on the table. I repeat, we have five days left. If you file a Bill tomorrow morning, early tomorrow morning, run it through committee it might have a hearing on the House Floor tomorrow. We have to send it over to the Senate. We're up to three days. So, we're getting very close so we need to do something. I've heard talk about this turnaround agenda and I have to be honest with you, there are some things on the turnaround agenda that I like, but that's a long term process. Government by design moves very slowly, moves incrementally. So, I think we need to have that discussion on the turnaround agenda. Some of the items that are there, but for the sake of argument, even if the Governor had his way and got all those items in place tomorrow, it doesn't address Fiscal Year '16 budget. We can't hold these guys hostage. People out there are fearful of what's going on for many reasons. They're concerned 'cause they read the paper, they

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

hear all the rhetoric, they hear about the cuts. They have nowhere else to go. So again, five days... I hope at some point that the Governor gets more engaged with his administration and we make something happen. I'm not advocating for tax increase. What I'm advocating for is that we work together with both sides and the Governor's Office to come up with some kind of solution for the welfare, for the betterment of the people that live in this state, and the state that we all love very much. So with that, I please ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4160 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 65 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4160, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mayfield, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mayfield: "I stand on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Mayfield: "Myself, as Chair of the Legislative Black Caucus along with..."

Hernandez: "...Lisa Hernandez as co-chair of the Latino Caucus."

Mayfield: "We would just like to remind everybody or re-invite everybody out for soul and..."

Hernandez: "...salsa!"

Mayfield: "After a long day we know you guys are going to need some nourishment. We've got soul food. We've got Spanish food.

It's going to be a fun filled evening."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Hernandez: "It's... I think it'll be a fun way to blow off that steam that we've been keeping in here. How about it?"
- Mayfield: "Absolutely. And I just want to draw everybody's attention to the ladies in pink the gallery. Can you please stand? The Elite Striders. That's our entertainment for tonight. They are here and ready to perform. Welcome. They are from Waukegan in the North Chicago area."
- Hernandez: "Let's go have some fun now."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representatives and welcome to your Capitol. Leader Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "I love you guys, too. House Bill 4153. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4153, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Arroyo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "May we adopt the Amendment? 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 4153, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4153 is an FY16 budget for the Department of Corrections, Appellate Defender, Appellate Prosecutor, Capital Development Board. The Appellate Defender and Prosecutor were held flat at FY15's post-supplemental level. All lines that did not acquire GRF

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

funding were held at a level recommended by the agencies. The Capital Development Board is an agency that is not funded with general revenue funds and it is at the level that was presented by the agency. The Department of Corrections appropriation is \$33 million higher than FY15 supplemental levels. This increase is less than the agency's recommended increase and is intended to go towards the improvement of mental health services and correctional officers among other things. I'll answer any questions."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack. The Sponsor yields."
- Sandack: "Representative Arroyo, remember we did this last year? Same question. How are we going to pay for this budget?"
- Arroyo: "You're talking about last year when you put it on YouTube?"
- Sandack: "I didn't do it, but I saw it. How are we going to pay for it?"
- Arroyo: "We're hoping to sit down with the Governor and your side to try to come up with a comprehensive budget to be able to pass it."
- Sandack: "I'll accept that answer. Then withdraw and take your Bill out of the record and we'll have that bipartisan conversation."
- Arroyo: "That's a good try, Ron. It ain't working."
- Sandack: "Well, okay, but you want to pass a spending Bill."
- Arroyo: "But, you know what, you and me can sit down in a private room and we'll talk about it. So, I could really... kind of really talk about what I want to talk about."
- Sandack: "That kind of sounds romantic, but I'm going to decline the invitation..."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Arroyo: "It won't be romantic."

Sandack: "...thank you very much. But to your spending Bill, Representative. Seriously, you don't know how we're going to pay for it and you're just going to try and get it out of here, right, like last time? Right? Same thing. It's like déjà vu."

Arroyo: "No, it's different... it's a different year."

Sandack: "It is?"

Arroyo: "It's a different year, so everything's different every year here."

Sandack: "So... but answer the question. How are we going to pay for your budget Bill?"

Arroyo: "We're going to try to sit down and negotiate some revenue stream or revenue source so we can pay for it."

Sandack: "Okay but... so, as it stands right now and as you present your Bill, it's not balanced, right? We don't have the money to pay for everything in the budget?"

Arroyo: "We got some of the money, not all the money."

Sandack: "Not all of it, right? So, you know it's unbalanced. You know it doesn't adhere to our Constitution."

Arroyo: "...but if I didn't know, you're going to tell me so..."

Sandack: "It is. So, why don't you withdraw it? Take it out of the record and we can have that conversation in a timely manner rather than in a half, kind of piecemeal fashion."

Arroyo: "You know what, Ron... Ron, I'm going to think about it."

Sandack: "You're going to think about it?"

Arroyo: "Right now."

Sandack: "We're getting there."

Arroyo: "All right. I thought about it. No thanks, no."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Sandack: "Yeah. To the Bill. It's getting late in the day. We've gone through this process and so, obviously, nerves are a little bit on edge and I get it, but we're really not advancing the ball on behalf of the people of the State of Illinois. We're not making the state fiscally better. We're not making the financials any... there's no improvement whatsoever. Instead, we're doing the very same thing and it is like déjà vu all over again. It is. We're passing unbalanced budget Bills hoping for what? Manna from the sky instead of actually working in a bipartisan fashion and actually trying to advance the people, advance the state, and change our trajectory, because unfortunately, we're at the bottom of every good category and at the top of every bad category and we keep doing the same thing and expecting a different outcome. It really is beneath us. Vote 'no'."
- 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? Anthony, Bryant, Thapedi. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4154. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4154, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Arroyo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted.

  Mr. Clerk."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4154, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4154 is an FY16 budget for the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority and the Illinois Emergency Management Agency. ICJ operational line was held flat out of FY15 post-supplemental levels. CeaseFire, Bullying Prevention, Franklin County meth were all held flat at FY15 post-supplemental levels. There were two increases made in this budget. There was \$1.5 million made to the adult redeploy line and there is a 12.5 million dollar appropriation for YouthBuild programs. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency is at the level presented by this agency. I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields to Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Louie, is this a flat budget for the Criminal Justice Information Authority or is there an increase in spending?"

Arroyo: "There's an increase of 1.5 million."

Sandack: "1.5 million? I got \$15 million."

Arroyo: "No, you're right. You're correct..."

Sandack: "That decimal point's a little off."

Arroyo: "You're correct. You got... with the 12.5 and the 1.5 to YouthBuild. It was 12.5 million and then 1.5 for redeploy."

Sandack: "Right. So, it's 15 million in new appropriation and the 12.5 you mentioned is a new appropriation for YouthBuild funded at 12.5. Has... have we ever utilized any of the dollars for that program?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Arroyo: "Excuse me, Ron?"

Sandack: "Have we ever actually funded anything for YouthBuild?"

Arroyo: "YouthBuild has been funded before. We have 12 agencies now operational mostly downstate, several of them in the City of Chicago and we're looking to increase this because this is a jobs bill and summer program, GED programing, and it's a good program that's in statute and a lot of Members on your side and a lot of our Members like this program."

Sandack: "Our research says it hasn't been funded since 2008. Do you have anything to refute that?"

Arroyo: "No."

Sandack: "Okay, so it isn't that good of a program if we're four or five years off. Seven years, actually."

Arroyo: "It's gotten federally funded. It's not funded by the state. You are correct."

Sandack: "Are you saying it's a pure pass through, so if it is..."
Arroyo: "No, it's not a pass through."

Sandack: "...there's no... okay, so there's a... the 12.5 million for YouthBuild is different, I mean, it's the first time we're spending money in that department since 2008, correct?"

Arrovo: "Yes."

Sandack: "All right. To the Bill. I appreciate the answers of the Sponsor. Again, we're adding new funding to a program we haven't had any funding in since 2008. Kind of oxymoronic, if you will, given our financial state of this state. Vote 'no'."

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? Bryant, Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4146. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4146, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Dunkin, has been approved for consideration."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4146, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 4146 simply appropriates money to our MAP program, our Monetary Award Program, here in the State of Illinois and I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Brady: "Representative, how much did you increase MAP grants? How much money?"

Dunkin: "According to this..."

Brady: "I'm sorry?"

Dunkin: "...this House Bill increases it to about \$32 million, a little bit above that, \$32,216,800."

Brady: "And where did you come up with that figure?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Dunkin: "I came up with that figure from listening to countless hours of testimony from school administrators, faculty members in some cases, and a lot of us discussing and students discussing their lack of funds or attempt to receive additional dollars from the Monetary Award Program."
- Brady: "And when you say us, who's us?"
- Dunkin: "Us in the entire committee, myself, yourself and other committee Members listening to countless hours of testimony here in the state's Capitol from January until now."
- Brady: "Well, just for the record, as Minority Spokesmen, I was never involved in any \$32.2 million discussion of increasing the MAP grants nor was I involved in this budget that you're rolling out today, and I don't remember having any specific questions about some of the figures that I see. We did a lot of generality discussions, but at what point did you decide this budget was going to be rolled out?"
- Dunkin: "Well, it was a combination of last week and this week."
- Brady: "And so, you decided that as Chair of the committee this was going to be what MAP grants was going to be raised to?"
- Dunkin: "This is a... an amalgamation of conversations, meetings, and a thorough educational process from students, from faculty, from administrators, from all across the state on how it is that we should approach our year's funding as it relates to the Monetary Award Program."
- Brady: "So, if the students decided that amount, where's that amount coming from?"
- Dunkin: "No, they helped inform an educated decision on this funding being increased."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Brady: "Okay. Then where did... where's the revenue to support the increase in MAP grants going to come from?"

Dunkin: "It's coming from a six and a half percent reduction to our state universities, a 5 percent reduction coming from our Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Community College Board."

Brady: "So, you're trying to say that if you have a reduction of around 6 percent you're going to increase the MAP grants \$32 million. Correct?"

Dunkin: "Correct. Yes, Sir."

Brady: "I don't understand how that math works especially given the fact of what we showed and what we heard throughout the budgetary process of what we were involved with and discussions you and I had. So, this comes as a surprise to me that this was the number that was decided and how, in fact, what type of number of reduction was going to be in regards to the Bill. So, I will certainly going to be voting 'no' and ask my colleagues and all to do the same. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Pritchard: "Representative, how is this \$32 million going to be used?"

Dunkin: "It's going to be used to improve allocation to about 15 thousand students. 15 thousand new students. So, we're going to break it out, for example, our estimate from the Illinois Student Assistance Commission is that 5 percent or roughly 750 students will come from proprietary schools. Another 59 percent will come from... which is the largest share, close to

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

60 percent will come from community colleges. For the private institutions about 14 percent or 2100 students and the lion's share or a large portion will come from public institutions at about 3300 or 22 percent of the additional revenue... from MAP."

Pritchard: "So, is this in the Bill or is this just a dream that you have on how it will be implemented?"

Dunkin: "This is a part of the application process as they go to apply for... at ISAC."

Pritchard: "So, I didn't think..."

Dunkin: "Based off of historical..."

Pritchard: "I didn't think we put limits on application other than who applies first."

Dunkin: "It's kind of heard to hear, Mr. Speaker."

Pritchard: "I said I didn't think we put limits on the kind of applications and awards that you mentioned? I thought it was on a first come first served basis?"

Dunkin: "Representative, this is from ISAC or the Illinois Student
Assistance Commission based on their historical use of the
MAP or application process of the Monetary Award Program."

Pritchard: "So, in other words, we're going to keep doing things the way we've done them before. How much is this going to help our students who are struggling with the cost of higher education?"

Dunkin: "Last year... this is going to help tremendously, Representative. Last year over 50 percent of the individuals who applied for the Monetary Award Program dollars were denied because there was no additional money."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Pritchard: "So, you're going to use the additional money for 15 thousand. Did I hear that correctly?"

Dunkin: "An additional 15 thousand."

Pritchard: "And you're not going to try to earmark it more towards community colleges which is more affordable?"

Dunkin: "Yeah. Actually, this subsidizes a lot of... 60 percent of the new recipients will receive... will benefit from this monetary award new allocation or additional allocation of \$32 million."

Pritchard: "How are you going to do that?"

Dunkin: "At community colleges."

Pritchard: "How are you going to do that? Are you going to set money aside for community college students who traditionally apply later?"

Dunkin: "By virtue of the fact because they apply it's an open entry process."

Pritchard: "Well, that's right and they apply later..."

Dunkin: "So, when the money's there, we appropriate it."

Pritchard: "So, we talked about a lot of things. You mentioned that this is a process and we heard things for weeks on end on how we need more funding for our Monetary Assistance Program, but we also heard comments about we need to make some reforms. We need to help those students that make decisions later to an affordable education. The fact that, as you mentioned, we have more and more students not able to get a grant and what we're awarding has been reduced over the last few years for each student. So, is that reflected in this Bill?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Pritchard: "Well, perhaps I need better glasses because I don't see that in the Bill. I think this is, again, your wish and we need to put things in law if we're going to have the right thing and the right allocation. I urge a 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My big concern, being on the Higher Education Committee, is we are pricing our students in Illinois out of a higher education. If you are lower or middle class, you can no longer afford college and that's why it is so important that we put more money into the MAP program. ISAC came out with the Monetary Award Program Task Force Report and some of the findings I found startling. It said in 2002 the maximum award covered the average cost of tuition and fees at an Illinois public university. Today it covers about 37 percent of that cost. In 2002, MAP completely covered the cost of community college tuition and fees. Today the maximum award paid covers about half that cost. It attributes a substantial part of the tuition increase for public colleges and universities to declining state appropriations to that sector. Another very, what I found, profound statistic that this report said was the cost of a higher education is a very real barrier to access. It said that in 1970, it would take a student about five and a half 40 hour work weeks to pay for a year public college. Today it takes 36 weeks to pay for that same year. So, in return, we are pricing these lower income students out of a college education and that's why I support increasing the MAP funding."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Representative, how are you doing over there today?"

Dunkin: "Fantastic. And yourself?"

Wehrli: "I'm doing great. Thank you. So, I sat through many of those committee hearings and I thank you for chairing that."

Dunkin: "You're welcome."

Wehrli: "We heard testimony saying that yes, we could use some more MAP grant funding, but we also heard from university presidents that there are things that we could reform that would help them in their business model, such as workman's comp and how they purchase things. Is that not correct?"

Dunkin: "Can you repeat your question, Sir?"

Wehrli: "So, during those hearings when we heard from not only the students we also heard from presidents of the universities at hand and did they not also indicate that if we could do some pro-business reforms, it would impact how they operate? That would help to the… speaking of workman's comp and how they purchase, would that not… was that not discussed as well?"

Dunkin: "Yes, we heard from them, but as you know, those issues traditionally have not been a part of the appropriations process. Going forward, I would be happy to review and sit down and look at them and make a decision with you."

Wehrli: "Well, you know, we had 11 weeks that we could have been doing that and I was certainly there, ready to go to work and to address the budget that I thought we were going to in that committee. Not until yesterday did I actually see a number. I heard percentages, but never an actual number. So, speaking of numbers, let me make sure my math is correct. When I look

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

at the three Bills that you're on today that the appropriations here in the House for higher education they total about \$1.5 billion. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Wehrli: "And the cuts... and then with the increase in MAP grants spending it's a reduction of \$40 million. Is that correct?

About?"

Dunkin: "\$48.2 million."

Wehrli: "I'm sorry?"

Dunkin: "\$48.2 million."

Wehrli: "48.2. So, about a \$1.5 billion budget allocation that is being reduced by \$48 million. Is my math correct?"

Dunkin: "You math is incorrect."

Wehrli: "Okay. My math is incorrect?"

Dunkin: "It's \$1.899.2 billion."

Wehrli: "Oh, I'm just speaking of the House Bills that we're talking about here, not the Senate Bills."

Dunkin: "Yes, yes, in that context."

Wehrli: "Okay. Right. So, what we have in our prevue here today,
1.5 billion in total with a 40 million dollar proposed budget
reduction. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Wehrli: "Okay. All right. 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? Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4147. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4147, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Dunkin."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4147, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4147 is an appropriations Bill that appropriates dollars to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Math & Science Academy, the University of Illinois, and Southern Illinois University. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard. Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "This is on the main Amendment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lang: "This is on the Bill on Third Reading, Sir. The Amendment's been adopted."

Pritchard: "So, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will be debating this afternoon a Resolution that I think we should find informative. Whereas, the economic competitiveness of the United States and of Illinois is in the global economy requires a well-educated workforce.

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Whereas, in 2015 education is more important than ever because it is an essential step for entering the remaining of the middle class. Whereas, high school dropouts are more than twice as likely to be unemployed and three times as likely to receive welfare assistance. Nationally, this costs billions of dollars in government funded assistance programs. And whereas, the United States Census Bureau estimates that a person with a high school diploma will earn nearly \$10 thousand more per year than someone without a high school diploma. Whereas, in 2014 people with a high school diploma had a nine percent unemployment rate compared to a six percent rate for those with a high school diploma. And whereas, a well-educated citizenry improves the business climate for providing highly skilled workers that employers need. Ladies and Gentlemen, we were talking a little bit earlier about the values that we have as Legislators and perhaps as political parties. If we really value education, if we really believe that education is a tool to reduce incarceration rates, to increase employment, to increase income that will allow middle class families to be affordable and to achieve the quality of life they need. If we really believe in those values, how can we cut this budget by six percent for all of our universities? The values that we say we support and our actions don't match up. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "Hey, Representative. One of the things that's tough...
tough being in the House here is that we do stuff in

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

committees and we know a lot of stuff so, I'm hoping you can educate some of our fellow Members on some terms. Can you explain what FTE or full-time equivalent is to the rest of the Members, please?"

Dunkin: "Can I explain what a full-time equivalent is?"

Batinick: "What a full time equivalent student is."

Dunkin: "It's a student who sits for at least 12 hours in class."

Batinick: "Okay. Well, the way we measure spending sometimes is full-time equivalent students meaning two part-time students equal one full-time student, okay? So, the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association gave me a chart here that I gave you a while ago and it talks about Illinois spending per full time equivalent student. Do you recall what that number is, Representative?"

Dunkin: "Can you indulge me?"

Batinick: "Twelve thousand two hundred ninety-five dollars is what this state spends per full-time equivalent student. Do you happen to know what the national average is?"

Dunkin: "No, can you educate me, Sir?"

Batinick: "Six thousand five hundred fifty-two dollars per full-time equivalent student. I think this is important for the Body to know that our overall higher education spending is nearly double the national average. This is the chart that I handed out to people in committee. Now, some people want to say, well, that's because of our high pension payments which, you know, some of our deeds of the past go into that. Other universities have pension payments too, but this was given to us by the Illinois Board of Higher Education. After overcorrecting by completely stripping out the pension cost,

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

which is clearly an overcorrection, we still rank ninth in the funding of higher education. Now, this was given to us by the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Do you recall seeing this? We can make a copy for everybody if you'd like. Do you recall seeing this, Representative?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. So my question is, if we're anywhere between ninth and third in the funding of higher education why are we 30 to 60 percent more expensive in tuition than other states in state public school tuition?"

Dunkin: "Representative, this Bill is about us coming up with a spending plan for our Illinois institutions of higher education."

Batinick: "That is an excellent line. The spending's not working.

I've heard a lot of talk on the other side about show me your budget and I'll show you your priorities. You know what I say? I can't speak for everybody else, but I'll say what I say. Show me your results and I'll show you our priorities. And when we're spending nearly double the national average on higher education and we are unwilling to take up a single reform to fix this system, that's pathetic. The results are in. Middle class families, middle income families cannot afford to send their kids to college in this state and they're leaving. Do you recall what the net outmigration is of college students in this state each year that was given by James Applegate in committee?"

Dunkin: "I don't recall. It was a while ago."

Batinick: "It's over 16 thousand students. To put that in context Eastern Illinois University is 8 thousand students. We are

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

exporting two Eastern Illinois Universities annually. To the Bills. I kind of said it before, everything's part of budgeting. All the reforms that we're looking for is part of budgeting and if we keep funding failure we're going to get more failure. We have some universities that pay a little bit over \$8 hundred per student in administration costs and some that spend \$3 thousand per student in administration costs. Until we start addressing all these issues it doesn't matter what you spend on something solely, obviously, you have to fund things, but it's the results that matter. It's how you spend and where the money goes. We need to fix higher education. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I really appreciate the Chairman of Higher Education hearing from me as a new Member of the House. When I was informed of the proposed 31 percent cut to the University of Illinois's budget I knew immediately that there was a lot of work that I needed to do as a new Member. And although, I would love to see a budget for the university that does not include any of these cuts, I do applaud the Higher Education Approps Committee for working diligently to reduce what was being proposed that, in essence, decimate public universities. I hear our colleagues speaking about the need to make it affordable. Reducing its budget drastically does not make it affordable. Reducing it even in this seemingly small percentage still makes it difficult for public universities to ultimately reduce tuition rates. We all, I believe, want affordable public education for all of the constituents in our state. This gets

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

us part of the way, but certainly, not where we need to be. Truly, the national average is not what we should compare to because we are not funding education at the level that we should be funding for an industrialized nation. So, I truly, truly respect the Chairman of Higher Ed Approp and thank him for listening to me, as a new Member, raise the issue of this cut and coming up with something that our university can at least work with and I appreciate him for that."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative, I, along with my colleagues on this side of aisle, attended the Higher Education Appropriation Committee meetings. We attended the Higher Education Appropriation Working Group meetings that as opposed to other years were merely an extension of the testimony from universities. So, my question to you, Representative, how did you determine the figure for this appropriation in these Bills?"

Dunkin: "Representative, you were the former spokesperson for the last couple of years."

Hammond: "Right."

Dunkin: "This budget really built itself over the years from... we drew off of a number of factors. One of the factors was 2015's budget, 2014's budget, and preceding years before that. MAP utilization, how our state agencies such as Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Community College Board really has developed itself over the years, but what we've done was take sort of a combination of testimony, years of

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

communication and education of what it is that we need to be doing for our higher education was when ... that's how we came up with this. This budget, by the way, is dramatically low compared to what we should be investing in our institutions of higher education. And so, although the Governor wanted a 31.5 percent reduction in all the state universities, a 50 percent in all of the... the entire budget of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, we came up with compromised, educated reduction, of six and a half percent even though we've been funding our institutions of higher education for the last ten years at about a 2003 level and this is 2015. So, a cut of two and a quarter earlier in the post-supplemental and now with this six and a half percent cut on top of this two and a quarter percent reduction brings it up close to ten percent. So, myself and you, we're not proud of or shouldn't be proud of how we've been funding all of our state's schools that we so love and brag and talk about, we celebrate as alumni. So, this number here is an educated number based off of last year's numbers and preceding numbers and how we have taken upon what the Governor requested of us and making some cuts compared to a complete annihilation or devastation by cutting each university... each university by a third. And so, that's how we came up with this educated, intelligent budget that's relatively conservative in light of what the pressure points have been from these state university presidents and their CFOs. So, this is an educated, built-up-to number close to \$2 billion in an allocation. So, is it responsible 100 percent? Absolutely not. I think we should be funding more in our institutions."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Hammond: "So, Representative, I apologize if my question was that complicated. I certainly didn't mean for it to be. My question to you was and still is, how did you arrive at the appropriation figure for higher education?"
- Dunkin: "Representative, former spokesperson to the committee, I believe I responded to that question. We... this number was built up over the years. So, last year we were close to... or at roughly \$2 billion. We reduced it by six and a half percent. So, we've always hovered around 2 billion, a little bit under. The highest since I've been Chair has been up to \$2.2 billion. So, we're within the same ballpark over the years that, again, through an educational process of our presidents, the CFOs of these state institutions and intelligent education from the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Illinois Community College Board, what we've been informed on over the years with the Monetary Award Program. This number, this budget reflects that type of financial dynamic, and yet it's still low as far as I'm concerned."
- Hammond: "So, Representative, just to be clear there was no input from the Republican Members of the Higher Education Appropriation Committee on this budget? You may call it educated. You may call it fair. You may call it whatever you want. It is a sham. There is no money. It is unfair to the higher education community to present an irresponsible budget such as this to give them false hope that they will be facing a six and a half percent cut. It is not realistic. It is unfair."
- Dunkin: "Representative, that's not true and I don't want to entertain, you know, this too deeply, but you along with my

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

other colleagues on both sides of the aisle were very actively communicated with in work groups and formal committee hearings as, you know, by listening to every president, students. So, it was an open process and we didn't shy away from ideas or suggestions. As a matter of fact, I asked the Minority Spokesperson today in the Higher Appropriations Committee for suggestions. I asked you. I asked Members on this side of the aisle multiple questions on how it is ... what it is that we need to do in light of the Governor's proposal of thirty-one and a half percent cut to all of our state institutions. So, I want to make sure we get the record straight. I'm not going to be a part of not voting or supporting to appropriate our state institutions. Now, most of us on the committee represent either a large scale community college or a major university. I can't imagine myself and I don't believe most Members on that side of the aisle as well would vote against a Western Illinois University, a University of Illinois, a Northern Illinois. Can you imagine voting against their budget, Representative? I can't. This budget, at least, funds those institutions. I cannot... if I were representing Northern Illinois, Eastern Illinois University, Western Illinois University, where you represent, and then to vote against their school's budget. Can you imagine the outrage that students and faculty who are active voters, active constituents would feel on you voting against their budget? Would you do that, Representative? I wouldn't. I'm not going to do that. Those students are paying attention to this budget, Representative. They're going to see who is voting for or against their budget."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Representative, as a Member of the Higher Education Appropriation Committee, I represent all of higher education in the State of Illinois, not one entity. I represent all of higher education and I believe that we need to appropriate fairly and in an attitude that is responsible and a responsible budget. This is not responsible budgeting. I will be voting 'no' because I do not believe it's fair to our higher education communities."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "I simply want to ask what other avenues of funding... so, as we start to remove money from our state institutions, what options are we leaving them?"

Dunkin: "Very few options."

Wallace: "And which student populations do you think are going to be most impacted by these types of cuts?"

Dunkin: "Well, all across the board all of our students in the community colleges, some of our veterans, our universities, our private sector, you know, we're benefiting our MAP students which is pretty much 80 plus percent of our schools. So, all of our students are going to be impacted. Hopefully, you know, not too much compared to what the Governor proposed at thirty-one and a half percent."

Wallace: "So, we've heard a lot of discussion about where Illinois ranks in terms of the cost of education, but are you aware that Illinois actually outperforms the nation in terms of degree attainment for two-year and four-year degrees?"

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Dunkin: "Yes."

Wallace: "And would you think that that's a result of our commitment to appropriating funds for state institutions?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Wallace: "Well, thank you, Sponsor. To the Bill. We understand that education is a great equalizer in our state and in our nation. And I do encourage individuals here in this chamber to 1) actually pay attention to how important this debate is. And 2) vote to make sure that we are funding our state institutions so that our children will be able to stay in our state, will contribute to our economy and be successful. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Dunkin, are you aware of a Senate Democrat report that just came out recently about higher education and the problems with it?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Ives: "And have you read that report?"

Dunkin: "Not thoroughly, I was preparing for this appropriations budget."

Ives: "Okay. So, what we, as Republicans, are standing for right now is that we're not interested in talking about the budget until we talk about reform. And if you looked at this report, the Senate Democrats, in their report alone, they talk about a number of reforms that must be put in place. And they also talk about some of the egregious spending that's been going on. For example, one administrator at a public university

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

makes an annual compensation of nearly \$900 thousand a year. There's annuities at community colleges of over \$30 thousand a year. There's one community college that was reported on where the president of the college gets over \$300 thousand a year in compensation. His housing allowance is based on his compensation. It's 10 percent of his annual salary and his annual salary increases automatically 10 percent every year. Now, all we're asking for is some reforms. We want some reforms put into place and you guys don't seem to even be considering that. Additionally, faculty... while faculty has remained pretty constant over the last administrators at these public universities... and this is not my report, this is the Senate Democrat Report... has increased 50 percent faster than faculty, 50 percent administrators, faculty flat. And we don't address any of the reform agenda, anything that we need in order to make things work better. We haven't addressed really severance contracts. Well, the House has, but the Senate is sitting on theirs. In the bipartisan and in the Senate and House way, we need to pass significant reforms before we even talk about doing any more on the budget. That's what we're asking for. Are you opposed to reform at all when it comes to higher education? Are you okay with these people making nearly a million dollars in compensation?"

Dunkin: "Of course not, of course not."

Ives: "Representative Dunkin, are you okay with administrators making nearly a million dollars in compensation while the students have a hard time paying for college?"

Dunkin: "Of course not."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- Ives: "Okay. Well, why don't we talk about some reforms in higher ed first? You sat in your own committee meetings, you heard what administrators said, you heard what they would like is some relief on prevailing wage rates. Why isn't that a part of the discussion? All we're asking for, and it's not that hard, we're asking for reasonable reforms. Worker's compensation reform. Prevailing wage reform. Reasonable reforms to lower the cost for everybody and level the playing field. That's what we're asking for. Are you opposed to any of the reform agenda?"
- Dunkin: "No, I'm not, Representative. You know, for this purpose here, we're talking about appropriating dollars for our institutions of higher education. I support..."
- Ives: "And I'm telling you that you're appropriating a hell of a lot of dollars with no idea where that money's going and how it's going to be used. That's the problem..."

Dunkin: "Representative, no..."

Ives: "We want some significant reforms."

Dunkin: "That's not the case. Representative, now you're not on the Appropriation for Higher Education Committee, correct?"

Ives: "No, but I did sit in on some of it and I've listened to
 quite a bit of the other testimony."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, I've chaired it for four years. I've sat on it for eight plus years. I can tell you, line by line, in most instances of where the dollars are going to go towards. Now what we did in support of the Governor's request was to give each university a lump sum to try to manage how it expends the state's dollars. So, I don't have a problem with reform of the pension Bill, by the way that I voted 'yes' for. I

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

don't have a problem with worker's compensation at the university level. I don't have a... which I voted for about five years or so ago. I don't have a problem with the maintenance of the facilities of any of these particular institutions. So, I support that and I voted capital Bill a few years ago as well to support just that. So, I'm all in. My record speaks for itself. That's what I've done in my tenure here, Representative. So, you and I, in that regard, are on the exact same page. So, I'm with it, but right now, here on this floor with House Bill 4147, we're talking about appropriating dollars to several state institutions including the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Southern Illinois University, University of Illinois, and Math & Science Academy. That's what's before us in this respective appropriation Bill. So, I'm asking for you and your colleagues to support higher education."

Ives: "Thank you."

Dunkin: "So, we're on the same page, Representative."

Ives: "Thank you. So, I look forward to working with you diligently on the reform agenda. Please vote 'no' on this though. Bye."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, I know this is a spending Bill, but I'm curious about a couple of spending items that I'm wondering if you're aware of. You mentioned you don't have a problem about worker's comp at the University of Illinois, but are

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

you aware that every year their expenses increase by 10 percent?"

Dunkin: "You know, it's a little noisy in here. Can you repeat that, Representative?"

Kay: "Sure. So, we're talking about a spending Bill and my question to you was do you have a problem with the fact that the University of Illinois spends... has had annual increases of 10 percent with regards to their worker's compensation expense to the extent that they're now paying 2.3 million for worker's comp?"

Dunkin: "Representative, yes, I'm aware of them."

Kay: "You're aware of that amount of money?"

Dunkin: "I'm aware of that."

Kay: "Expense."

Dunkin: "Correct."

Kay: "And that's not a problem?"

Dunkin: "It is a problem."

Kay: "Okay. How about the universities' legal liability expenses?
Are you aware of the increases there?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Kay: "What are they?"

Dunkin: "What are they? They're high. They're expensive at all of our state universities."

Kay: "Well, how much have they increased? Can you tell me that?"

Dunkin: "Representative, if you have the information just share it with us. I don't have every university's..."

Kay: "Well, here's, I guess, what I'm concerned about. We're talking about spending and no way of paying and we've got some huge expense items in the insurance area and one of which

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

is legal liability which is up a thousand percent. Does anybody care about that? A thousand percent."

Dunkin: "Is anybody aware of that or concerned about that? I am."

Kay: "So, in committee, when you're talking about this spending that you're proposing did you talk about how this was going to get fixed so that there would be a diminishment for the insurance expense that I've just mentioned?"

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm speaking of... talking about the bare minimum of what these universities can spend. That's the subject here before us. As I articulated to Representative Jeanne Ives, I am just as concerned about liability issues, worker's comp, maintenance, facility maintenance too... our pension costs of our universities. I wish that was a part of this discussion, Representative. As a matter of fact, myself, you and other colleagues here in this chamber and across the hall. That's what we're going to do in working together. I am looking... I am so looking forward to trying to resolve some of these exceptionally expense costs, up to a thousand dollars in increase in liability, worker's compensation, pension costs, maintenance on the facilities out there."

Kay: "Well, here's what..."

Dunkin: "I am anxiously awaiting."

Kay: "...Representative, I'm glad to hear that. What concerns me is that the general legal liability program at the University of Illinois has gone from.6 million to 6.27 million during a ten year period of time. That seems excessive. What are we doing? Do we know?"

Dunkin: "Representative, I want to be a part of the solution as you do. I don't have answers for some, you know, of the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

political, rhetorical questions, but I do know that this budget here is a safer bet compared to what the Governor proposed at thirty-one a half percent. We're only at six and a half percent per university."

Kay: "Let me ask you this question about your aspect of the budget. Do you know what the outstanding liabilities are for the University of Illinois or any other university that we've talked about today? The outstanding liabilities."

Dunkin: "Can you repeat that? I couldn't hear you."

Kay: "Do you have any idea what the outstanding liabilities are for any state university in your budgets today? Because I don't how... here's my point. I'm not going to be coy. I don't know how you make a budget if you don't know what your expenses. Are and it sounds to me like worker's comp and your legal liability is something you don't know much about here."

Dunkin: "Representative, do share. I would love to hear them."

Kay: "No, I just did. I mentioned worker's comp. I mentioned the legal liability for the university which has increased dramatically and I guess my question is do you know the total expenditures or do you know the total potential liability for the universities that you want to fund at the rate in your budget today? Just a 'yes' or 'no'."

Dunkin: "No."

Kay: "Okay. I would advocate then... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'd advocate that if you don't know the expense side of any equation you can't make a budget and I don't know what we're doing here. I know this is a budget Bill we have now deemed to be a spending Bill, but how in the world can you justify bringing something to the floor that is one part of the

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

problem, and certainly, no consideration for outstanding liabilities? None. How can you do that? Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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? Cabello, Poe, Sosnowski, Yingling. Please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4148, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4148, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Dunkin and has been approved for consideration."

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 Hollman: "No further Motions are filed at this time."

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4148, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4148 is an appropriations Bill for Eastern Illinois University, Illinois State University, Northern Illinois University, Western Illinois University, and the Illinois Student Assistance Commission to receive the new... the additional monetary award monies. Excuse me, MAP was in

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

another Bill. But this is for the Illinois Student Commission's budget."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Brady: "Representative, I want to make sure I heard you correctly.

Did you say Normal Illinois University?"

Dunkin: "Northern."

Brady: "Where's that located?"

Dunkin: "Northern Illinois University."

Brady: "I'd like to go back to that tape. In any event, do you really believe that these packages of Bills in higher education are going to be signed into law by the Governor?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Brady: "Well, for your benefit, I'm glad to see, Representative, that you're very optimistic. That's great. But what's not being so optimistic and so fair is what's being done to these universities. And in this particular Bill, one of those universities, one of our nine state universities I happen to represent and that's Illinois State University. And I know, Representative, as Chairman much like you do in the committee, you're listening and hanging on every word I say. Paying attention which is glad... I'm glad to see that. But what will you say to these universities with this process the way that it is. We know that this Bill, financially, is not stable from a revenue source and we know that this is going to leave all of our nine state universities in limbo once this process is finished such that it is and these Bills are vetoed by the Governor and we are back here discussing a way to actually

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

treat higher education as fairly as possible with realistic dollars. And I'd like to share with you, Representative, a letter that I was handed today from all of our nine state university presidents. And a small portion of the letter and I'll read that to you says, we believe that relief from burdensome regulations will be an additional, essential part of what must become a new operating model for our universities. What portion of these budget Bills for higher education represents a new operating model for our universities that gives them relief from burdensome regulations?"

Dunkin: "Representative, you're reading a small portion of that entire letter."

Brady: "Now, once I agree with you..."

Dunkin: "A very small portion."

Brady: "...I agree with you because, Representative, that's exactly what I just said. I said I was going to read a small portion from the letter and that's what I did."

Dunkin: "So, here's the other part of that letter that you didn't read. Each one of those nine university presidents asked for level funding because over the last ten years we have not funded them to the rate of inflation, the cost of doing business in the 21st century. We have not done that, Representative. Now, I know I'm not going to be on the side voting against Illinois State University or Western Illinois University or Eastern Illinois University or Northern Illinois University or the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. Can you imagine, me, as an elected official, representing those districts voting 'no' against those

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

- particular universities' or institutions' budget? I can't imagine especially if I represent them."
- Brady: "Representative, I can imagine anything is possible with you."
- Dunkin: "I'd be very... I mean, I think it's political suicide if you represent, let's say, for example, Illinois State University, Northern Illinois University, Eastern Illinois University, Western Illinois University voting against my own constituents. Voting to say 'no' against funding the very constituents that we represent."
- Brady: "And I, Representative, think it's political suicide to vote for a budget that is nothing but a sham and is dishonest to nine state universities in this state. So, I won't be doing that and what I want to know is since you think this is a real budget and this is what these universities will have at the end of this process and this will stay intact for the universities, how is that possible when the funding isn't there for the spending?"
- Dunkin: "Representative, I'm simply doing what the Legislative Body's intent is and that's to come up with an appropriation amount to the Executive Body. Now..."
- Brady: "Representative, you're doing something that somebody told you to do, but I don't think it's this General Assembly Body."
- Dunkin: "Somebody told me to do what?"
- Brady: "I said you are doing... your own words. You are doing something that you said this Body told you to do? I said I don't think you're doing something this Body told you to do. I think you're doing something a select few told you to do with this budget."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Dunkin: "Representative, I am coming up with a budget that students, that faculty, and that the lead administrators and trustees have educated myself and Members such as yourself on the committee on what we should be doing. Remember, they don't want any reductions."

Brady: "Correct."

Dunkin: "They don't."

Brady: "That's correct."

Dunkin: "Certainly, not thirty-one and a half percent that was proposed back in February or March, Representative."

Brady: "And, Representative, there was numerous times that you and I talked and I said, if you remember, that I'm sure we will work on coming up with a middle road number to have in the way of reductions. That is a reality of what a spending Bill and a revenue Bill would support."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm trying to follow the edict of all of those individuals who testified before us. And as a matter of fact, Representative, I'm waiting on you to vote for a budget of higher education. I'm waiting on Members across the aisle to vote for a budget of higher education. You've said 'no' since I've been the Chair. You voted 'no' on Bills to fund the very schools that you represent. Now, I'm not personally trying to attack you. I'm making a point of reference. At some point, the rubber has to meet the road. We have to appropriate dollars to our state institutions. Don't you agree?"

Brady: "I agree as some of those 'no' votes over the course of the last several years."

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Dunkin: "If you read the rest of the letter you'll see what the universities want."

Brady: "I think I'm talking. I think I have the floor right now. And I believe that if some of those 'no' votes had been adhered to and we had straightened out budgets over the last several years we might not be looking at some of the things that was proposed in Governor Rauner's budget of what he inherited of the misspending through this Body over the years. That's what I think, Representative. And the reality is you think this budget is going to, obviously, pass and you think this budget, in your own words, you believe will be signed into law. I happen to disagree with you and those that I represent in higher education, not only in my district, but all of us across the state want to be fair, want to be upfront and want to be honest with those universities that this is a long way from becoming a budget. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. In 2012, there was a task force that was set forth by this General Assembly. It was the Monetary Award Program Task Force and that Bill... excuse me, that task force had several findings after significant work that they did looking at state funding to our state universities. And instead of pontificating on what I think they mean or what the executive summary came up with I'll just simply read it to you. In 2002, the maximum award covered the average cost of tuition and fees at an Illinois public university. Today, in FY13, it covers 37 percent of that cost. In 2002, MAP completely covered the cost of community college tuition and fees. Today, the maximum award

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

covers just about 51 percent of the cost. A substantial part of the tuition increase for public colleges and universities has been driven by declining state appropriations to those sectors. Let me repeat that. The substantial part of tuition increases for public universities has been driven by declining state appropriations to those sectors. Another very key, important portion of these findings from this task force was that no amount of rearranging of existing MAP dollars is going to correct a fundamental problem of underfunding. The cost of higher education is a very real barrier to access. In 1970, it would take a student about 5.5 40-hour work weeks to pay for one year at a public college. Today, it takes 36 weeks to pay for that same year. It is no longer possible for a low income student, let me say that again, no longer possible for a low income student to work his or her way through college without assistance and attend full time. So, Representative, I thank you for the Bill that you have brought forth. You are looking at ways to add taxpayers to our tax rolls. I appreciate your work and the efforts of this committee. I urge 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 64 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Committee Announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after session. Appropriations - Elementary &

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

Secondary Education is meeting in Room 114. Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies is meeting in Room 413. The Executive Committee is meeting in Room 118. Agriculture & Conservation is meeting in D-1. Renewable Energy & Sustainability is meeting in C-1 and Tourism & Conventions is meeting in Room 115."

Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving Perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, May 27 at the hour of 11 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does stand adjourned until Wednesday, May 27 at the hour of 11 a.m."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2015: do pass as amended Short Debate Senate Bill 29, Senate Bill 51, Senate Bill 96, Senate Bill 637, Senate Bill 1229, Senate Bill 1262, Senate Bill 1466, Senate Bill 1488, Senate Bill 1506, Senate Bill 1562, Senate Bill 1673. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 29, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 51, a Bill for an Act concerning state government. Senate Bill 96, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 637, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1229, a Bill for an Act concerning state government. Senate Bill 1262, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1466, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1488, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1506, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill

55th Legislative Day

5/26/2015

1562, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1673, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 1, offered by Representative Cabello. Senate Joint Resolution 8, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer. Senate Joint Resolution 22, offered by Representative Bellock. Senate Joint Resolution 24, offered by Representative Brown. Senate Joint Resolution 25, offered by Representative Scherer. These are referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned."