58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Michael Stark who is with First Baptist Church in Roxana. Pastor Stark is the quest of Representative Beiser. Members and quests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Stark." Pastor Stark: "Let's pray. Our Father in heaven, holy, holy, is Your name. We thank You for life, for liberty, and for the freedoms we enjoy in this great nation. Thank You for our many servicemen and women who have worked hard and are working hard to ensure these freedoms for generations to come. Thank You for the honorable men and women of this Assembly who have dedicated their time and their talents and very lives for the security and betterment of the citizens of this great state. We ask Your blessing upon this Assembly, upon all whom You have graciously and sovereignly granted the authority of government. Grant each Member of this Session wisdom and quidance, patience, humility, faith, and courage that productive policies and solutions might be reached for the benefit of all of Illinois citizens and that peace, harmony, truth, justice, piety will prevail and flourish among her people. Please send Your spirit of peace upon each citizen of our state, from Chicago to Cairo and every county in-between. We pray this for Your holy name's sake, and may all that is done within the peoples' House this day be for Your greater honor and glory, Amen."

Speaker Lang: "Will be led in the Pledge by Mr. Cabello."

Cabello - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

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

Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Poe and Sullivan are excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absences of Representatives Ammons, Monique Davis, and Mautino."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. We have 112 Members present. We do have a quorum. The Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Sir. Today I rise in honor of a birthday. On this date in 1917, our 35th President Mr. John F. Kennedy was born. As we deliberate these final days of Session in policies intended to move our state forward, I would like to share with this Body and all who work in this great Capitol of ours a quote. 'Let us not seek the Republican answer or the Democratic answer, but the right answer. Let us not seek to fix the blame for the past. Let us accept our own responsibility for the future.' Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Page 10 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 1834, Mr. D'Amico. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1834, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1834 seeks to establish basic protections for railroad workers required to be transported in a contract carrier vehicle. I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Good morning, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "John, I just turned my computer on. I don't... I'm not sure anyone's really awake. Could you just walk through what the Bill does? I'm sure it's perfect in all respects, but..."

D'Amico: "Basically, what it is, it's a video camera that's in these vehicles that will record the accident. If the driver has not been driving well, the… it will record the accident to protect of… the workers inside."

Sandack: "Perfect. But help me out. Is there a reason why it needs to be codified in a statute? Is there... I mean... is... what..."

D'Amico: "I guess... I... I think we need a law to allow this camera in the vehicle."

Sandack: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege. Oh, I'm sorry."

Speaker Lang: "We'll get right back to you, Representative. Those in favor of the Bill will... 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? Sommer. Please take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Clerk is recognized."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 763, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1312, Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1334. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1672; recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2495. Representative Costello, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 and 4 to House Bill 3674. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: recommends be adopted is House Joint Res... correction... House Resolution 479, House Resolution 512, Senate Joint Resolution 1, Senate Joint Resolution 8, Senate Joint Resolution Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 455. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 548 is offered by Representative Riley and is referred to the Rules Committee."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock on a point of personal privilege."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have with me today two Pages that have come down to see how laws are done in the State of Illinois. One is Landon Ballard and he's from Rockford, Illinois. And the other young man with me is Andrew Licata and he's from Plainfield, Illinois. So, I ask everybody to welcome them today to the State of Illinois to the House of Representatives."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Happy to have you here with us today, guys.

 Representative Hammond on a point of personal privilege."
- Hammond: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a point of personal privilege. I am pleased to be joined with two fine young gentlemen here today. Landon is from Rockford, Illinois and Jon is from Addison, Illinois. They are both members of MWAH, which is Messages Which Are Hopeful. And for any of you that have had the privilege of seeing this group in person, it is quite impressive. And they bring messages of hope and encouragement and if we don't need that, I don't know who does. So I'd like for you to join me in welcoming them to the House chamber today."
- Speaker Lang: "Glad you're joining us today. Thank you very much.

 Mr. Phillips on a point of personal privilege."
- Phillips: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have with me a wonderful, beautiful young lady from Robinson, Illinois, Ryndi Runyon. She is turning... or she turned 10 years old yesterday and graduated from fourth grade. She's my Page for the day and she was my #1 fan, walked in every parade with me. So, I'd like to give her a big welcome here."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Speaker Lang: "Excellent. Welcome. Thanks for being with us. Mr. Ford on a point of personal privilege."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like for the Body to welcome Pages for the day. They're from Representative Welch's, Lilly's, and my district. We have Paxton, Jordan, and Henry on the Democratic side. If you could please stand and be welcomed in the House. Thank you for coming."

Speaker Lang: "Morning, guys."

Ford: "Thank you. And... and..."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Glad you're here with us today."

Ford: "...a warm welcome also. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Ford. Mr. Meier is recognized on a point of personal privilege."

Meier: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the House to welcome a very good friend of mine. A fellow JC of mine for over 30 years now, Chuck Isringhaus is standing up here in the gallery. And he is also here with his minister's wife, Gretchen Trinklein, and their children, John, Abby, and Mike. So, I'd like you all to welcome Chuck and the Trinklein family."

Speaker Lang: "Thanks for joining us. Enjoy our deliberations today. Thank you, Mr. Meier. Mr. Butler is recognized on a point of personal privilege."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, please welcome Matthew Johnson. He's a resident here in Springfield. He goes to St. Agnes Grade School. What's the St. Agnes nickname? Aces? St. Agnes Aces. He's a cross country runner and a baseball player. Please welcome Matthew, this morning."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Speaker Lang: "Welcome, Matthew. Thanks for joining us. Senate Bill 1846, Representative Manley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1846, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Manley."

Manley: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1846 is an initiative of the Alzheimer's Association Illinois Chapter Network. The Bill amends several Acts to provide for the creation of Silver Search Task Force. This task force, in coordination with the Department of the State Police, is charged with creating and coordinating a statewide awareness program and a tool kit to be called Silver Search that would be used when a person who is 21 years or older is believed to have Alzheimer's or other related dementia, goes missing. There are 210 people in Illinois living with Alzheimer's. Twenty-two states have already implemented this program. One in three people have been diagnosed... will be diagnosed with Alzheimer's, will wander. I want to thank the 80-plus cosponsors on this Bill and the many people that are relying on that. And I want to also thank Sqt. John Thompson of the Illinois State Police for their willingness to work with us on this Bill. It's been in the making for about five years. And I'll take any questions."

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? Franks. Please take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Brown for an announcement."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 118 for one hour."

Speaker Lang: "The Republicans will caucus in Room 118 immediately.

The Democrats, I'm sure, will be bought breakfast by Mr.

Moylan. And we'll stand in recess 'til the call of the Chair.

The House will be in order. Page 12 of the Calendar, Senate

Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 248, Leader

Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 248, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on the Amendment."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment incorporates many suggestions from the county clerks with respect to places where we made errors in previous Bills. There's nothing particularly substantive in the Amendment except for the provision that means that when it comes to Special Elections, we'll be in compliance with Department of Justice rules with respect to how long elections must be set in order to make sure that our military personnel are able to have access to a ballot. So, I'd be happy to answer your questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Do you want to do this on Third Reading?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Sandack: "Well, my... my inquiry could be to the Chair too. I'm under the understanding there's another Amendment and I don't know if there is any intention by the Leader to utilize the next Amendment as well."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "I'm... Let... let me just have a quick look. I don't see a second Amendment on my LIS."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 2 appears to still be in the Rules Committee, Representative."

Currie: "Okay. Then why don't we take this out of the record."

Speaker Lang: "Unless you don't need that Amendment."

Currie: "I think I might."

Speaker Lang: "All right. Let's take the Bill out of the record.

Leader Currie, I'm returning to Senate Bill 248. Do you have
new information for us?"

Currie: "I have. My information is that I plan to withdraw Amendment 2."

Speaker Lang: "And proceed on Amendment 1?"

Currie: "Oh, okay. So, no, I don't want to adopt Amendment 1 either. So, I'm withdrawing Amendment 1 and Amendment 2."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 248."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 248, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. It was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "And Representative Currie withdraws Amendment 1."

Currie: "Yes, indeed."

Clerk Hollman: "No..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 248, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill is exactly as it came to us from the Senate. It is an effort by the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform to see to it that independent expenditures are promptly reported during an election season. So it takes from five days to two days the amount of time that somebody making an independent political expenditure would have to report within the 60 days before the election. We're trying to make for conformity and while others like our own political committees or political action committees have to report in a timely fashion, the Campaign for Political Reform noticed that the independent expenditure committees didn't have to file as quickly disclosures about their spending practices. I know of no opposition. And I'd be grateful for your support for passage of the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. Will the Leader yield, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Leader yields."

Sandack: "All right. So, Leader, the introduction the last time we did this has nothing to do with county clerks and instead has everything to do with campaigns."

Currie: "This has oh... this is exactly the Bill as it came to us from the Senate. In committee, I did talk about some other more technical Amendments, but we're not doing those today."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Sandack: "Right. So, what we're doing today, forget the technical Amendments, we're talking about some independent expenditure committees being required to file what, when?"
- Currie: "They have to file reports of their expenditures within 48 hours, 2 days, within the 60 days preceding the election. And as I understand it, the rest of us make those... those kinds of disclosures as well. And the Campaign for Political Reform discovered that... that the independent expenditure committee had five days while the rest of us had two and that's the loophole that this language is intended to address or even close, if you prefer."
- Sandack: "Leader, I'm... I'm told you're speaking to the Amendment you just withdrew. And I'm looking at the language..."
- Currie: "I withdrew Amendment 1, which had been considered by committee. I withdrew Amendment 2 and that means the Bill that is before us is the Bill that came to us from the Senate and it does one thing and one thing only. It says that in campaign season the political... the independent political expenditure committee would have to disclose within two days, not five."

Sandack: "Speaker, can I have one second, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Surely."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Another inquiry of the Leader." Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Sandack: "Representative, I understand that the Als have a 30-day period and that we're making a change that wouldn't be congruent with what at least is the reporting law under Als."

Currie: "And I think... I think it would cover B1s and that is a 60-day period before the election. So we're trying to bring the

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- independent campaign committee into line with... with that disclosure."
- Sandack: "So, it's... so they... the goal of this legislation is to bring independent expenditures in the line with B1 disclosures and not A1 disclosures."
- Currie: "That's right."
- Sandack: "And... and why is that congruent in your mind? Why does that make more sense?"
- Currie: "Well, you know, this is a Bill that came to us from the Senate."
- Sandack: "Right."
- Currie: "It was drafted, I believe, by the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform. That is the group that noticed that the independent political expenditure committees had five days to report whereas all the rest of us had two. So, we were taking their language and I think it makes a lot of sense."
- Sandack: "All right. Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I... obviously, this has been a little bit of an interesting interplay. I think there's some language and some aspects of the Bill folks ought to look at very carefully before voting. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer. Gentleman wishes not to speak.

 Leader Currie to close."
- Currie: "This is a very good Bill. It's political reform. It means that independent expenditure committees have to let us know what they're spending and upon whom. Please vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have... have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

record yourselves, Members. Fortner, Harris, Martwick, McAuliffe, Poe, Unes, Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 8 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 1441, Mr. Bradley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1441, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I present this Bill, could I have a point of personal privilege?"

Speaker Lang: "We'll let you squeeze that in, Sir."

Bradley: "Thank you. Up in the Republican side of the gallery...

I'll ask them to stand... I have members of my Youth Advisory
Council here today. They're high schoolers from southern
Illinois. Each of the high schools in my district select two
of their top students to participate and they get an
opportunity to participate in real-life government. Very
proud of them, great things going on in our area. I'd like to
thank my Legislative Assistant Chris Lowery for bringing them
up here. And how about a round of applause for these bright
young minds from southern Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thank you for giving advice to Mr. Bradley. Proceed, Sir, on your Bill."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that passed out of this chamber last year 113 to 1. It quit... Huh? It... it went to the Senate... it went to the Senate and got stalled at the end of Session there. This is basically a cleanup of the

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

towing industry in the State of Illinois. It would have specifics with regards to rotations, with regards to towing vehicles with towing solicitation and it is basically to create transparency and to make the system more fair, more equitable for all the people of the State of Illinois. I would like to compliment and thank Representative Beiser for all of his efforts with regards to this. If not for his work on many of these issues, this would not have been possible. And I want to thank the stakeholders that participated in this. I know of no opposition. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. Will Representative Bradley yield for a question?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "John, I'm told the City of Chicago is exempted from this Bill. Is that accurate?"

Bradley: "Yes, as it was last year."

Sandack: "And can you just help us out with why it's exempted from the provisions of your Bill."

Bradley: "That was one... that was one area where we had trouble getting an agreement between the City of Chicago and the insurance industry with regards to what might be characterized as rogue towers. That's an issue that may have to be revisited and I hope will be revisited at some point. But we didn't want to let all these other good government transparency, equitable reforms get stalled forever while we tried to work that out."

Sandack: "And I appreciate the answer. Obviously, the City of Chicago should also be involved in good accountability,

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

transparency and best practices, so I hope we're not just leaving them on the sidelines for reasons unstated and that whatever trailer Bill and/or following legislation may capture it as well."

Bradley: "This is a significant step and I would ask for your support."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, last year we talked about another provision that you were going to include in this Bill that dealt with uninsured drivers. Is that provision in this Bill?"

Bradley: "Yes, it is."

Pritchard: "And might you give us... the Body just a brief thumbnail on that?"

Bradley: "Actually, Representative Pritchard, I believe this was your initiative. So if you would like to present that portion of it, I would be glad for you to do that, Sir."

Pritchard: "So, actually, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Body, I appreciate the Representative's willingness to include this. It was a provision that we had proposed last year due to a number of accidents in our area, and I'm sure in your areas as well, where a citizen of ours is... is injured, is... there's a collision and the other driver is uninsured and therefore, not able to contribute anything to repairing those vehicles. And this provision has in it that whenever a law enforcement officer issues a citation for driving and operating vehicle of an uninsured vehicle, that driver and... that driver has a

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

prior conviction within the last 12 months, the arresting officer shall authorize the removal and impoundment of that vehicle by a towing service. What we were finding in our area is someone would get a ticket for not having insurance and then they would proceed to drive away. So this is trying to close that loophole. And I thank the Representative for including it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mautino: "Representative Bradley, I did have a few phone calls from some smaller towing companies that wanted to know how the tow lists would work. One of their concerns is, if a normal customer had called them and they weren't on a designated tow list, would they still be able to go pick up those cars and ply their trade?"

Bradley: "Yeah. We're going to give... it's my understanding that the tow list is going to be handled at the local level. And our analysis, with regards to the conditions of the tow list, we give a lot of deference to the local authorities, but a driver that wants to call someone if they got their car towed, can still do that."

Mautino: "There was a little bit of concern from some smaller guys on that. The other thing is, if the local municipal police force or the State Police chose to not include your business on their tow list, is there a recourse for that small company?"

Bradley: "Yeah. There would be a recourse. It would be handled locally."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Mautino: "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? Golar. Please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jesiel is recognized."
- Jesiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to let the record show that on SB248 my intention was to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Moving to page 13 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1466, Mr. Yingling. Mr. Yingling. Out of the record. Mr. Zalewski is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

- Zalewski: "I needed some help pushing these buttons, my fingers were tired, so I brought my daughter Reese with me today. So she's in charge of the green buttons on this side of the aisle. I expect us to get a lot of work done today, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Mr. Clerk, on page 14 of the Calendar, there appears Senate Bill 1728, Leader Currie.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1728, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill wa... was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopt... Floor Amendment #1 was adopted previously. No further Amendments. But a state mandates note has been requested but not filed at this time."

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

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Currie: "Yeah. Thank you, Speaker. A state mandates Act note? This has nothing to do with local governments. I would therefore rule that the note request is inapplicable."

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

Sandack: "We... we object to the Motion and request a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Franks, Gordon-Booth. Please take the record. On this question, there are 68 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no'. The Lady's Motion carries and the note is held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further notes are requested."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1728, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. We've discussed this issue on the House Floor in, I believe, a previous General Assembly. What the measure does is two things. It creates, as a separate agency, the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, changing the membership of the board, giving the Governor the authority to appoint new board members and to appoint the executive director. As well, it creates, as a separate entity, a freestanding entity, the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum. That entity will have an 11-member board confirmed by the Senate and they will choose their own executive director. And in the... in the process, we're transferring from the Department of Natural

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Resources the Dickson Mound State Memorial, Illinois State Museum including several galleries, they will go to IHPA rather than staying with the Department of Natural Resources, but all the employees and whatever terms of employment they are currently operating will be transferred with this change to the appropriate agency. I'd be happy to take your questions. I think this is a reasonable response to the tensions and difficulties we have seen between the agency and the library."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Butler: "Leader Currie, you and I have had a few discussions about this particular topic over the last few weeks. This version of the legislation is a little different than some legislation that came out of the Executive Committee a few weeks ago. Can you kind of tell us what has happened? What the genesis for this particular version of the legislation is and how come we're not advancing another version of this?"

Currie: "Well, I believe that part of the discussion was with people in the Springfield area who were concerned about how the Historic Preservation Agency would work. What's also different is the Bill that came out of Executive some weeks ago did include some changes in the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity and that is no longer a part of this Bill."

Butler: "Since these are obviously executive agencies, have you been working with the... with the Governor's Office on... on this?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Currie: "We have been trying to work with the Governor's Office, yes."
- Butler: "And where is the Governor's Office on this legislation?"
- Currie: "It's hard for me to tell. I know they would be very unhappy that the DCEO language... the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity language is not included in this Bill, but we've had discussions with them and could not agree on exactly how that would operate. There's every opportunity to do that in another piece of legislation."
- Butler: "If I... if I read the *State Journal-Register* correctly, as of yesterday, the Governor's Office is opposed to this legislation it seems to be"
- Currie: "They haven't... they didn't tell me."
- Butler: "Okay. There's one provision especially I wanted to... I wanted to ask you about and it concerns... in the Bill it Section 1-65. It's concerns the transfer of the State Historical Library into the Museum, I believe. And in the legislation, it basically says the status and rights of any employees that are being transferred will be the same. But below that it says staff hired on or after the effective date of this Act shall not be subject to the Personnel Code or any applicable collective bargaining agreement. Can you tell me why future staff would not be subject to the Personnel Code?"
- Currie: "You'd have to ask the Governor. It was the Governor's language that we incorporated in this version."
- Butler: "Well, I... I believe this is your Bill, actually, not the Governor's Bill, 'cause the Governor's Office said that they're opposed to..."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Currie: "No, but we were trying to work in our usual bipartisan collaborative way with the second floor and this was their proposal that came from that direction."
- Butler: "I hope we can continue to work bipartisanly with the... with the second floor. That doesn't seem to be the point this week, though. But has... has any of the public employee unions talked to you about this particular Section, especially AFSMCE, about the fact that folks will be exempted from the Personnel Code?"

Currie: "No."

- Butler: "Okay. I... quite surprised that that Bill would be advanced on that side that would exempt folks from the Personnel Code. Another question I had was, you know, in reorgs in the past, under... from what I'm familiar with, whether it's the IDNR, whether it's Human Services, Professional Regulations, it... it seems to me, at least I've been told and through my memory, that usually these get... first go down a path of being an Executive Order that changes these and then the Legislature codifies those changes. Can you tell me why we're not... we're not going down that path for this particular one?"
- Currie: "Well, as you know, when I appeared in front of your committee with the measure that included references to the State Historic Preservation Agency, the Abraham Lincoln Library and Museum, and the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, that came from the Governor and apparently, he would prefer to have done those statutorily rather than by Executive Order."
- Butler: "But we're not working with the Governor right now on this?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Currie: "But we've tried to."

Butler: "Okay. One... one further question I had was about the executive director of the Museum... of the Presidential Museum, which, if I read correctly, IHPA director on your legislation is subject to consent from the Senate, yet the director of the Museum is not subject to consent by the Senate. Could you tell me why?"

Currie: "Every member that the 11-member board will have been subject to consent by the Senate. So, we thought, and I don't know of anybody who was dissenting, that that might be adequate in terms of Senate confirmation. And my understanding is that our good friends across the rotunda were comfortable with that approach."

Butler: "Is there... is there another state agency director that is not subject to Senate confirmation?"

Currie: "I don't know of any, but I would also say this. Most of the people on the boards that are making big decisions are not subject to Senate confirmation."

Butler: "Okay."

Currie: "Most are advisory in nature and this is one that actually will have real authority."

Butler: "Leader, I... I appreciate your... your answers. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This is... there's parts of this that I... that I agree with, actually, because I do think some changes need to be made to these... both of these institutions. Yet, once again, as we've seen over the past few weeks, the process around this is wrong. The Governor's Office needs to be involved in this... this operation. These are... these are executive agencies where we're making these decisions on. And the Governor's

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Office needs to be a part of this ... of this legislation. They need to be on... onboard with this. I would encourage folks to vote 'no' and I would encourage those of us on both sides to continue to work together for the Presidential Mu... Museum and for IHPA. I have five historic sites in my district. IHPA, obviously, is a big part of my district and the surrounding community here. And let me just read something that was in the State Journal-Register this morning from Brent Glass who authored a study last year about... about this very topic. He said, the most recent legislation regarding the Presidential Library and Museum contains a number of contradictions, no doubt the result of hasty drafting in the midnight hours. I'm convinced that if we looked every... locked everyone in a room for one day, we could produce results that would avoid the anguish of misquided legislation and build a strong future for the past. We need to sit down with the Governor's Office and get this hammered out. I would encourage people to vote 'no'. And I thank you for the time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "I have a letter here from, not from one of my constituents, but it includes one of my constituents in the names. And it says, the names listed above are former employees of the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum who left to inscape... escape the unprofessionalism, ineptitude, and machinations of the current director. Others are on the lookout for new employment or considering early retirement. The most recent escapee decided to retire because

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

of the... the absurdity and the profound incompetence. She is singlehandedly ruining this institution and its reputation. Her move to have the ALPLM, that's the Presidential Library and Museum, and IHPA split is not motivated by any thought of what is best for either. She is proving to her detractors that she has the power and clout to have it her way. Sadly, I don't think she knows or cares what her way is, just that she can make it happen. Why... why are we splitting these two currently? What... what is the reason for having these two split?"

Currie: "I'm sorry. Say the question again, please?"

Davidsmeyer: "What are the reasons for splitting the..."

Currie: "Well, there has been..."

Davidsmeyer: "...Presidential Library from..."

Currie: "...there's been terrible tension between the Historical Preservation Agency and the Library practically from day one. The Library actually has a bigger budget, a bigger operating budget than does the Historic Preservation Agency. Steve Beckett, who is a U of I faculty member and chairs the advisory board of the Museum, has testified several times before House Committees about how very much this whole arrangement needs to change. He came and told us that there should be a separation. The two agencies should not be housed under one roof. There ought not to be reports from the Museum to the director of this agency. Whether this is the right answer, I don't know, but as I say, our negotiations with the Governor's Office broke down over an issue that is not in this Bill rather than the decision to separate the Historic

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Preservation Agency from the Abraham Lincoln Library and Museum..."

Davidsmeyer: "And it sounds..."

And remember that under this Bill, the new..."

Davidsmeyer: "...It sounds to me like it's..."

Currie: "...and remember that under this Bill..."

Davidsmeyer: "...it sounds to me like it's..."

Currie: "...the new... there will be a new executive director appointed by the Governor of the Abraham Lincoln Library and Museum. So, whatever complaints people may have had in the past, there'll be a whole new opportunity for new blood for a different approach in that agency. Today there is no board; there's an advisory board. This measure creates a real board that will have some authority."

Davidsmeyer: "It... it sounds to me, from these letters and actually people that work there, that it's a battle of... of personalities as opposed to a battle of departments and what's best for these two groups."

Currie: "It's hard for us on the outside to know, but I want to remind you that Steve Beckett, the chair of the advisory committee to the Library and Museum, has testified before us several times that the agencies need to be separate. They need to be reporting in different ways to their own directors."

Davidsmeyer: "And I would argue..."

Currie: "And again, if there are complaints about management, I can only say that there will be new direction in that agency and presumably new in the Historic Preservation Agency, as well, or at least that is an option."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Davidsmeyer: "And I... I would argue that we pick and choose who we have come and testify. We don't bring in the people who are actually doing the day in, day out work. In this letter to the editor, this person states, the problem with IHPA and the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum for the last four years has been poor management at every level from Governor Quinn's Office on down. Two adults went to war and Illinois taxpayers lost. My concern is that we're doing this because of conflict of personalities instead of what's best for the State of Illinois. I urge a 'no' vote because we need to do what's best for the taxpayers. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, this issue was thoroughly vented before the State Government Administration Committee. Are you aware of the testimony that was given to that committee?"

Currie: "But I believe my Bill came out of the Executive Committee.

So I don't know that I was privy to the testimony in the State

Government Administration Committee."

Pritchard: "Well, I was hoping our chair of that committee might have shared that with you because we were very attentive to many of these issues and were very interested in the recommendation of the study panel that was created and that did give a report and came up with a different solution than what we have before us in this Bill."

Currie: "But what I can tell you is that it... the Governor's Office was working closely with us on the separation between the agency and the Library and Museum and what broke down did not

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

have to do with our proposed changes that is in 1728 before you, it had to do with a different issue and that was the issue of the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity and the ... the effort to create a public-private partnership and... and the thought that perhaps there should be a sunset because we want to find out how that works. So, the dispute with... you know, there are 15 different ways to run a railroad and I would not argue that this is the only way for us to deal with how you put together a Historic Preservation Agency and how you put together an Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum. There are many different ways to do it. But we know that what we had was dysfunction and this is a reasonable approach and Mr. Beckett, the chair of the advisory committee to the Library and Museum, said that he thought this might well work. Something has to change. We were open to other ways of doing business, but the Governor's Office was, as I say, perfectly comfortable with this approach until things broke down over an ancillary issue and it seems to me there's every reason to think this might... this certainly will end the dysfunctionality between those two agencies. And while there could be other ideas out there, those were not ideas that I saw."

Pritchard: "So one of the other issues that was brought up was the relationship between the Presid... Presidential Library and Museum and the foundation. They are two standalone organizations and ostensibly the foundation would be to raise money for the Museum operation. The state currently subsidizes the Museum at somewhere around \$10 million. Is that correct?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Currie: "That was the amount that we put into the budget Bill that we adopted... the... the statutory language we adopted yesterday, yes."

Pritchard: "Is it the vision..."

Currie: "And that's what we're currently doing."

Pritchard: "...is it the vision that this foundation will be working better with the Museum so that, like other Presidential Libraries that stand alone, the state doesn't have to put more money into it?"

Currie: "Well, in fact, my understanding is the foundation supports this Bill."

Pritchard: "Well, I hope that we'll also support the Museum."

Currie: "So, yeah. I'm sorry. My staff says that she's not sure that's totally accurate, but they are... they are... they're... they've seen the language and they are comfortable with it. So, their relationship won't change between the foundation and the Library and Museum."

Pritchard: "Well, I hope it will change to some degree because I don't think it's worked the best way. They've operated too independently in the past. The foundation needs to be dedicated to helping raise funding for the Museum so that we can continue our world-class Museum. If you look over the last four or five years, the attendance at the Museum has fluctuated and it's going in the wrong direction."

Currie: "I completely agree."

Pritchard: "And... and our \$10 million may grow if we're not better able to raise private funding for this Museum."

Currie: "And the foundation will continue to raise money privately to support the work of the Library and Museum."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Pritchard: "One of the other concerns that came up was that the state historian and all of our other state archives that are independent of Abraham Lincoln, are now going to come under the purview of the Abraham Lincoln Library. Is that your understanding?"
- Currie: "I... I think the rationale behind... First of all, let me just correct the record. I have just been told that the foundation does support this Bill. But secondly, in response to your specific question, we think that the historian belongs where the materials are and the materials are in the Library and in the Museum."
- Pritchard: "But we have many records and historic documents that go beyond Abraham Lincoln."
- Currie: "Of course. And I'm sure that the State Historian will work closely with the Historic Preservation Agency. And some of the things that have been transferred to the agency, some of the historic sites, I think will mean that there's a good... good reason for cooperation."
- Pritchard: "Well, we certainly need improvement. I'm just concerned that the Governor hasn't been fully engaged with you and I think we're going to need that..."
- Currie: "Well, he was engaged in another part of the Bill that's no longer in the Bill."
- Pritchard: "I... I just hope that we can have that kind of engagement because we need a Governor who's going to help oversee and make sure that people who are appointed here are taking care of a wonderful jewel that we have in Illinois."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to follow up with the previous speaker because we had I... at least two meetings for the State Government Administration Committee and we spent hours and hours on this and I personally spent hours and hours on this. And some of the previous speakers have talked about the dysfunction of what's going on at the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum. And that's exactly correct. And there is a huge problem there and I want to thank the Speaker for bringing this to our attention last year because, quite frankly, we voted on this about a year ago and I didn't know enough about it and I had voted 'no'. And to his credit, he allowed us to have some hearings to ... so we could get more information. So, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions on this as well. As it's ... as this is put together, your idea is to have a board of 7 members which would be appointed by the Governor."

Currie: "That would be the Historic Preservation Agency."

Franks: "Okay."

Currie: "And the Abraham Lincoln board, which would be a real board, not just an advisory board, it's an 11-member board, again, appointed by the Governor but confirmed by the Senate.

And then they would choose an executive director."

Franks: "Okay. So, there'd be two... you'd be separating the Historical Agency..."

Currie: "Yes."

Franks: "...from the Abraham Lincoln?"

Currie: "Right."

Franks: "Okay. Now, is there anything in the Bill that would deal with the foundation?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Currie: "There's nothing specific in the Bill, but the foundation would have the same relationship tomorrow as it does today with the Library and Museum. And as I just noted, the foundation supports this Bill."

Franks: "Well, some of the things the foundation had been doing was running the restaurant and the gift shop, but I think in this legislation that would go to the Library and take it away from the foundation. Is that correct?"

Currie: "That is correct, but they are in support of that..."

Franks: "Oh, I'm sure they would be. It's less work for them."

Currie: "Well, right. On the other hand, it frees them up to raise more money."

Franks: "Right."

Currie: "We like that."

Franks: "Right, absolutely. So, I think, going to their cor... their core issue, certainly there's been issues with the foundation as well. There's been politics played there. So, hopefully, this will... will be a wakeup call there as well. But one of the questions I have is, one of our appropriation Bills indicated that we allocated around \$10 million for the Library. Was it..."

Currie: "That's right. That was in the 'bimp' Bill... in the... the budget implementation Bill. And I believe it matches an appropriation. That's exactly what we gave the Lincoln Library and Museum in last year's budget."

Franks: "The fiscal note that I saw attached to this Bill though says that the cost will be over \$20 million..."

Currie: "And that was the silliest fiscal note I have ever seen.

I've been here a long time, but I've never seen anything that

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

is as misleading as that fiscal note. Because what the fiscal note says the money that is coming from all these other sources from the State Museum, for example, which gives out grants to museums across the state, it's as if that's new money. But in fact, all it is, is sent from this place to that. So that figure is just, on its face, ridiculous."

Franks: "So they counted it twice."

Currie: "They counted it... oh, three times I think."

Franks: "Okay."

Currie: "And it wasn't just that money, it was money from every place else. So treating everything as if it's new money even though it's old money that was in a different compartment."

Franks: "Okay. Now, let me ask, right now, what is your plan with the executive director? Would the executive director stay at the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum, the one that's current? Because when she came to the committee on State Government Administration she stated on the record that she would no longer be the executive director and I want to know if that's the plan."

Currie: "The board will make the determination and I have heard that also. I assume that meant that she was planning to retire. But in any case, it won't be her decision, it will be the decision of the board."

Franks: "Okay."

Currie: "But I did hear that testimony in your committee and I think that... that the... yes, the board will be choosing its own person."

Franks: "Now, when they separate these from... from the Historical Preservation Agency and create this new agency, which

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

employees would move over from the Historical side to the side of the Museum?"

Currie: "Only those that were doing work, operations work, within the Museum. And the same thing is true of the DNR people. Remember, we're moving the Dickson Mounds and several other things to the... the Historic Preservation Agency and the employees will move over to perform the same functions that they had done."

Franks: "And what about the backroom functions, 'cause some of the things I heard about cost savings is that HPA was doing some of the backroom functions for the Library..."

Currie: "And then, I assume they would move over as well."

Franks: "But I think they were shared."

Currie: "Yeah."

Franks: "I think they..."

Currie: "Well, there's no reason that agencies can't share activities like that..."

Franks: "Is that..."

Currie: "...if they choose to."

Franks: "Okay. That makes sense. Now, let me ask you about those that do move over. I'm reading in our... in our analysis. It said after... staff hired after the transfer shall not be subject to any applicable collective bargaining agreement."

Currie: "That was language that we took from the Governor and maybe we shouldn't have. But that's where it came from."

Franks: "So..."

Currie: "I mean, it basically in the future will look like a new agency."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Franks: "So, it'll look like a new agency. But those that are subject to collective bargaining now should..."

Currie: "They still would be. They still..."

Franks: "They still would be protected."

Currie: "Their... their collective bargaining rights are as it were grandfathered in."

Franks: "Okay. That... that was my question. There won't... We certainly need to do something because what we're doing now doesn't work. And my concern with the agency... or with the Museum is that I want it to be as relevant 50 years from now as it was... as it is today and as it was 10 years ago when we started. I want to make sure that it keeps going. I do have some concerns on how this is set up. I want to... I want to hear more of the debate, but I do appreciate the opportunity to bring this forward. And there may be more opportunities to work with the Governor's Office on some of their ideas as well, I presume, should this be going to the Senate."

Currie: "Thank you..."

Franks: "Thank you."

Currie: "...Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Some of this back and forth in dialogue is very interesting. Let me suggest it's a microcosm of what we're doing all day long, maybe with the State of Illinois, but this Session in particular. So there was an attempt to have a bipartisan path towards resolving some of the issues with these two boards. A bipartisan path was tried and then, unfortunately, it didn't work. I'm not casting aspersions, but instead of trying to continue to make it work,

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

the Party in charge of the Legislature is deciding to go it alone. It's bad practice. It's bad form and we know it's not going to ultimately resolve anything. This Bill will not resolve the problems associated with these two boards because it just won't. I wish... I wish the Lady would pull this from the board. I wish we'd let bipartisan collegial discussion about two important boards actually go forward in the manner in which it should. Not here, not now, but rather in a compromised environment. Unfortunately, because this is a partisan Bill I urge a strong 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Unes: "Representative Currie, just a couple of questions. I'm... I'm looking through this and in the analysis I see Dickson Mounds mentioned. And I was just wondering if you could fill me in on what conversations you've had with Dickson Mounds and... and what those conversations were about?"

Currie: "Yeah. I think that was an agreement between Members of the Senate and the Governor's Office. I think the theory here is that Dickson Mounds State Park has more value as a historical resource than part of the natural resources, which is what the Department of Natural Resources is all about."

Unes: "It's interesting because I just toured it, not long ago.

Representative Hammond and I both did and... and the Museum really borders both of our districts and we haven't talked to anyone about that and we just toured it with the director, not too long ago, and that conversation never came up. So I'm

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

just curious where that came from and why that's in this Bill."

Currie: "Well, I believe it was supported by the Governor and I think, in some ways, it came from him. And again, the reason for including it in this Bill is that there was a sense that this is part of our historic, cultural mission history and that it belonged more appropriately within the agency devoted to that historic ma... mission rather than the hiking and boating and fishing that tends to be the purview of the Department of Natural Resources."

Unes: "Did you by any chance have any discussions with Director Rosenthal on this?"

Currie: "I did not, but I'm sure the Governor did. At least, I would certainly assume that he did."

Unes: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I noticed that the... the new board of the Museum would be appointed by the Governor?"

Currie: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "And confirmed by the Senate?"

Currie: "There would be an 11-member board, as you say, appointed by the Governor, confirmed by the Senate."

Harris, D.: "But the executive director is simply confirm...

appointed by the Governor without Senate confirmation."

Currie: "No. In the... and for the Library and Museum, the executive director would be appointed by the members of the board, board members having already been confirmed by the Senate."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Harris, D.: "Yes. Excuse me."

Currie: "And appointed by the Governor."

Harris, D.: "I... I misread. I saw that it is a board appointment and for a four-year term does not require Senate confirmation.

I'm sure it's probably not contained in this Bill, but let me ask. Is there any requirement in this Bill that the executive director have certain qualifications?"

Currie: "Board members have to meet certain qualifications, but it is not specific as to the qualifications of the executive director."

Harris, D.: "Right. And... and if I may, and just briefly to the Bill. One of the problems in my estimation, and the previous... one of the previous speakers made reference to this, is that there, I think, is a serious issue about leadership at the ... at the Museum. It would be ... it would be great if the executive director was accredited and had a degree in library science. This is a jewel, a gem in the City of Springfield and in the ... in the State of Illinois that we need to make sure there's somebody at the top who knows how to run an institution of such greatness. I'm not sure that that's there now and I'd like to see the fact that the executive director meet certain criteria, at least have certain credentials which are not spelled out in the Bill. But I'd like to put that into the record that I think that would be an appropriate thing for the Governor to... to look at when they makes... if the Bill becomes law, if he makes that appointment. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "I'd like to give my time to Representative Butler."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Butler: "Leader Currie, I just had a couple of follow-up questions that came to my mind. What's the effective date of this legislation?"

Currie: "Immediate."

Butler: "So, we have an immediate effective date for a brand new agency. What's the... what's the..."

Currie: "Because..."

Butler: "...transition plan?"

Currie: "...because... because things have festered between those two agencies practically ever since the... the Library and Museum was created. And I don't think we can stand anymore dysfunctionality with respect either to the Historic Preservation Agency or to the operations of the Library and Museum."

Butler: "But there's no current transition plan. It... it would go into effect immediately."

Currie: "Yeah."

Butler: "For... for..."

Currie: "The employees will be in place. I'm not quite sure what you're looking for in terms of transition. There will be a time when the... the new members... the board members at the Historic Preservation Agency and the board members of the Library and Museum will be appointed and confirmed by the Senate. But that shouldn't take forever. I mean, I, you know..."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Butler: "To... to the Representative from East Peoria, his point about... about Dickson Mounds and you mentioned the fact that DNR has... should be facilities for fishing and hiking and things like that. There's a facility in... in my district that's a historic site..."

Currie: "Okay."

- Butler: "...New Salem, which I brought up in the Executive Committee, that is probably more state park than it is historic site. It has hundreds of acres of trails, and camping, and fishing, and boating on the Sangamon River. If we're moving Dickson Mounds into IHPA, why aren't we looking at moving New Salem to DNR?"
- Currie: "Well, I would say, let's look at it. Perhaps we overlooked the opportunity to switch from one agency to another at New Salem, but we certainly have the opportunity. We're a continuing Body. We have the opportunity to add or subtract whatever we've already done."
- Butler: "Which I think gets to my original point that the Governor's Office needs to be involved in these discussions."
- Currie: "And they were. And they were. I will say again, that the Governor, we were in constant communication with the Governor's Office. The Governor's Office was very comfortable with the language about the Museum and Library, very comfortable with the approach with the Historic Preservation Agency. Conversations broke down because we thought a sunset would be a good idea given that the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity is moving forward with untried... untested, private-public partnerships and the Governor's Office wouldn't agree."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Butler: "Very good."

Currie: "So, that's why that's not in this Bill, but in terms of the conversations we had with the Governor's Office, I do not remember any dispute over the treatment of the Historic Preservation Agency nor of the Abraham Lincoln Library and Museum."

Butler: "Very good, Leader. I appreciate your answers. I appreciate your concern on this issue. We're going to agree to disagree here. And again, Mr. Speaker, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Leader Currie, a few minutes ago with my colleague Representative Unes, you... in explaining how Dickson Mounds got into this whole mix, you mentioned that that started over in the Senate."

Currie: "Well, it was conversations from some Members of the Senate with the Governor's Office that resulted in that language."

Hammond: "Okay. And I'm just curious because my Senator, Senator Sullivan, has never brought it to my attention. We generally have open and honest conversations. I... I'm not..."

Currie: "Okay. I can't tell you which Members of the Senate."

Hammond: "Okay. And I appreciate that and certainly we'll follow up. But in addition to that, I know there's been conversations with DNR about the possible transfer of... of Dickson Mounds. I don't know if there were other... I'm just hearing this now from... from DNR, but in fact, they are not in support of this Bill. And are you aware of that?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Currie: "No, I'm not. You mean that DNR is not in support of this Bill?"

Hammond: "Right."

Currie: "Oops. Well, maybe they're not because the Governor has decided to withdraw his support over an issue that is not in the Bill."

Hammond: "Well..."

Currie: "So I would not be surprised if the instruction from the Governor's Office to all the agencies was to say oppose."

Hammond: "Well, I... just speaking for Dickson Mounds in particular, I think that DNR has done an incredible job for years, decades, with that site and it seems a shame that we would pull that from them at... at this point. So, I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. We had extensive conversations with the Governor's Office. What is in this Bill was clearly approved by the Governor. What he didn't approve was the disappearance from this measure of an ancillary issue. I know there are many different ways to run a railroad, but I do know the way that the operation of today's State Historic Prot... Agency and the Abraham Lincoln Library and Museum does not work. This is a proposal that has been suggested by various people including the chairman of the advisory committee to the... the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum. I think it's a reasonable way to go. And I would very much appreciate your 'aye' votes." Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed

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

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ammons. Please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2037. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2037, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2037, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the appropriation Bill for the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Aging, and the Department of Public Health. And in these budgets, as we said in our other... my other presentation the other day, we have given reductions in the personnel lines, in the grant lines, and the ... there are a couple major changes which I want to point out. In the Department of Aging, there is no longer any change to the determination of needs score or income eligibility for adults... senior citizens in the Community Care Program. In DCFS, this program restores funding for services and programs for wards of the state who are 18 to 21 years old. In the Department of Public Health, there is a slight increase over the Governor's introduced budget in the HIV/AIDS and the breast and cervical cancer program. tobacco Quitline is restored as is the sickle cell anemia

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

program. And an important thing that came up in our committee is the local Health Department distributive grants are held flat. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative Harris, are you aware of the status of the previous Bills, some of which you sponsored, others... other appropriations Bills sponsored by some of your brethren, the status of those Bills over in the upper chamber?"

Harris, G.: "I don't spend a lot of time over there, so..."

Sandack: "I don't blame you. But do you know what's going on with our... the appropriation Bills... the partisan appropriation Bills that have gone to the Senate? What is the status?"

Harris, G.: "I think the one that I sponsored passed out of the Senate and at some point will go to the Governor."

Sandack: "What about the other appropriation Bills? Do you know..."
Harris, G.: "I did not look those up. Honestly, I do not know."

Sandack: "Have you been told or have you heard that many of those appropriation Bills are basically the Pre... the Senate President put a Motion to reconsider on them?"

Harris, G.: "I did not know that."

Sandack: "Okay. To... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. That's something we can all look into is the status of these appropriation Bills. I suspect it is a larger game and a larger... I'm not using that word, Representative... structure that, unfortunately, we are mere pawns in. Well, actually, my friends on the other side of the... of the aisle are because these Bills will not vote... won't be going to the Governor soon and if they do go,

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

they're going to be vetoed. The process of passing partisan Bills is not going to get us over the goal line. We're not actually helping the people of the State of Illinois. We're not going to get things done for the people until and unless we work in a bipartisan fashion. This ain't it. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Thank you, Representative Harris. I just wanted to ask a couple questions. On the… on the Community Care Program, in this budget you have an increase, correct? Correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes, there is an increase, Representative."

Bellock: "Okay. Can you just explain... I know we've gone back and forth about the... the Human Services Fund..."

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

Bellock: "Oh."

Harris, G.: "If you... if you add up all the lines together, there are three lines. I'm just looking at my chart here. If you add all the CCP lines together, it is flat from FY15."

Bellock: "Flat from FY15?"

Harris, G.: "Yeah. If you add... there is three major grant lines in CCP, so it does get a bit confusing. So, I misspoke. It is flat funding."

Bellock: "Okay. So, but can you just explain, 'cause I know we've gone back and forth about the Human Service Fund, what's going on with that, because the Human Service Fund was what was created if this is, I think, was the one that was created during... with the income tax vote, the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Harris, G.: "So, this was a separate fund. It is fed from GRF. And so, essentially it's GRF money that, you know, I think eventually we will fold back into the regular GRF lines. So, it is. There's this major CCP line, the Community Care Program Administration and Services. There is the Commitment to Human Services Fund and then there's a Capitated Coordinated Care portion of the Commitment to Human Services Fund. But it's GRF."
- Bellock: "I'm not... Oh, I'm not clear. I thought that that was the fund, but maybe it's called the Human Service Recovery Fund.

 The one... there were two funds created when the income tax vote was passed through. I'm not sure."
- Harris, G.: "I think those are called the Commitment to Human Services Fund."

Bellock: "So, that's a different fund?"

Harris, G.: "That's the one that was created..."

Bellock: "Right."

Harris, G.: "...as part of the tax."

Bellock: "Does that have anything to do with this right now?"

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

Bellock: "'Cause..."

- Harris, G.: "Yes, there's some money that comes out of that fund, but that fund is fed from GRF, so essentially it's GRF funds."
- Bellock: "Okay. So, you're taking 345 million, is that correct, out of that fund?"
- Harris, G.: "413 from the main program, 346 million from the CCP mainline Commitment to Human Services Fund, and 100 million from the Community Care Program, Capitated Community Care Fund, which is part of the Commitment to Human Services Fund."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Bellock: "I guess the point I'm asking about that is I thought that we were putting money into that fund so that we could pay Medicaid bills so we could get federal match on that. And I'm not sure if it's going into..."
- Harris, G.: "The... the Capitated... I believe the Capitated Community

 Care Fund is Medicaidable. So, that's just one part of the

 hundred million."
- Bellock: "Okay. Then so, did the HIV/AIDS program receive an increase or a decrease regarding what the Governor's proposed budget was?"
- Harris, G.: "They received a... it is down from FY15, but it is up from the Governor's in... Governor's proposed budget."
- Bellock: "Okay. Thank you very much. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. We're just debating this Bill and there are some things in it that we would like to see have a discussion more on, but the way the budget has been handled this year, this is going into law now and so, in the overall scheme of the budget, of the \$3 billion increase, we will have no chance after this to have a discussion as to the things that all of us would like to see put in or taken out like we usually do in a regular debate on the Bill. So those are our concerns from our side of the aisle because this... all of this pertains to peoples' lives and we want to make sure that we protect the most vulnerable. So we wish we would have just had a chance to have made a final discussion on this and along with the Human Service agencies to be able to partake in this discussion too. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sente. Please take the record. There are 66 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2036, Mr. Harris. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2036, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2036, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is the final appropriations Bill from our committee. It has six... six departments. We could discuss them all separately for Representative Sandack. They are the smallest agencies including the Guardianship and Advocy... Advocacy Commission, the Human Rights Department, the Human Rights Commission. These agencies received some reduction, but we also gave them lump sum spending authority so that the department heads could manage most effectively with reduced resources. I would be happy to answer any questions."

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

Sandack: "To the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "To the Bill."

Sandack: "Yeah, to the Bill. I take issue with the Sponsor's comments that this is the last time this budget Bill will be discussed. This is just the beginning because this budget is

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

out of balance. It makes no sense. So this partisan stuff will continue. We'll get 68 or so votes on the board, but it doesn't mean a thing because it's not balanced. It doesn't make sense. And we will be back at it doing the peoples' work, the real peoples' work, soon enough. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to... I do want to thank Representative Harris for all the work that we've had on this. And these issues that are on here, as you can see, these are very, very important people. It comes from... well, developmental disabilities is federal, no money there, but the deaf and the hard of hearing, the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, the Human Commission, and the Hu... the Human Rights and the Human Rights Commission. These are all small agencies, but they're very, very important agencies. They have taken a reduction, but again, in the overall budget of which we did not get to participate that much in, we would have appreciated and we will move forward with trying to work on this budget. So, in the overall, we will be able to serve the people that need to be served but also look at how the budget in the State of Illinois, how we can bring a balance to what is now 3 billion over. Thank you very much, 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? Cloonen, Costello, Sente, Walsh. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

declared passed. Senate Bill 2035, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2035, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2035, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2035, this is the fourth of five appropriation Bills for General Services. It includes OMB, Court of Claims, Elections, Supreme Court, Supreme Court Historic Preservation Commission, the State Employee Retirement Services for operations only, the General Assembly Retirement System, as well as the Judicial Retirement System. Under this, Senate Bill 2035, OMB increases by \$3.1 million from other state funds for the Grant Accountability and Transparency Act, moneys that will be reimbursed back to the state through federal funds. The Court of Claims is coming in at the Governor's introduced which is the cut of \$2 million from fiscal year '15. State Board of Elections, same as fiscal year '15. Supreme Court, same as fiscal year '15. Supreme Court Historic Preservation Commission, same as fiscal year '15. The State Employee Retirement System, same as fiscal year '15, again, for operations only. And the General Assembly Retirement System and the Judiciary Retirement System are

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

being funded at the certified amount. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will... Sorry. Mr. Morrison with a late light. We'll recognize Mr. Morrison."

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

Morrison: "Representative Crespo, there's just one item I wanted to ask you about, the Supreme Court line item. Do you know how much is going to be spent on probation services?"

Crespo: "Give me one second, Representative. Representative, I know it's the same that we appropriated last year. Let me get that for you. Do you have second question so we can get set up and get back to you on this?"

Morrison: "On this Bill? No, that was my only question."

Crespo: "Okay. My understanding is we gave them a lump sum appropriation so the Supreme Court can decide how much they're going to spend on probations. I know the intent was to fund them the same we did last year for probations and they're so short, according to their account, by 20 million, 30 million dollars for probations."

Morrison: "So, what is that going to mean for us going forward?" Crespo: "Beg your pardon?"

Morrison: "All right. What will that mean going forward then if...
if they need more than we're going to appropriate to them?"

Crespo: "Well, they've always... they've always been short.

Actually, last year was perhaps when we hit the high water

mark for the last four years. Prior to that, they were getting

close to 40, 50 million dollars less than what they needed.

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- We were able to increase that close to 20, 30 million dollars last year, which is basically what we did this year as well."

 Morrison: "Okay. No further questions. I would just ask the Body for a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? He'll yield. Representative Crespo..."
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Sandack: "I just took my turn. Similar questions to what I asked your colleague before. Are you aware of what President Cullerton's done with some of the appropriation Bills over in the Senate?"
- Crespo: "The only appropriation Bills that I know of are these two that came from the Senate."
- Sandack: "No. I mean the ones that we sent from the House to the Senate."
- Crespo: "Oh, no. I don't know. I can't answer that."
- Sandack: "Okay. I'll just tell you that there... a lot of Motions to reconsider have been filed over there. You know, yesterday we changed our Motion to reconsider process, which was interesting. Do you expect your Bill to actually be... move to the... the Governor?"
- Crespo: "That's been the intention all along, as far as I'm concerned."
- Sandack: "All right. Do you expect he'll sign these budget Bills?"
- Crespo: "I think this is part of the process, Representative. I'm a little bit disappointed. A couple days ago when we were talking about the House Bills, I think you made a statement that you were going to file the budget Bill and..."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Sandack: "No, I said a... a budget Bill's coming. A budget..."

Crespo: "No, I thought you said you were going to file it? There's two day... two days left and I... according to my staff, we've run out of time. So, I'm disappointed that we won't have that second option to debate."

Sandack: "There's going to be... there's going to be options and I guarantee you there's going to be options. It just won't include spending 4, 3 billion more than the people of the State of Illinois have and so... in the aggregate. The... the budgets we're dealing with spend... or seek to spend 4 billion more than in our receipts. So, that's not going to work, right?"

Crespo: "You mean, the budget as proposed? I know it's short 3 or 4 billion dollars. And I know we've met with his staff, close to two or three weeks. Again, I'm disappointed that with two days left we haven't seen anything yet..."

Sandack: "Well..."

Crespo: "...to follow the process as we normally would."

Sandack: "I... I suspect... well, you know, it's hard for a Republican to get a Bill out of Rules sometimes, Fred. I know that may shock you, but look, I appreciate your effort. I know you're sincere. I suspect we'll be doing this real soon in a different format. Obviously, to my colleagues that care about revenues and expenditures meeting... that care about us actually undertaking a budget structure that makes sense. They care about not overtaxing our residents that care about actually restoring some Illinois pride and some fiscal dignity, you'll vote 'no'. Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harris, Hoffman, Jones. Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2034, Mr. Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2034, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2034, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 2034 is the last of the appropriation Bills for General Services. Senate Bill 2034 includes the Department of Revenue, the Executive Ethics Commission, the Inspector General, Procurement Policy Board, PTAB or Property Tax Appeal Board, and Racing. For Revenue on the GRF side, it's the same as fiscal year '15. The Executive Ethics Commission, it's at a smaller GRF decrease, which is offset by other state funds. The Inspector General is at the Governor's introduced, which is a cut of \$459,300 from fiscal year '15. The Procurement Policy Board is at the Governor's request for an increase of 10,700 for operations. PTAB has also come in at the Governor's introduced amount. The Racing Board is the same as the Governor's introduced. And Revenue

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

is at the fiscal year '15 level. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Morrison: "Representative Qes... Crespo, the only question I did have for you is for the Department of Revenue line item."

Crespo: "Yes."

Morrison: "For other funds, it shows an increase of 10 percent. Is that accurate?"

Crespo: "Give me one second. We do have... yes, we do have an in...
You're right."

Morrison: "Okay. Is that due to any changes in the Local Government Distributive Fund?"

Crespo: "No, it's a... it's a combination of things. We have the Housing Development Authority. There's an \$8 million increase. We have the foreclosure prevention line item there's a \$6 million increase. I think the biggest increase was \$38 million for the Use Tax Refund. There was a couple other items that make up the difference."

Morrison: "Okay. No further questions. Again, I would ask the Body for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I noticed that this Bill has the portion of the budget that deals with the Department of Revenue. I can't help but think that perhaps maybe we should perhaps consult with the Department of Revenue before going on to find out maybe what our revenues are before passing this unbalanced and unconstitutional budget. This

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

budget has over \$5 billion in spending that we don't have. Spending billions of dollars over our revenues that we don't have. My question is, why stop there? Why not pass a budget that has 10 billion or 20 billion dollars over what we have? What's it matter? What difference does it make? If at the end of the day the money's not there, why not pass a budget that's a hundred billion dollars? It doesn't matter. It's very easy to legislate when the truth doesn't matter. And that's what we're doing here. We're passing a budget that is based on lies. And what we're doing is we're using our children, we're using sick people, we're using elderly as pawns. And it is a very cruel game. And it's a very sad game what's happening. Politicians, because of this game, are looking good at the taxpayer's expense. At the end of the day, all that's going to happen is the same thing that just happened several weeks ago here in this Body. Because last year, at about this time, this side of the aisle was saying we don't have the money and the money's going to run out. And when the money runs out, we're going to be back here trying to do an emergency Bill to refund it. And that's what we're going to end up doing next year at the same time. This is a sham. This is a game. And it's very cruel what we're doing to our children, to our sick people, to our elderly and these games need to end and they need to end now."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. An inquiry of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative Crespo, are you aware that one of your colleagues just filed a Motion to reconsider on the previous budget Bill?"

Crespo: "No, I'm not."

Sandack: "Had anyone consulted you about doing that?"

Crespo: "I'm the small guy on the totem pole here..."

Sandack: "Yeah."

Crespo: "...Representative. I'm not in Leadership like you so."

Sandack: "All right. Thank you. To the Bill. I would commend the previous speaker with respect to the farce that this process really is and the fact that peoples' lives are implicated because it's nice to tell people we're going to fund certain agencies, we're going to fund certain projects and build up some false expectations when we simply don't have the money to do everything. And the exercise of actually prioritizing and going through a budget in a meticulous manner and in a bipartisan manner simply has been missed. Hopefully, when we get back to it, we'll go through those steps in the right way. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. A couple things based on previous speakers. No, this is not a game. It is scary though and that... that I do admit. But what's scary is that the Governor and his administration proposed a budget Bill, which is also short by at least \$3 billion. We admit on this side that this one is short as well and we need to continue having this conversation, but to attack our side and say that our budget is short and not talk about the Governor's proposed budget, it doesn't make any sense to me and people are getting scared.

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

I get it... they're getting scared 'cause they don't know what their future holds, but they're even more scared when they look at the Governor's proposed. And as I mentioned earlier, I'm a little bit disappointed because a couple of days ago a statement was made that a Bill was going to be filed with the Governor's proposed budget and with only two days left... well, counting today it's three... I checked with staff, we haven't seen anything yet. And we talk about the process, this is part of the process. We know we're not done yet; we admit that on our side. Hope we will continue working together and reconcile what we need to reconcile here. So, with that, I ask for a 'yes' vote and thank you for your time."

- 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? Hays. Please take the record. 66 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Batinick."
- Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a fine time for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Any time is a fine time, Sir."
- Batinick: "I just... I would just like to recognize the slightly less follicly challenged Batinick brother, Dave Batinick, up in the gallery. Right there now, Dave, if you can wave to everybody."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 2033, Mr. Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2033, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2033, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 2033 is an appropriations Bill for the Department of Transportation, Workmen's Compensation, and Employment Retirement System. Illinois IDOT budget is the Governor's introduced level with the following exceptions. The OFF Downstate Trans... Transit Line were also in... increased by the current required 10 percent increase by FY15. The RTA reduced fares is funded at the FY16 appropriations levels at 17 million, 3... 3,800,000 Road Fund for the total of \$8 million. The state match for the RTA sales tax funded at FY15 appropriations levels. Amtrak operations assistance funds also appropriations at the level at \$42 million. The Latino Family Commission is also funded at the postsupplemental level at 733 thousand. And the... the Grade Crossing Protection Fund is also appropriated at... at the FY15 level. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, does this budget or appropriation Bill, is it larger or smaller than last year's 2015?"

Arroyo: "This is supposed to be a flat budget. We're considering it as a flat budget."

Sandack: "From last year?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Arroyo: "Yes."

Sandack: "And was last year's... did... do we have enough money to fund all the items in 2015?"

Arroyo: "I think it was a little higher, Representative."

Sandack: "But did we fund all those items as originally budgeted?"

Arroyo: "Well, I think we did, then we're trying to."

Sandack: "I didn't hear you, Louie."

Arroyo: "I said I think we did, but we're trying to fund it."

Sandack: "And you... you might have heard me ask some of your colleagues previously, you had some House Bills that you sponsored that went over... some spending Bills that went over to the Senate. Do you know what happened to them in the Senate?"

Arroyo: "No, I really don't."

Sandack: "All right."

Arroyo: "I don't..."

Sandack: "Do you..."

Arroyo: "...I don't hang out over there too much."

Sandack: "You don't care what they do?"

Arroyo: "Well, I care 'cause it affects us, but I... I don't... I don't hang out there too much."

Sandack: "All right. Maybe it'd surprise you to know that some of those Bills there's a Motion to reconsider on them over at the Senate. Do you expect the package of these appropriation Bills to actually be sent to the Governor?"

Arroyo: "I hope so."

Sandack: "And do you expect him to sign this out of balance... \$4 billion or so out of balance budget?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Arroyo: "Well, I... I think the Governor's been unpredictable. I couldn't say what he's going to do."

Sandack: "Well, if you were the Gov..."

Arroyo: "So, I would hope. I would hope he would sign them."

Sandack: "You would hope he would sign them?"

Arroyo: "Yeah."

Sandack: "And how would we pay for all the 4... 3 or 4 billion out of balance projects and agencies?"

Arroyo: "Ron, we talked about this... we talked about this in the last..."

Sandack: "We did?"

Arroyo: "...Bills that we passed. And we talked about we would like to sit down and hope that we could..."

Sandack: "Do you..."

Arroyo: "...come to agreement and try to work together."

Sandack: "I mean, do you think this... do you think this Gov... do you think we should pass a tax increase, Lou?"

Arroyo: "I believe some of your Members is trying to have me to say that. I'm not at liberty to talk about that. I want to sit down with you and work something out..."

Sandack: "I get it, but if we're 3 or 4 billion..."

Arroyo: "...to look for a revenue enhancement or revenue stream so we can pay for this."

Sandack: "So, why are we spending money we don't have? Why aren't we doing this together? Revenue, spending, making sure we have a balanced budget."

Arroyo: "You're cor..."

Sandack: "Doesn't that make sense?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Arroyo: "You're correct. You're correct. But what we're trying to do is pass a budget line... a budget Bill to get out of the House. Once we get it out of the House, we could come back and negotiate probably a financial stream to pay for this at a later date."

Sandack: "To... to the Bill. As... as the previous appropriation Bills were out of whack, this, too, is also out of balance. The idea that we're going to actually propose 3 or 4 billion more in spending than the state has is not a budget. It's more of the same. It makes no sense. We shouldn't be doing this. Families and businesses in Illinois do not act like this. This needs to stop. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, when we were making this budget in the Public Safety Committee, did we ever pull out and look at contingent liabilities that the lines in your budget make up?"

Arroyo: "No."

Kay: "I'm sorry?"

Arroyo: "I don't recall."

Kay: "Well, was it a no or I don't recall?"

Arroyo: "I think it was I don't recall."

Kay: "Yeah. I do... I don't think anybody remembers looking at contingent liabilities in any budget. So, how do you make a budget if you don't look at your liabilities? How do you do that?"

Arroyo: "Is that a question?"

Kay: "Sure is."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Arroyo: "I think that we always consider a liability when we're drafting a budget and a program."

Kay: "Well, that's... that's good. What were our contingent liabilities that you brought to the committee and outlined for us so that we wouldn't make the same mistakes that we made the past 13 years? Na... just name one or two or five. How many... how many ever you recall."

Arroyo: "We... we took a hard look at what the Governor proposed and that's what we're considering. So, we had talked about... yesterday we talked about bipartisan. So, we look forward to working what... the same way we did on that Bill yesterday that we brought back and we reconsidered and brought it back. We've got to sit down and negotiate and try to come to an agreement to pass this Bills."

Kay: "Okay. So, we... we didn't consider a big piece of budget making, which is looking at what the contingent liabilities of the Public Safety Approps were, but that's okay because we didn't do it in any other Approps Committee either and I sit on two. We didn't do it on any of them. So, I just wanted to get that into the record to make sure that the general public understands that we didn't, again, do our job. So, let me ask you this. On Tuesday, when I mentioned the fact that we've had 13 consecutive years of unbalanced budgets, I asked the question, as has been asked many times, how do you intend to pay for the increases? And I'm going to ask you today, how do you intend to pay for the increases in this budget..."

Arroyo: "We are going to be..."

Kay: "...your budget?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Arroyo: "We are going to be sitting down with both sides to figure out a revenue source, may it be gaming or any other way to be able to find money to pay for it. We have to sit down and talk about it. We have to sit down and talk about it with the Leaders and the Governor and hope that you could be in that meeting..."

Kay: "So..."

Arroyo: "...to... to come up with some ideas on how to pay for this..."

Kay: "Yeah."

Arroyo: "...and find a new revenue."

Kay: "So, there was several Representatives who made the comment that this week we'd see a revenue source coming to the floor. Where is that revenue source?"

Arroyo: "I didn't... I didn't hear that correct, Dwight. Can you repeat that, please?"

Kay: "Yes, I'd be happy to. Comments were made on Tuesday when I mentioned that we didn't have, for the 12, 13 previous years, we didn't have a balanced budget, we didn't have one this year, that you were going to bring... you weren't, Louie... but your Party was going to bring a revenue source to the floor. My question is, where is it?"

Arroyo: "Well, Representative, I don't remember that, but we've always had, in the last three years, we've always had a surplus. So, I don't remember that conversation about the..."

Kay: "We al... we always have a what?"

Arroyo: "In the last three years, we've always had a surplus. But as far as that conversation that you said that we were going to bring a revenue source to the floor, I don't remember that conversation. That wasn't from me."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Kay: "So, we don't... we don't know anything about contingent liabilities. You're spending more money than we've got, as we've done all week. My question to you just is this, where's the beef? Where's the money? Where is it?"

Arroyo: "You sound like you work for Wendy's."

Kay: "Hey, I... I'm just asking questions."

Arroyo: "I would be happy to answer that, Dwight, but I'm really not sure. But we're looking forward to sitting down..."

Kay: "You're really not sure where the money's coming from, are
you?"

Arroyo: "Right. Where the revenue..."

Kay: "Right."

Arroyo: "...stream is coming from, but we're going to sit down and try to work it out."

Kay: "So, we're going to pass a spending Bill and we're going to hope to find, somewhere, \$4 billion after... after you told us that there'd be a revenue source coming to the floor this week. And my question is..."

Arroyo: "Who told you that?"

Kay: "...where's the beef?"

Arroyo: "Dwight, who told you that there was going to be a revenue..."

Kay: "All I want to know is, where's the beef?"

Arroyo: "It wasn't me. But when the beef comes, I'll... I'll make sure you know where the beef is at."

Kay: "All right. Well, Louie, again, terribly in... disingenuous, a fraud when it comes to budget making. We can't add or subtract. We certainly have no respect for the budgeting process. And for you to stand here and tell me you're going

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

to spend more money and you have no idea, none whatsoever, not a clue, where the next dime's going to come from is a disservice to the general public and this Body. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cabello: "Representative, I have two questions for you. One, the downstate public transportation operating assistance grants are increased from fiscal year '15. Is the increase due to the increased revenue from the sales tax portion they receive or from another source?"

Arroyo: "A statutory mandate at 10 percent increase."

Cabello: "Okay. And my last question for you, Sir. The subsidy that Amtrak receives from the state is the same as fiscal year '15..."

Arroyo: "I believe..."

Cabello: "...but higher than the Governor's proposal. Were you... how will this increase..."

Arroyo: "I think that's staying flat."

Cabello: "...over the Governor's proposal impact IDOT's multiyear plan?"

Arroyo: "I think the Amtrak is staying flat as I... FY15."

Cabello: "Okay. That's... Let me... let me read this for you one more time, Representative. The subsidy that Amtrak receives from the state is the same as fiscal year '15, but higher than the Governor's proposal. How will this increase over the Governor's proposal impact IDOT's multiyear plan?"

Arroyo: "I am not aware that it was... would have no impact in the multiyear plan."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Cabello: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Mr. Chairman, just one quick question for you. I understand that this is the plan that your committee has put together. During the planning process to come up with this number, did all Members have access to participate in this process and offer numbers contrary to what you have?"

Arroyo: "No. We haven't gotten no contrary numbers to what we have."

Ammons: "And so, there were no Members of the other side of the aisle who said, we want to reduce a certain line item or here's my suggestion for this particular committee. Did that happen at all in this committee?"

Arroyo: "No."

Ammons: "Thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Hays. Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Leader Currie for a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that HJR82 can be heard in Appropriations-Public Safety, HR527 in Community College Access, HJR80 in House Economic Development, Senate Bill 1717 in Executive, House Resolution 526 in Human Services, Senate

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Bill 1281 in Labor, House Resolutions 531 and 536 in Revenue, HJR78, 79, and 81 in Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges, Senate Joint Resolution 11 in Transportation: Vehicles & Safety, and House Resolution 521 in the Veterans Committee."

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there leave? There being no objection, leave is granted. The Lady's Motion carries and the posting requirements are waived. The Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Durkin: "In the previous two budget votes we've just taken up, one of the... the Gentleman from Hoffman Estates made a comment the fact that the Governor's budget wasn't filed. There's nothing that the Governor's Office has presented to the General Assembly. I just want to make sure that people realize that on... on February 20 of this year, the day after the Budget Address, House Bills 2842 through 2912, under my sponsorship, are the Governor's budget Bills. Let's be very clear about that when we have this debate over the next few days. The Bills are out there. They were filed. They were filed in a timely time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2032, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2032, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2032, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Senate Bill is another appropriation Bill, 2032. Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board, which doesn't have no GRF. Metropolitan Pier Expansion Authority, Military Affairs, the Illinois Power Agency, Prisoner Review Board, Southwestern Development Authority, Sports Facility, State Police, State Police Merit Board. The Metropolitan Expansion Authority funded at the Governor's recommended level. Exceptions are as follows: an \$8 million line that was eliminated in the Governor's level restored to FY15. The line of Choose... for Choose Chicago that was paid by for that trans... Tourism Fund was eliminated. DCEO budget, the Governor's proposed appear ... appears that it is budgeted at the FY14 level at \$2.6 million. The Department of Military Affairs is funded at the Governor's recommended level. Except... exceptions of the grant for the Veterans' Assistance Commission of Cook County which at FY15 supplemental levels draft. GRF transfers into the Illinois Military Relief Fund is also not presented at this draft because the agency says that the demand has declined which is result in that fund has a healthy balance that the transfer is not necessarily the result. The Prisoner Review Board is funded at FY proposed supplemental levels that is also operated lump sum of \$1.2 million and is part of the Governor's request in order to comply with the outstanding consent decree. The Southwestern Illinois Department (sic-Development) Authority is funded at Illinois Governor's

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

proposed level of 1.3 million. Debt Services, the State Police, GRF operation line are lump... lumped at a level of 1.9 million more than FY15 operation level. Illinois State Police overall G... GRF 4... 4 million less than the Governor's proposed... all other lines of the Governor's recommended levels with the following exceptions. Seventy-five million is provided for the Illinois State Police anticipates January 1 take... time... time won't... takeover the distribution of 9... 9/11... 911 surcharge to 911 systems outside the City of Chicago. I'll ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor's proud to yield."

Cabello: "Mr... Representative Arroyo, you might want to check that microphone. I couldn't hear any of what was going on."

Arroyo: "I got... I got a cold. I can't hardly... I got the Frank flu."

Cabello: "Would you read... repeat it again for us, then?"

Arroyo: "I got the... I got the Frank flu and I can't speak too much so."

Cabello: "Would you repeat it again for us then, please?"

Arroyo: "You want me to go over it again. I'd be happy to do that, John."

Cabello: "Thank you."

Arroyo: "The Metropolitan Pier Expansion Authority is funded at the Governor's recommended level and excepted... exception of the following: an 8 million... 8 million 90... \$8.9 million line that was eliminated and the Governor's level restored at FY15 level. At this draft, the line of Choose Chicago that was paid from local trans... Tourism Fund was eliminated from DCEO

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

budget until the Governor's proposed appears in the budget at the FY14 appropriations level at \$2.6 million. The Department of Military Affairs is funded at the Governor's recommended level with exceptions from the grant at the Veterans' Assistance Commission in Cook County, which is a FY15 postsupplemental level draft. GRF transit into mili... Illinois Military Family Relief Fund is also not presented in this draft because the agency says that demand has declined which has resulted in the fund having healthy balance. The transit is not necessary for the result. The Prisoner Review Board is This is FY15 postsupplemental levels. operational lump sum of \$1.4 million and part of the Governor's request complies with the outstanding consent decree. The Southwestern Illinois Department Development) Authority is funded at the Governor's proposed \$1.3 million debt services. The State Police GRF operational line in a lump sum at the level of \$1.9 million more than the original recommendation level. The State Police GRF appropriations is at 1... \$4.4 million less than the Governor's proposed. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Did you hear that, John?"

- Cabello: "Not really. Maybe you could get that to us in writing 'cause maybe it's the noise level in this room, but I did not. I just have a couple..."
- Arroyo: "Look, John, it's in the Bill. So, if... I could come over to you and show it to you, if you want. But I think it's my voice goes in and out."
- Cabello: "I just have a couple questions for you, Sir. Is... in the proposed for the State Police, is there any type of cadet classes that are funded?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Arroyo: "No, no. It's... we put it... I think that the State Merit Board wanted this cadet class because they wanted to put it in that 166 Fund."

Cabello: "Okay. And my last question for you on this is, why is the Department of Military Affairs being reduced by 3.1 percent?"

Arroyo: "That's at the Governor's introduced level; we put it in."

Cabello: "So, you're going to take some of what he wants but not all of what he wants?"

Arroyo: "Right."

Cabello: "Well, I think that's a bad one to take."

Speaker Lang: "To Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill. I won't ask the Gentleman to reread the script. We were subjected to it twice. And Louie, no offense, but I don't even know half of what we're doing here. The process is absolutely a mess. And I... I suspect soon after this Bill passes with 66 or 67 votes, Leader Currie will quickly file a Motion to reconsider just as she's done on SB2034, 35, 36, and 37 belying the whole waste of time we are undertaking here. 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? Please take the record. There are 65 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: recommends

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1672; recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution #10."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2031, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2031, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2031, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is another appropriation Bill, Senate Bill 2031. State Fire Marshal is at the Governor's proposed level. The Juvenile Justice Inquiry Board is funded at FY15 postsupplemental levels. The Department of Juvenile Justice operations are a lump sum of 135 million. The total GRF appropriations for the agency is 1.4 million less than the Governor's proposed level, which is about one percent lower. The Department of Labor is funded at the Governor's proposed level and is presented that to reduce appropriation level of FY15 supplemental funding levels. The department feels... feels it is equipped to handle the reduced level funding. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Cloonen. Please take the record. There are 66

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2030, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2030, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time... second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2030, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2030 simply is an appropriations Bill for operations and grant lines to the State University Civil Service System and the State University Retirement System as well as the Community College Health Insurance Program. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "Representative, I'm not going to get into too much 'cause we hit this a couple days ago again, but I just wanted to go over the numbers again. Do you... can you recall for everyone how much more per full-time equivalent student we spend versus the national average?"

Dunkin: "No."

Batinick: "Okay. Is that a... is that a concern of yours?"

Dunkin: "No."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Batinick: "Okay. We spend \$12,293 per full-time equivalent student versus the national average just over \$6500. So, clearly there... there's some efficiencies, and I won't drown you again on everything, but we've had several... several of the colleges have spoken about procurement costs and the potential to save maybe tens of even... or even a hundred million dollars because of how difficult it is for them to buy things from Central Management Services. Do you recall that in debate?"

Dunkin: "No."

Batinick: "Okay. Maybe I'll send the committee tapes back over to you. House Bill 4215 is a Bill that I introduced that would potentially provide some relief for universities and save them some money so that maybe we could put more money in the classroom instead of in the process. Would that be something you... you could join me in doing?"

Dunkin: "No."

Batinick: "Okay. To the Bill. Clearly... clearly, there's one side of the aisle that does not want to make any changes to where our money's being spent in higher education. I think it's important that we try to keep kids in this state. We're not doing a good job of that right now. We have a net export of 16,500 kids per year. I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cavaletto: "Representative, could you let me... or tell me about the veterans' grants. How much revenue are we going to spend there this year?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Dunkin: "Those were in the previous Bill a few days ago. They're in an upcoming Bill in 2029. And we..."

Cavaletto: "2029, yes."

Dunkin: "Senate Bill 2029."

Cavaletto: "All right. Excuse me. Then I'll get back with you on the next one."

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 record yourselves. Cavaletto, Williams. Please take the record. There are 65 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Sandack is recognized."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order. Under Rule 65, I'm asking that the Motion to reconsider filed by Leader Currie on SB2034 be taken by the Body as a whole and I ask for a recorded vote on that, please."

Speaker Lang: "Sir, that's her Motion to make, not yours."

Sandack: "It is not. The Motion to reco... any Member, during the last three days of April, may... may request that... or during Veto Session, may request and move on a vote to reconsider and be taken immediately, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Did you say the last days of April?"

Sandack: "May, excuse me."

Speaker Lang: "We'll get back to you on that Motion, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you. I..."

Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 2029, Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2029, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2029, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2029 simply provides FY16 operations and grant line appropriations to Chicago State University, Governors State University, Northeastern Illinois University, and the Illinois Community College Board. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cavaletto: "Thank you. Representative, again, I wanted to speak to the veterans' grants, the amount of money that was put into revenue for that. Would you please give me that number?"

Dunkin: "The Illinois Veterans' Grant allocation level is level with '15 postsupplemental. Bear with me. Let me get that specific number for you, Representative."

Cavaletto: "Could it be 1.2 million?"

Dunkin: "That's about right."

Cavaletto: "Okay. How are those funds divi... divided?"

Dunkin: "How are these funds provided?"

Cavaletto: "Yes. How are... how are you... how do you divide those... those funds up among the colleges?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Dunkin: "The... Clarify your question. How do the funds work?"

Cavaletto: "No. How are they divided among... And how many... how many community colleges are we talking about?"

Dunkin: "Well, 19 community colleges across the state."

Cavaletto: "How many?"

Dunkin: "About 19."

Cavaletto: "Nineteen. Then how's the money divided up?"

Dunkin: "There's a formula, Sir."

Cavaletto: "What is the formula?"

Dunkin: "Let me give you those specifics. The formula's based off of the… it's a break… I have a breakout of those colleges that receive tuition and it is based off those veterans who apply."

Cavaletto: "I see the numbers, Representative, but I... I see that you... there are some... some of the community colleges are left out. Our veterans are veterans throughout the State of Illinois, are they not?"

Dunkin: "Representative, we barely..."

Cavaletto: "Well, I..."

Dunkin: "...have enough money to fund this particular line item for them."

Cavaletto: "But my question was veterans are veterans throughout the State of Illinois."

Dunkin: "Representative, over 50 percent of these schools that are funded for the vet... Illinois Veterans' Grants are in Republican districts."

Cavaletto: "I don't care. Republicans, Democrats, Independents, any, I don't care. I'm not talking about that, Representative.

I'm talking about schools like my district in case... Kaskaskia

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

College, Lakeland College, and Rend Lake College. There's no funds for those veterans. That's what I'm speaking to. And I think a veteran down in southern Illinois and a veteran in northern Illinois are... a veteran's a veteran. And I think they're entitled... all these community colleges are entitled to some funds for the veterans in their districts. And Representative, that wasn't the case last year and it's not the case this year because you kept the funds at the same level and the same distribution areas without... Did you take numbers or did you take a... a number... did you find the number was equal in all of the districts the same way of veterans?"

Dunkin: "Representative, I agree wholeheartedly with you.

Unfortunately, we simply do not have enough money to fund all of the schools and we're... actually, this list is from last year. And..."

Cavaletto: "Yeah, I realize that. That's why I'm complaining because my districts didn't get it... we didn't get any veterans money. And my college Presidents are saying, hey, what's wrong? We... we got our veterans too. Shouldn't we be able to look... have some funds for them?"

Dunkin: "So, are you for us increasing the line, Representative?" Cavaletto: "I'm for dividing that 1.2 million up equally to... with all the schools. Equally, equally."

Dunkin: "I don't have a... I don't have a..."

Cavaletto: "Equally."

Dunkin: "I don't have a problem with that."

Cavaletto: "You do?"

Dunkin: "I do not have a problem with that. So, if we do that..."

Cavaletto: "What?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Dunkin: "...that means you're going to... 'cause every year you voted against the budget."

Cavaletto: "Well, take this part out..."

Dunkin: "So, we... so, if we... if we add..."

Cavaletto: "Take it out of the record because..."

Dunkin: "So, you're saying if we add your college, your three colleges, you'll vote for this budget? "Cause you..."

Cavaletto: "I'm... I'm saying to take the money, the 1.2 million..."

Dunkin: "...you've never voted for the veterans..."

Cavaletto: "...and you said there's 19."

Dunkin: "...and their school."

Cavaletto: "I think there's 33 colleges, are there not? I think there's 33 community colleges..."

Dunkin: "If we change..."

Cavaletto: "Thirty-two?"

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Cavaletto: "Forty."

Dunkin: "Fifty, roughly."

Cavaletto: "No, there's 40."

Dunkin: "If we... if we change the formula or these schools, would you support this Bill?"

Cavaletto: "I... how can you change the formula on veterans? A veteran is a veteran."

Dunkin: "We have... absolutely. I have family members..."

Cavaletto: "A veteran is a veteran, Representative, and every one...
every one of the veterans deserve to have the privilege of
going to their community college and receiving one of these
grants. But you've chosen to select only a few."

Dunkin: "Mr... Representative."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Cavaletto: "Yes. You've chosen..."

Dunkin: "I have..."

Cavaletto: "...to select..."

Dunkin: "I did not..."

Cavaletto: "You selected it. You selected it."

Dunkin: "I did not. I have a brother who is a Marine. I have another brother who is in the Air Force, active duty."

Cavaletto: "And thank you... thank you for that."

Dunkin: "I have an uncle who was killed in the military."

Cavaletto: "Thank you for that."

Dunkin: "The staffer, Mark Jarmer, is a veteran. We are proveterans here. Now, I did not accumulate this list. The Illinois Community College Board accumulated this list. Now, you have never, not one time, raised an issue and during committee time on all of the schools receiving these dollars. You wait until we get on the floor and you're trying to making it seem... seem as if I'm or this committee is against veterans?"

Cavaletto: "I think last year, when I was on... on that committee, I did say something to you..."

Dunkin: "You think?"

Cavaletto: "Yes, I did and you know what you did to me? You pointed your finger at me and you said, Representative, your school will be taken care of."

Dunkin: "You think?"

Cavaletto: "Do you remember that, Representative?"

Dunkin: "You think?"

Cavaletto: "I remember that, definitely."

Dunkin: "I don't remember that."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Cavaletto: "But rather... rather I... didn't..."

Dunkin: "Are you going to vote for the Bill if we put your schools in? Is that what you're saying?"

Cavaletto: "That what? You didn't take care of it. It wasn't there."

Dunkin: "Representative, I try to accommodate as many Members as we possibly can."

Cavaletto: "Okay. I..."

Dunkin: "And I would have loved..."

Cavaletto: "Here's... here's a way I think..."

Dunkin: "I have..."

Cavaletto: "Here's a way I think we can do this. I think you take that 1 million 259 and divide it up evenly among all the colleges for the... give everybody a little of the money."

Dunkin: "I don't have a problem with that. I do not have a problem with that, Representative."

Cavaletto: "Thank you very much."

Dunkin: "You're welcome."

Cavaletto: "To the Bill. I still think... I still think that we take the dollars, divide it up evenly among all the veterans and all the schools in our state and give them a little piece of the pie. And if they don't use it at one college, send it to another. And I think that's the way to do it. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Ford: "Representative Dunkin, you know, the previous speaker's onto something. He said we should be fair in every neighborhood."

Dunkin: "Yes, he did."

Ford: "I agree with him because my community needs fairness too and so do yours."

Dunkin: "Absolutely."

Ford: "And this budget and every budget should change to be fair to the people on the west side, the south side of Chicago, and rural Illinois, everywhere. So, I agree with him, but I really want to impact on the west side. Thank you."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Chapa LaVia: "Chairman Dunkin, how do the schools supply the veterans with their needs when there isn't a specific line item for them for veteran grants?"

Dunkin: "Representative, there is not... I want the Body to hear this. There is not one, not one... let me say it a third time... not one Illinois veteran who is dismissed or discounted or that does not receive an Illinois grant. There are multiple grants in the State of Illinois. Every veteran in this state who applies for a grant, whether they're in this 1.2 line... this is just a little 'ol 1.2 line out of almost \$2 billion budget. They receive federal grant dollars. We have several other grant programs that they receive. This is just a formula of which certain community colleges receive reimbursement.

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Every single veteran in the State of Illinois receives veteran grants of some level, not just with this one particular line." Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Thank you, Sponsor. To the Bill. Also, just so everybody knows, some of our community colleges provide veterans with those amenities and take it on the chin. So, there's not one community college that would turn a veteran away. Okay? And in the mix of things, when you look at the appropriations for higher ed, you got to look at all their different silos in which they contain money and get money. And I agree with one of my counterparts over there about doing a little bit more budgeting for the dollars they do receive, but to my knowledge, and being in the General Assembly now 13 years and being appropriation chair for Elementary & Secondary Ed and being Veterans vice... Minority chair or vice chair with McAuliffe and now being the chair, I have never heard of one university or community college that turns away a veteran on dollars to help support them in their postsecondary degrees. And... and I stand with the chairman on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "To the Bill. The last speaker is exactly right. To my knowledge, veterans are not turned away. Danville Area Community College, the college shares a campus with a wonderful Veterans Administration Hospital. But it is also true that when we pick winners and losers in this fashion, the good news is the veterans are accommodated, as is only appropriate. The bad news is the community college is stiffed for the bill and stiffed to the tune of hundreds of thousands

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

of dollars over the last several years and it's inequitable. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Burke, Crespo, Flowers, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just making an inquiry into the status of my Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Your Motion has not been forgotten, Sir. The parliamentarian is reading through it and reading through the Rules."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. And... and it will not be ignored.

Representative Mayfield."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Mayfield: "Last year, the House of Representatives passed House Resolution 450 which acknowledged the Tulsa, Oklahoma race riots which lasted from May 31 through June 1 of 1921. Today in the chamber, in the back of the chamber, I'm going to draw your attention to five individuals who are going to be the delegates from Illinois that are going to go down to Oklahoma in reference to those race riots to represent us. In the gallery, we have Jeffrey Dawkins, who is the President of the Black Wall Street South Suburban Branch, Reven Fellows, Gregory Jones, who is the… who is with the South Suburban

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Black Wall Street representing Chicago, we have Cherry Montgomery, who's the chairman of the United Peoples Action Council, and Andrea Paxton, President of the Harvey Chamber of Commerce. Can we all give them a Springfield welcome?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack, Sir, would you restate your Motion?"

Sandack: "I think I moved under Rule 65 that the Motion to reconsider brought by the Leader, I think the Bill was SB2034, be debated and a Roll Call vote occur. Given that it's beyond the last three days of April, I think any Member of the General Assembly can make that Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Members, the Motion is, 'Shall we move to vote on the Motion to reconsider?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Hold... hold that, Mr. Clerk. I'll restate the Motion. We're voting on Mr. Sandack's Motion to require a vote on Representative Currie's Motion to reconsider. Those in favor of Mr. Sandack's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 46 voting 'yes', 70 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Members, we are moving to page 17 of the Calendar under the Order of Concurrence. On House Bill 417, Mr. Walsh has made a Motion to Nonconcur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Is there leave? Leave is granted. And the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 417. On page 18 of the Calendar, House Bill 2483. Representative Chapa LaVia has moved that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1. Is there leave? Leave is granted. And the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2483. On page 19 of the Calendar, Representative Pritchard moves that

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3143. Is there... is there leave? Leave is granted. And the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3143. Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Members, on page 10 of the Calendar we have Senate Bills on Third Reading. Senate Bill 1847, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1847, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1847 presides... provides that access to SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program formerly called food stamps, benefits for working families. The goal of the SNAP program is to alleviate hunger and malnutrition by increasing the food purchasing power of eligible households. So, what this Bill does is it raises the... it keeps the net income the same, but raises the gross income. So, more families can apply. The net income level is the same as the federal... as the federal requirement. We think that by doing this there will be another 40 thousand additional households will be eligible for SNAP and these households would be receiving a monthly benefit on average of \$125. Over 90 percent of these benefits would go to households who work and 82 percent of the households would have children. This would bring in... this program is completely a hundred percent federally funded and it would bring in about \$60 million to the Illinois economy. And according... according to USDA, every dollar increase in SNAP benefits generates \$1.80 in local economic activity. I urge an 'aye' vote."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Demmer."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Lady indicates that she will."

Demmer: "Representative, we had a... I know we've had a number of discussions on this and we've certainly heard from a number of groups who are interested in this. The first thing... there are a couple of things I want to talk about, but the first is an issue that surfaced in committee on behalf of the Retail Merchants Association talking about the distribution schedule for SNAP. So, we understand that's a pretty big problem right now. Does this Bill do anything to address the problems in distributing... distributing SNAP benefits?"

Gabel: "Well, there was a change in the distribution of SNAP benefits a couple years ago when the Department of Human Services went into a new computer system. There have been groups meeting about this. Recently, there was an agreement reached about how to make sure that the SNAP benefits are relegated throughout the month. With the new director at DHS, these new discu... these discussions are just beginning. And I think everybody who's involved with this Bill is committed to make that happen."

Demmer: "I appreciate that. An... and I also appreciate looking at some of the benefits that an expansion like this might bring, but one of the issues that just arose recently, in fact after the committee had a chance to talk about this, is the fact that SNAP eligibility is used in many programs across the state as a proxy for low-income status. So it's used as if you're eligible for SNAP, you may be eligible for other programs. Now, have we... do we have any kind of analysis on

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

the fiscal impact to other programs in the state based on what would be an increased eligibility because of SNAP expansion?"

- Gabel: "There are... there are a number of estimates. There's nothing solid yet. I think... I think that that would still have to be looked at. There may be some impact on the... the GSA, but that budget is so huge that serving another four thousand children would not have that much of an impact across the state when... if you average it out across the state."
- Demmer: "While that budget might be large, it's also decreased.

 It's not at a full funding level. So it already is being prorated to schools across the area. And this might even exacerbate that problem to an extent. Is that correct?"
- Gabel: "I think it's really important for children to have enough food to eat so they can go to school and do their work. So, I, you know, I... I can't... I don't have any estimate on what kind of impact that would have."
- Demmer: "Other programs rely on SNAP as a proxy: LIHEAP, child care subsidies, energy companies, rebates, senior farmers' markets, WIC, school fees, senior meals, transportation subsidies, local ordinance penalty fee relief, Lifeline phone services, and a school poverty grant. All of those programs use SNAP as some sort of proxy for a low-income qualifications. All of those programs would be affected by an increase in SNAP."
- Gabel: "No, that's not true. Some of those programs are capped.

 And as they're capped, this would have no impact on them."

Demmer: "Okay. But this is one of the..."

Gabel: "LIHEAP is capped. Child care subsidies are capped."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Demmer: "...this is one of the issues we're talking about here is that we don't really have numbers on those programs right now, which are capped which are not capped, what is the expected growth in some of those programs. And you know, especially, I think we demonstrate the breadth of how many programs rely on SNAP as an indication. But certainly one that we can all relate to is the school poverty grant. A formula that would... may shift more dollars out of GSA, I think, is really a difficult proposition to undertake at this time. And it's important to understand that we're not just talking about delivering an increased SNAP eligibility today. We're talking about increased eligibility in programs across the state, the impact of which we just don't know. Is that right? Would you agree with that?"

Gabel: "No. No, I... I disagree. The vast majority of these programs are capped and I don't think it would have much of an impact on them at all."

Demmer: "I think this is a ... "

Gabel: "WIC is capped. Child care subsidies are capped. LIHEAP is capped."

Demmer: "So, Representative, I appreciate that some of these may not have an impact, but the… just, you know, this kind of analysis that's been able to be done between the time that we had a committee vote and between today on the floor, a lot of questions re… remain unanswered. The effective date of this Bill is not 'til January 1 of next year. I think it… this is probably not the right time to do this before we have all the information that's put forward. Today, because of a lot of

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

unans... unanswered questions and unknown fiscal impact, I... I have to urge a 'no' vote today."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ammons. Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. I rise in support of the Lady's Bill. And I took a little bit of time to put it into perspective. We are talking about increasing the federal poverty threshold for a family of three from \$25,727 to \$32,653. I want to say that again because I know the people who are watching and listening via Internet want to really know what this means in dollars and cents. We do know that this is federally funded and we are trying to help the most vulnerable in our state. I want to say again that this change request that is before us in this Bill, 1847, changes the income threshold from \$25,727 for a family of three to \$32,653 for that same family of three. Many of us know that we cannot live a lavish lifestyle on \$32,653. I even went further 'cause I wanted to see what this would do specifically for the 103rd District of the Illinois General Assembly. In my district, there are 16,193 people in my district, which is the 103rd, who receive SNAP benefits. The child food and security rate in Champaign County is 21.8 percent, almost 22 percent. That means over 8,500 children in Champaign County are food insecure, lacking reliable access to adequate nutritious food. This Bill is dealing with access to food. The food banks in my district, for which I volunteer for, for many, many years, those food banks in my district are seeing a lot of families come through the doors in need of help. Parents are working low wage jobs and are finding that their meager

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

paychecks don't go far enough to meet their basic needs. Once families pay rent and utilities, and we know we're dealing with increases all the time, if they need medication, transportation, or even school supplies, they don't often have enough out of that current rate to also purchase food. So, the benefits that they receive from the Federal Government just simply help those families get by. Senate Bill 1847 is a way for us to ensure that working families in my district, in your district, and districts across this entire state have access to SNAP and to get the support that they need to put food on their tables so that their children are adequately fed. I encourage a strong 'aye' vote. And we will look at what other needs are necessary as a result of this, but today we're asking for a nonpartisan, all of us come together, let's support families in Illinois to ensure that they can do something as basic as feed their families. I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in full support of Senate Bill 1847. It'll put \$60 million into the hands of consumers to spend in local food retailers. SNAP benefits are a hundred percent federally funded. Although, Representative Demmer brings up excellent points in regard to the impact it has on the state... state budget, especially with education. I recommend to the Sponsor that they do a thorough review of what the cost this program, as expanded, is to the state. Thank you very much. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bellock."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

"Thank you. Representative, when we were in this discussion, and there is a lot of, you know, concern about this program even though we like the idea of bringing this money back into the state, but when we had this in committee, we talked about some of the issues that Representative Demmer brought up. And one of them is discussed in this issue of 'This Week in Springfield', that all of us get from IRMA. So, IRMA had come to us right before the meeting. We asked them what was their problem with the Bill? And I just want to explain this because it's a little complicated, but not really, is that in the dispensing of the benefits of food, and I know a lot of people are concerned about areas where there aren't fresh fruits and vegetables, that they were dispensing the food throughout the month and that's the way that they could keep their stores going and they could keep their customers coming in throughout the month and get fresh food and fresh vegetables all month long. Well, then for some reason, and it wasn't because of the Affordable Care Act 'cause the Federal Government actually sent a letter to every state encouraging them to do exactly what the State of Illinois was doing. But for some reason last year they decided not to do that and they were just giving those benefits on the first 10 days of the month. So, the people who went to the stores didn't like that, the Retail Merchants didn't like that. So, they have been asking, in working on this SNAP Bill, if they would put an Amendment on to this Bill that our DHS

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

would go along with a permanent fix. They did... as Representative Gabel said, they did a temporary fix of interspersing days during that month, but it is not permanent. And what the Retail Merchants have said is that when they were reconvening the meeting to hammer out those problems, that is when Senate Bill... what we have before us, 1847, was introduced and the rest of that discussion stopped. So, that is one of the concerns of this Bill moving forward now is that we don't know if that will ever get worked out and that is not right for now. The rest of the United States is pushing those benefits all month long and our state has not come to an agreement upon that. So, that is the con... one of the concerns that we have on this Bill at this time as to not support it at this time."

Gabel: "Okav."

Bellock: "And also, some of the other concerns that Representative Demmer brought up about the school poverty grants and that we wanted to look into more before it was voted into law. Thank you very much."

Gabel: "Okay. So, Representative, that was not my understanding from either IRMA or the advocates. They had both said that they came to an agreement and the only holdup was working with the department... with the new department head. The new department head, as you know, came up with a solution which did not seem reasonable to anybody and that was to have IRMA pay for the computer fix, which I don't agree with either. So, those discussions will continue. I've given my word. Sargent Shriver Center's given their word and Irma. We've all talked about continuing to work on this and to come up with

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

a solution as soon as possible. But let me all say... also say that this new group, this group between 25 thousand and 32 thousand, is a group that does not totally depend on... on the SNAP benefits. They have other income. This will just be money that is added to their food budget. They will not be the people who will go in on the first of the month, spend all their money, and then eat the food for the rest of the month. These are people that will use this money throughout the month. I don't think that this is the Bill to hold up for the changes that IRMA wants. I think that this is a Bill for working families and I... I think that this is a bipartisan issue and that people need to support the working families in their districts."

Bellock: "Representative, I just want to repeat the sentence that was in here about what I was saying about IRMA. They said, as this was a temporary compromise, a resolution passed that required everyone to come back to the table in 2015 and hammer out a permanent fix to the SNAP distribution that was fair to everyone involved in the program. Before the reconvened, Senate Bill 1847 was introduced to add more people in the SNAP program and that further exacerbated the existing distribution problem. Therefore, they were asking for an Amendment to this Bill so that they would be able to meet the needs of all the people that received the SNAP benefits and have those stores, have those benefits 30 days during the month so that they would get all their benefits and get their fresh fruits and vegetables not just in the first 10 days or on sporadic 6 or 7 days, but that they would get that all during the month. Thank you very much, Representative."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Gabel: "Okay. Let me... let me..."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

Ives: "Hey, Mr. Speaker, just to the Bill. I just wanted to add a little bit of context as it relates to the poverty grant with GSA because I think it's important to note that food stamp qualification is a consideration for when we look at general state aid and what qualifies for poverty. It's one of the many. You know, we also look at Medicaid and TANF and all that, but food stamps... or SNAP program being part of that does... is... gives you consideration for poverty. And what we need to understand is that the poverty grant has grown over 400 percent since FY05. So, in 10 years it's gone from 459 million to nearly \$2 billion of our general state aid. And now, that's... that's a lot of money when it comes to general state aid. So, I mean, it's just... we don't know the effect of this Bill on the... the, you know, differential of general state aid and more will be going into the poverty grant and less going to other schools. So, I just think it's something that people should consider before voting on this. If the Sponsor be willing to maybe hold harmless general state aid as it increases with this, I'd be in favor of the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Repres... Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For those of you who do not understand or know what it's like to be poor, I could understand you wanting to vote against this Bill. But for those of you who do understand that we have been in a downward economy and the poor is only getting poorer and the rich is getting richer, if you understand that, you would be in support of this Bill. This Bill is making sure that working

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

poor people do not have to go to bed with their children hungry. This Bill merely makes sure that working poor people do not have to go to bed hungry and still able to maintain a roof over their heads. Now, if they were not able to maintain that roof over their head and they become homeless, guess whose door they're going to stop at? Yours and mine. And if we do not pass this Bill and we do not help them to feed their family, guess whose door they're going to stop at because we're going to lock them up because they were stealing from the stores and they were stealing food to feed their family. So, this one is for the working poor of the State of Illinois, Ladies and Gentlemen. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer, your name was used in debate."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think one of our obligations in the General Assembly is to understand both the costs and the benefits of any program that we're talking about. During the course of this Bill coming through committee and here today on the floor, much attention has been given to the benefits of it. The benefits which could provide great... a great deal of... of support to working poor families across the state and be a very positive development. However, not enough attention has been paid to the cost side of this equation. We need to understand what we're committing to. We need to understand the possible impact this could have on other state programs. We need to have a good feeling for how general state aid will affect our schools, how WIC qualifications or heating programs or senior farm... farmers' markets, any of those other programs that rely on SNAP, will

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

be affected by this before we can make an informed decision here. The Bill does not become effective until January 1 of next year. We have the time to rea... really investigate these things. We may even have the time this summer to get together and investigate these things. The... the fact of the matter is that today, under the current situation, we don't have enough information about the costs to make an informed decision about whether the benefits are something we can bring into place here. And for that reason, I... I can't support the Bill today, however alluring some of the benefits and how positive some of the benefits may be."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, the previous speaker talked about the costs and I would just challenge anybody, if you're thinking about costs and with this Bill, look in the eyes of a child who's hungry. Look in the eyes of a child who when you go to a school and they go to school hungry. I live in Thorn Township and we operate the largest food pantry in the State of Illinois and I'm sure there are others that do a good job. We see families that come into our community that come into the food pantry they're hungry. We see families that come in that they can't survive on the benefits that they get because they're working and they're working under poor. So, when you think about them, you talk about the costs, think about how this affects families and people who can't actually afford and the children who are going to school hungry. And I... Mr... Mr. Speaker, I just encourage an 'aye' vote. And I rise in support of the Sponsor's Bill. I commend the Sponsor for bringing this

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

legislation to the floor because it's time. So, let's think about the costs of the children who are going to school hungry. And I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, I... I just want to state a few more facts about this... this Bill. First of all, there are 26 other states have already exercised this same option as Illinois would under this Bill. These states are neighboring states like Iowa, Wisconsin, and Michigan. Also, in building a better Illinois, the Governor's transition team recommended that Illinois increase its participation in SNAP and there boy... thereby reach its potential to gain access to substantial amounts of federal funding now being left on the table in Washington. So, this truly is a bipartisan issue. It has bipartisan support. I think that ... to one of the previous speakers, there... the resolution that was worked out between IRMA and the advocates was done just a few days ago. It was not worked out in... weeks ago, but it was just worked out a few days ago. I think that because this Bill does not take effect 'til January, we have time to work out this distribution with IRMA and I have full confidence that we will do that. So, I would really just like to urge an 'aye' vote. We all have working people in our communities who could benefit greatly from this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1847 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 81 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 0 voting

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

'present', Senate Bill 1847, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1854, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1854, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. This Bill... there's... it does a couple things. It is an initiative of the North Shore Sanitary District. And it allows them to set fees... let's see... impose civil fines, liens, and declare nuisance property and... I'm sorry... and declare a nuisance regarding unlawful discharge of waste in the sewer systems. It also adds Lake County to the Upper Illinois River Development Authority for the purpose of bonding, but it has no effect on taxpayers. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Jesiel."

Jesiel: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Jesiel: "Thank you. Representative, I just have a few questions on this just to clarify this Amendment #2."

Mayfield: "Yes."

Jesiel: "First of all, can you explain why this Amendment was added?"

Mayfield: "This Amendment was added so that it would just very...

basically clarify that the bonding authority is the sole
responsible party for any bonds that are taken out. They don't
need to respond to the Illinois General Assembly or to the
Governor should they go in default because we have nothing to

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

do with that. If they lend the money, they are the borrower and they are solely responsible for that money."

Jesiel: "Okay. I was actually talking about the Floor Amendment 2 and I think that one is #3."

Mayfield: "Right, right."

Jesiel: "Is that correct?"

Mayfield: "Oh, #2?"

Jesiel: "I was asking about #2. If you could just clarify the reason for that Amendment."

Mayfield: "Okay. Number 2 just adds Lake County to the Upper River Development Authority. And it provides one seat to Lake County on that board."

Jesiel: "Okay."

Mayfield: "That's what Amendment #2 does."

Jesiel: "Okay. And can you tell the Body why you're adding Lake County to that board?"

Mayfield: "Right. It is for the purpose of a development project that we are trying to do in North Chicago, Illinois. It is a housing development project. North Chicago is a... we're not financially rich as... as some of our counterparts are in the area. And this will allow us to take out bonds at a very reduced interest rate to save the taxpayer money. We can get a low interest rate if we do it through this authority as opposed to just going out to a bank and borrowing the money. So, it actually will be a benefit to the taxpayers."

Jesiel: "Okay. Can you give a little bit of background, too, about who is going to be performing the development on this particular parcel or this project?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Mayfield: "Let's see. The Benoit Group are ... are the individuals that are going to be actually performing the work. Okay. The Benoit Group is a Georgia-based minority-owned commercial company. They recently finished developing an affordable housing facility in Champaign, Illinois. We're using the Eastern Illinois Economic Development Authority to issue a \$20 million bond to finance the project. It would do the same thing for the project we're looking for in North Chicago. The Lake County Housing Authority, which is in our district, is demolishing the existing multifamily and senior housing project and is seeking financing for redevelopment, will include a 50 senior and 170 multiunit including a community room, kitchen, exercise, playground, and a library. So, it'll be a very nice addition to the community. The current development project that was torn down was rife with gangs and drugs and violence. So, it is really going to be something that's going to help improve the area and improve our economic status as well."
- Jesiel: "Okay. Another question. Has this project been bid out or has this already been issued or how will that work with this developer?"
- Mayfield: "I believe the project has already been bid out and this is the company that was actually selected and they were the ones who brought to our attention the fact that we could do this by adding ourselves to the Housing Authority... Development Authority, I'm sorry... to save the money because we really did not have a lot of money for the project."
- Jesiel: "Okay. And who is responsible for the repayment of the bonds once they're issued?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Mayfield: "The borrower, the Benoit Group."

Jesiel: "Okay. And that would be the developer?"

Mayfield: "Yes."

Jesiel: "Okay. Are any taxpayers on the hook for the repayment of these bonds?"

Mayfield: "Absolutely not, no."

Jesiel: "Okay. Thank you."

Mayfield: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, can you tell me about the North Shore Sanitary District to the North Shore Water Reclamation District?"

Mayfield: "That's a name change."

Franks: "Okay. So, it'd be the North Shore Water Reclamation District, now?"

Mayfield: "Yes."

Franks: "How many members are in this... on this commission?"

Mayfield: "Good question. I want to say seven, but let me be sure."

Franks: "Our analysis indicates there's five, but I'm not sure that's correct."

Mayfield: "I'm going to go with the analysis. I think it was... it says... oh, I'm sorry... there are five. There are five trustees."

Franks: "Okay."

Mayfield: "There are five."

Franks: "Do you know how often they meet?"

Mayfield: "I believe it's once or twice a month."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Franks: "Okay. 'Cause one of the things that troubles me with the Bill is we're going to allow them to increase the salary of the President and the other members. If they..."
- Mayfield: "Right. By a supermajority vote and it has to be a supermajority vote. And I can tell you that in the current climate that if my trustee were to vote 'yes', we'd vote her out."
- Franks: "I... I get it. Why are we even given that option at this point?"
- Mayfield: "It is what was requested by the Sanitary District."
- Franks: "Okay. That was my concern 'cause at a time when if you look at the budgets, one is \$3 billion out of whack and one's \$4 billion out of whack. Take your choice. Then we... we're looking at allowing people to raise their salaries. I just don't think that's proper public policy. I think I could feel better about this Bill if that wasn't in there. Okay."
- Mayfield: "Right. And I do understand your concern. I just want to let you know that it would only apply... that increase would not even apply to those that are currently seated, it would apply to those after an election."

Franks: "I get it."

Mayfield: "So, they could possibly... if they vote for it, they could possibly vote it out and be giving a raise to their predecessor."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Sandack: "Rita, thank you, you've been very helpful with this Bill 'cause it didn't, in our analysis, translate very well. Just want to hit on one thing you mentioned with respect to the developer of this project and I... I agree the community needs some help and some renovation. Is it an out-of-state company that's a developer?"
- Mayfield: "This particular development company is. They are out of state. They're Georgia-based is what I'm told. But the Development Authority is actually in Ottawa, Illinois. And they have an office down here in Springfield as well."

Sandack: "All right, good."

- Mayfield: "And they've done several throughout the state. They've done projects in Marseilles, Hennepin, Ottawa, Channahon, Morris, Seneca, Mendota, Toluca, McHenry, Lake in the Hills, Yorkville, Streator, Peru, Huntley, Richmond."
- Sandack: "All right. You killed it. You killed it. Thank you.

 Obviously, the concern was trying to get Illinois jobs and obviously, this company has made a nice impression and done some work that's benefited Illinoisans. So, best of luck to you with this development; it seems very worthwhile."

Mayfield: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Jesiel."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Jesiel."

Jesiel: "Thank you, Mr. Chair, but I don't need any more time.

Thanks."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield to close."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Mayfield: "This initiative would really make a significant impact with the add... devel... adding of the Upper Relat... River Development Authority particularly in our district. It would save the taxpayer literally millions of dollars by it... allowing us to use this particular entity for the purchasing of our bonds. And the underlying Bill these are initiative is from the North Shore Sanitary District. You know, it includes the name change and it talks about how they can increase their penalties and their fees and just puts some penalties out there for people that are unlawfully dumping wastewater. So, I urge an 'aye' vote, please. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1854 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', 50 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1854, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1859. Oh, excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Fine, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Fine: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Fine: "Up in the gallery behind me, right now, are my two awesome interns for the summer, Ruby Goren and Kristen Daly, and Kristen's mom Lisa, who did us the kind job of driving them down here today so they can experience from this side what takes place in Springfield. So, if we could give them a warm Springfield welcome."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And welcome to your Capitol. Mr. Clerk,
Senate Bill 1859, Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1859, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1859 amends the Private Employment Agency Act in order to provide better enforcement mechanisms to protect workers consumers. It makes the following changes. Replaces criminal penalties with civil penalties for violations of the Act. Requires the Illinois Department of Labor to publish a list licensed employment agencies on its website. streamlines provisions regarding application... application fees, renewal licenses, investigations, definitions, disciplinary actions. Also, heightens recordkeeping requirements, prohibits employment agencies from violating the Illinois Minimum Wage Law and the Wage Payment and Collection Act. Prohibits employers from accepting employees' referrals from an unlicensed employment agency. Prohibits employment agencies from retaliating against employees and provides that money collected from violations of the Act shall be deposited in a labor... in a Child Labor and Day and Temporary Labor Services Enforcement Fund. There is no opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1859 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 Harris, Jones. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1859, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1861, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1861, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of the Illinois Bankers Association. It came out of the Senate and committee unanimously. This would allow banks to reorganize their capital accounts so they can appropriately issue dividends. It also clarifies that banks are not required to file paperwork for approval with the Federal Office of the Comptroller or a supervisor of another state just simply to exercise the general corporate powers they already have under the Illinois Banking Act."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1861 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 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1868, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1861, excuse me, Mr. Clerk, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1866, Representative Christian Mitch... Mitchell. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1866, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of the Attorney General's Office. Effectively, what we're trying to avoid here is people being retraumatized after a crime. What can often happen if someone's endured an assault, an attempted murder, something like that, they can have bills related to those damages for which they can seek compensation actually from the office. This Bill would make sure that they were not going through debt collection while that process was going on. Those folks who might attempt to seek the debt would probably want to be notified. So, this Bill makes sure that within 10 days the victim is provided a written notice which they can then send to their collectors. This is a good Bill to prevent retraumatization. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote and I welcome questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Franks: "Representative, could... can you tell us how this would work? I... I understand the intent of the Bill. I'm just not sure... can you walk me through a scenario on how this... how this might work?"

Mitchell, C.: "Yeah. Give me just one moment, Jack."

Franks: "Sure."

Mitchell, C.: "All right. So, effectively, and then I'll ask staff if there's an additional question, but what happens is, you know, I've suffered from some sort of crime and I am seeking the ability to collect some of that debt from the public service offered by this office that helps victims with these sorts of crimes. So, I would reach out to the Attorney

58th Legislative Day

- General's Office. I would put in my application. Once that application were received, I would receive a written notice that... or basically, almost a ticket that would say this is currently in... in our process. And I could then take that letter and notify someone who might otherwise be trying to collect that debt of what's happening. So, effectively, it avoids me being harassed while I'm going through this process."
- Franks: "Now, would it only be for the debt that could be incurred as a victim? For instance, let's assume you were battered or assaulted and as a result you received some medical treatment..."
- Mitchell, C.: "A hospital bill, for example."
- Franks: "...and so then the hospital or the medical provider would be prohibited from asking you for money during the time where you're trying to get money through the Attorney General's Office, correct?"
- Mitchell, C.: "That... that's correct."
- Franks: "Okay. But let's assume you had been battered and you were in a hospital, but you owed somebody a debt for a bad check that you had written before."
- Mitchell, C.: "Not applicable. So, thank you for the clarifying question. So, it is only for debts incurred as a direct result of the assault, for example."
- Franks: "Okay. That makes sense. Now, is there a time frame?

 Because I don't know how long it will take the Attorney

 General to work through the system."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Mitchell, C.: "Yeah. So, it can take up to a year, kind of in the worst case scenario, Jack, but on average, it's about three months, approximately."

Franks: "Well, that seems very reasonable, then."

Mitchell, C.: "I think so too. That's why I'm carrying it."

Franks: "I think it's a good Bill and I encourage everybody to vote for it."

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell to close."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, guys. And thank you, Representative, for the clarifying question. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1866 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1866, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reis, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Reis: "If I could have the Body's attention. We have our former colleague Franco Coladipietro, mayor of Bloomingdale, joining us today in the final days of Session. Please give him a hand."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome back. Senate Bill 1877, Representative McAsey. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1877, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1877 is an initiative of the Illinois Bankers Association. It's supported by the Illinois Fiduciaries Association, the Attorney General, as well as the Illinois State Bar Association. I know of no opposition. It passed the Senate as well as committee unanimously. And what the legislation does is amend the Trust and Trustees Act to allow for a trustee to present a certification of trust document to a third party, for example, a bank, instead of a copy of the entire trust instrument. That certification of trust is a condensed version of the trust instrument. It omits certain private information. This is an attempt to standardize practices and is modeled on provisions of the Uniform Code. The Bill includes a statutory short form as well as a list of the required items. I am happy to address any specific questions, but urge the support of the Body."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Thapedi: "Representative, this seems like a really good idea. Could you give me a hypothetical of how this would work? For an example, the trustee passes away, the successor trustee wants to go in and access bank accounts or safety deposit boxes. How would that work? And this really seems like a good idea."

McAsey: "So... so, essentially, really what this is about and the reasons that the Bankers Association, for example, is

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

supporting it is that, you know, as fiduciaries they have a responsibility to make sure that an individual who is presenting themselves, and you know, saying that they have the ability to exercise certain rights or powers related to the trust. This is a way for that third party to be able to act in good faith reliance on whatever that representation is, but without sometimes a trust or a trustee, for whatever reason, there have been instances where they've been very reluctant because of wanting to protect privacy..."

Thapedi: "Yeah, yeah."

McAsey: "...to provide the entire trust document."

Thapedi: "Right, right."

McAsey: "So, we think that this is a nice balance in terms of protecting the privacy of individual trusts, but at the same time allowing for a uniform practice so that parties that have to act in reliance on these representations also have an ability to... to move forward and act in good faith reliance."

Thapedi: "What... what is the law now? Because I think that you bring up a very important point especially with respect to certain privacy aspects that might be contained within the trust that the trustee may not necessarily want to disclose all that information to a lender, for an example, or a bank or whatever just to access those accounts. So, what is the process now prior to enacting this legislation?"

McAsey: "So... so, right now, kind of as I understand it, there's really sort of a patchwork of practice across the banking industry, for example."

Thapedi: "Okay."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

McAsey: "So, what this Bill is doing is working... it's modeled on a Uniform Code. And... and really, I think that Illinois law is kind of silent with regard to... well, is silent with regard to the ability to use a certification of trust. And so, this patchwork means that, you know, certain financial institutions might have their own internal form that include, but... some, but maybe not all of the information that we're going to require under this certification of trust. Some financial institutions may require that a trustee present the entire trust document. Under this Bill, there actually isn't a prohibition on a financial institution, you know, making that sort of demand."

Thapedi: "That there is or is not a prohibition?"

McAsey: "There is not."

Thapedi: "Okay."

McAsey: "The moving forward, you know, a third party can act in reliance upon the certification of trust, but if there is some reason, you know, that... that they just don't feel comfortable in that reliance, they still do have the ability to ask for an entire trust document, you know, if the situation warrants that. But... but they are able to standardize practice and act in good faith reliance on a certification of trust whether an internally created form that includes the items that are enumerated in the Bill or whether using the statutory short form."

Thapedi: "Thank you very much. I urge an 'aye' votes on this."

McAsey: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAsey to close."

McAsey: "I urge your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1877 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 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1877, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1882, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1882, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the Currency Exchange Act to update certain definitions and also expand permissible services that the exchanges may offer. And some technical issues that were brought up by IDFPR. IDFPR is a supporter of this Bill. I know of no opponents."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1882 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 Wheeler, Jackson. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1882, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1893, Representative Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1893, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Wehrli."
- Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of DHS.

 It's a cleanup language Bill. It removes references to

 Lekoteks. The funding for the program was removed in FY10. I

 urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1893 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 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1893, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing down the Order of Wehrli, we have Senate Bill 1894. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1894, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Wehrli."
- Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is also a DHS initiative. It's cleanup language, once again. It's removes a duplicative reporting requirement. Basically, we were asking for the same report in two different places of our statute. So, this cleans that up."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1894 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 Riley, Currie, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1894, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1898, Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1898, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office. It seeks to do three things related to the expiration of driver's licenses and identification cards. With also with regard to expetited... expedited driver's licenses and ID cards as well as limits on duplicate IDs. I'll be more than happy to answer any of Mr. Sandack's questions. None?"

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1898 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1898, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1899, Representative Costello. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1942, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1942, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the great Members of this Assembly. Senate Bill 1942 makes changes to the High Risk Loan Act to conform to federal regulations at that the... the current 20 thousand threshold, an amount they're determining

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

when the total points and fees payable in connection with the mortgage constitutes a high risk loan, are subject to change. Purs... pursuant to federal regulations, permits a lender to recoup condition to waive third party fees from borrower who pays on a closed-ended credit transaction or open-ended credit transaction plan within three years. I passed this Bill out, 3101. This is the Senate version. I ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1942 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo, Mitchell. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1942, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, on page 11 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 96, Representative Phelps. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 96, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Bradley."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I'm going to yield my time to Representative Bradley. He did
a lot of work on the 9-1-1, what this is. And then, I was
going to ask for its adoption and debate this on Third... Third
Reading. And I don't..."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 96. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Bradley."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Bradley."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley on Amendment #4."
- Bradley: "Thank you. This is technical. It addresses issues and concerns that came up pre... predominantly with the ITAC in committee yesterday."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 96. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Brown, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 118 for one hour."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Brown."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'd like to withdraw that request."
- Speaker Turner: "Your request is withdrawn. Members, can we please bring the noise level down? We're going to continue down the Order of Second Readings. On page 12 of the Calendar, we have

58th Legislative Day

- Senate Bill 508, Representative Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 508, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Crespo."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. The Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 508 is a gut and replace Amendment that becomes the Bill. It is nearly identical to the underlying Bill. It does five things. It adds a sunset to the grant program. It authorizes or adds a municipal amateur sports facility to the Bill. It decreases the amount of square footage to be eligible for the grant. And it sets a... the fact that a report must be submitted by DCEO after the grant is completed. And I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 508. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 637, Representative Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 655, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 655, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming.

 The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Rita."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

58th Legislative Day

- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 The Floor Amendment #2 was that we amended a Bill and we took out the original language. It deals with video poker machines.

 I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 655. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 663, Representative Brady. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 663, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Leader Riley in the Chair."
- Speaker Riley: "Thank you. Senate Bill 1229, Representative Smiddy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1229, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Smiddy."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Smiddy on Floor Amendment #2."
- Smiddy: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, this was adopted in committee last night."
- Speaker Riley: "Can you explain a little bit about what the Amendment does?"

58th Legislative Day

- Smiddy: "Yeah. This Amendment will replace the underlying Bill and will take away the right to strike for state workers under the Governor's control."
- Speaker Riley: "Thank you. Representative Smiddy moves do adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1229. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Floor Amendment #2 is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. But a fiscal note and a state mandates note have been requested on the Bill as amended by Amendment #2 and those notes have not been filed."
- Speaker Riley: "Mr. Clerk, hold this Bill on Second Reading. Senate Bill 1334, Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1334, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted. Floor Amendments 3, 4, and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Turner."
- Speaker Riley: "Leader Turner on Floor Amendment #3."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment #3 has some changes that dealt with the community colleges. It does a number of things. Delays the community college reporting for two years. Allows community colleges to submit an abbreviated report. I'd like to discuss the Bill on Third Reading if possible."
- Speaker Riley: "Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1334. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Turner."

Speaker Riley: "Leader Turner on Floor Amendment #4."

Turner: "Floor Amendment #4... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #4 deals with the cure period. It takes it down from 30 days to 10 days. Ask for its adoption."

Speaker Riley: "Chair recognizes Representative Sullivan. Do you wish to speak on the Amendment or?"

Sullivan: "Yes."

Speaker Riley: "Proceed."

Sullivan: "Oh, hang on a second. We're having some confusion over on this side, where the Amendments are. Representative, could you just go through Amendment #4 real quick?"

Turner: "Amendment #4 specifically deals with the cure period. The underlying Bill... well, one of the Amendments we had adopted before Amendment #4, I believe it was Amendment #2, I put a cure period back in for 30 days. And we reduced that cure period in Amendment #4 from 30..."

Sullivan: "Down to 10 days."

Turner: "...to 10 days."

Sullivan: "Okay. And you'll be running Amendment #5 next?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Sullivan: "Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "No further questions. Representative moves do adopt Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1334. All in favor state... say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #4 is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk."

58th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Turner."
- Speaker Riley: "Leader Turner on Floor Amendment #5."
- Turner: "And I apologize for any confusion throughout this process.

 There were a number of Amendments that came down. Amendment

 #5 dealt specifically with the community colleges again. And
 this is where we put the cumulative language in there which
 allows them to aspire to a collective goal of 20 percent
 across the contract and categories. I ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker Riley: "Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1334. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1334 is hereby declared adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Riley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1381, Representative Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1381, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Riley: "Third Reading. You wish to move it back to Second?

 Mr. Clerk, move this Bill back on Second Reading, please.

 Senate Bill 1455, Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate... Senate Bill 1455, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 3

58th Legislative Day

- and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Golar."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Golar on Floor Amendment #3."
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Floor Amendment #3 basically is an Amendment that... hold on just one second... that states that for col... college and career readiness determination that shall be accepted that this state's public institutions of higher education as defined in the Board of Higher Education Act for the purpose of student application or admissions consideration. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Barbara Wheeler."
- Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."
- Wheeler, B.: "Representative, there were a couple of Amendments,

 I think Amendment 3 and Amen... Amendment 5. Does this Amendment
 address the ACT and... in regard to being one of the
 assessments?"
- Golar: "This... this Amendment does, Representative, addresses the ACT. The Amendment 4, we decided not to go with that one and Amendment 5, of course, I'm going to ask to be tabled also."
- Wheeler B.: "Okay. Thank you for that. So, the three assessments that will be mandated..."
- Golar: "That will be the Bill."
- Wheeler B.: "Okay. So, it's ACT, PARCC, and another assessment chosen..."
- Golar: "No. PARCC is not... actually, prefaced in it. It does just state that it's already in current law."
- Wheeler B.: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Golar: "You're welcome."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Hays."

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

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Hays: "Representative, can you walk me through the... the attendance portion of this? I... I guess I'm a little confused on how it intersects with the testing."

Golar: "Beg your pardon?"

Hays: "I'm sorry. So, the attendance portion of this is out of the Bill?"

Golar: "Yes, it is."

Hays: "Okay. Thank..."

Golar: "I'm tabling 5 and 4."

Hays: "Thank you."

Golar: "Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "Chair recognizes Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Pritchard: "Representative, I know you've been working on this issue for a long time and we've been trying to sort through the issues that the state board has been raising about an assessment that measures college and career readiness as a standard that colleges and universities can use as an entrance requirement. Has this Amendment solved all of those issues?"

Golar: "Could you repeat that, Representative?"

Pritchard: "Has this Amendment solved all of the objections and issues we've been dealing with?"

Golar: "I don't think it has. I think... that's... that was the reason for 4 and 5. Actually, in 5, I think it addressed it

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

completely. But there was some opposition to that and from the Senate Sponsor I went back with Amendment #3."

Pritchard: "And the state board has objected to this. Have they expressed their objections to you?"

Golar: "Yes, they have."

Pritchard: "And they are that what? They can't complete this?"

Golar: "They're saying that based on the language presently, it would be impossible for them to implement it."

Pritchard: "So, I know their staff has some strong feelings on that and other attorneys have different feelings. So, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Body, I think we have an issue here that is not yet solved. I think we need to move forward with this Amendment and this Bill today, but I would hope that in the very near future we could come back with some trailer legislation that would satisfactorily deal with this issue in terms of the state board and still have a test that can commonly be used for college and career readiness. So, I would urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Sullivan: "Representative, you have multiple Amendments. How many... which ones are on the Bill right now?"

Golar: "Actually, there... the latest Amendment was Amendment #5, which was actually the last one that I did... that I did with the universities, and this particular Amendment actually was satisfactory to the Secretary of Education, ISBE, and of course, the Governor's Office."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Sullivan: "Okay. And the reason I ask is because Amendment #5 becomes the Bill and so, there's no reason for this, but you're saying that because Amendment #5 is already adopted, you're going back to 3... Oh, they're not doing tabling here."

Golar: "No. I have tabled both 4 and 5, Representative."

Sullivan: "Okay. Sorry. A little confusion on our side. We're making sure that we're not repeating ourselves in different Amendments. Can you further explain the opposition and why you think that this may or may not help with the opposition?"

Golar: "Well, I think, in the beginning, the language that was put on the Bill, it was prefaced more to ACT and SAT. And of course, there was some opposition by ISBE saying that in the language of Amendment #3 it wasn't clear to them and they wanted... they felt that they could not implement it in its present language. And then I began to work on trying to work on Amendment 4 and 5 to, of course, actually get the approval of the Governor's Office and the Secretary of Education."

Sullivan: "Okay. Fair enough. So, we haven't succeeded these problems with ISBE. Are there any other states that are using ACT in their college exams?"

Golar: "Everyone is."

Sullivan: "Everyone?"

Golar: "I would... most of the colleges are SAT and ACT."

Sullivan: "Throughout the country..."

Golar: "Yes."

Sullivan: "...so other states..."

Golar: "Also, I can actually name here in this great state:

Illinois State University, Western, Southern, Eastern,

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

University of Illinois-Champaign, and Chicago, Governor's State University, and Northeastern Illinois University."

Sullivan: "So, obviously, ISBE is focusing on PARCC. Are there any other states that use PARCC as an entrance exam?"

Golar: "That I do not know. But I can tell you, Representative, on April 25 of this year, I actually am the chair for Education in Elementary & Secondary Education Curriculum and Policy..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Golar: "...we had a four hour debate on PARCC."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Golar: "And based on..."

Sullivan: "And we've obviously had a pretty big debate on PARCC here. Are there any other universities that accept PARCC as an entrance exam?"

Golar: "No. Not that I know of."

Sullivan: "There are none here that you know of?"

Golar: "Maybe the community colleges, but not the regular universities."

Sullivan: "Did you... did you say the community colleges do or do not?"

Golar: "They do."

Sullivan: "They do. Okay. Well, thank you for your comments. I appreciate it."

Golar: "Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Golar moves do adopt Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1455. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 15... 1455 is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk."

58th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Golar."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Golar on Floor Amendment #5."
- Golar: "I'm tabling Floor Amendment #5, Mr. Chairman."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Golar moves to table Floor Amendment #5. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

 In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #5 is hereby tabled. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Riley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1470, Representative Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1470, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill has been read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Riley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 763. Senate Bill 763, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 763, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Zalewski on Floor Amendment #1."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is the Bill dealing... it deals with the Bedford Park Fire Department. We're trying to make these two... the... the Fire Fund and the peop... Police Fund copacetic. I'd... I'd ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Zalewski moves for adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 763. All in favor say 'aye';

58th Legislative Day

- all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 763 is adopted.

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Zalewski and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Zalewski on Floor Amendment #2."
- Zalewski: "Floor Amendment #2 simply replaces the word 'and' with
 the word 'or'."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Zalewski moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 763. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 763 is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Riley: "Mr. Clerk, hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1236, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1236, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Riley: "Leader Currie on Senate Bill 1236."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This represents several things... agreements between the county of Cook and our Department of Revenue. For some time, our department has been collecting taxes due on private car sales, used car sales. This would extend that agreement, in fact, would codify and make it statutory. In addition, the measure provides that the Department of Revenue can, for a small administrative fee, not only make this kind of collection for Cook County, but... but make agreements with other units of

58th Legislative Day

- government, local units of government, including counties, as they already do with municipalities, to provide tax collection services. I know of no opposition. I'd be happy to answer your questions."
- Speaker Riley: "Seeing no debate, then the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1236 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, take the record. On this question, with 115 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1236, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Leader Brown."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Sandack for the remainder of the day. And also... you're not going to cheer for this one. Also, the Republicans request an immediate caucus for one hour in Room 118."
- Speaker Riley: "The Republicans will caucus in Room 118 for one hour. The House will be at recess until the call of the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Page 11 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 1747, Representative Manley. Please read the Bill. Oh. Senate Bill 1947, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1947, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Manley."
- Manley: "Thank you, Speaker. Members of the House, Senate Bill 1947 expands the definition of 'sexual abuse' under the Department of Human Services Act to prohibit an employee of

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

the Department of Human Services from sending, showing, or posting sexually explicit images of or to an individual who is receiving services due to mental illness, developmental disability, or both from the department. This Bill is effective immediately. I'll take any questions."

- Speaker Lang: "Well, you're not going to get any. 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? Durkin, Wheeler. 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. Mr. Brown is recognized."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Meier and Barb Wheeler are excused for the remainder of the afternoon."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Senate Bills-Third Reading, on page 7 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 507, Mr. DeLuca. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 507, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 507 is virtually identical to legislation I sponsored last year that passed both the House and Senate unanimously as Senate Bill 3397. In Governor Quinn's last day in office, he issued an Amendatory Veto on that Bill. And not to get into the details, but the Veto had zero substantive relationship to the Bill. So, we're back here again. Under current law, a retailer that administers its own credit to consumers is

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

entitled to take a credit or tax deduction for the sales tax paid by the retailer when the consumer defaults on the payment for the merchandise. Senate Bill 507 will clarify existing law by allowing a retailer that offers a store credit card, also known as a private label credit card, to consumers that is administered by a third party to obtain a credit or refund for the sales tax paid to the state after the consumer defaults on the payment of the merchandise. Senate Bill 507 will clarify that the retailer must have already written off the underlying outstanding balance as bad debt on the retailer's federal tax return before applying to the Illinois Department of Revenue for the sales tax deduction. Senate Bill 507 has no opposition and is an initiative of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and General Electric. IRMA has engaged in lengthy negotiations with the Illinois Department of Revenue to make this legislation possible. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, could you run through that... that last portion again about the bad debt?"

DeLuca: "Sure. This... Senate Bill 507, it clarifies that the bad debt before that... it can be applied for, the refund can be applied for, has to be listed as bad debt on the retailer's federal tax return. Is that the part you're referring to?"

Hays: "Yes. And thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Guzzardi: "Representative Deluca, will you just walk... walk me through sort of a concrete example of how this might work? So, a consumer gets one of these private cards from a retailer, right, and they default on the card. Then so, what are... what are the subsequent steps according to this legislation?"

DeLuca: "Right. They make a purchase."

Guzzardi: "Mmm mmm."

DeLuca: "They don't... they don't pay. The sales tax is then paid to the state. This would give the opportunity for that money that the sales tax portion that's paid to the state to be refunded to the retailer."

Guzzardi: "Okay. And so, what... what's the impetus behind this change? Why is that a better way than the way it's done now?"

DeLuca: "Because the retailer has paid the money to the state and it's actually not the state's money."

Guzzardi: "How do you mean?"

DeLuca: "The sales tax portion."

Guzzardi: "Mmm mmm. Explain..."

DeLuca: "Because they defaulted the..."

Guzzardi: "Sorry."

DeLuca: "...the purchaser defaulted on the payment. Did not pay the bill..."

Guzzardi: "Right."

DeLuca: "...for the purchase."

Guzzardi: "Okay. So, the point of this is the purchaser didn't pay for the item."

DeLuca: "That's correct."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Guzzardi: "The store didn't get the value of the item and therefore, it shouldn't be passing along a percentage..."

DeLuca: "That's correct."

Guzzardi: "...of that to the state in sales tax. Okay."

DeLuca: "Yes."

Guzzardi: "Thank you. I appreciate it."

DeLuca: "You're welcome."

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? Nekritz, Reis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. McAuliffe is recognized."

McAuliffe: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

McAuliffe: "Up in the gallery, we have from Representative Martwick and my district, from St. Mana... St. Monica Academy our eighthgrade class with teacher Mrs. Mash and our favorite gal Suddy, up in the gallery. Can we have a big round of applause for them?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo is recognized on a point of personal privilege."

Arroyo: "I wish not to speak right now."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Mautino is excused for the remainder of the day."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Moving to page 8 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 691, Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Dunkin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 805, Representative Mayfield. Out of the record. Senate Bill 838, Mr. Rita. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1076, Mr. Morrison. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1076, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."
- Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we just temporarily take this out of the record? Or, I mean, could we come back to it in a few minutes?"
- Speaker Lang: "I can't promise you that, Sir. But we'll get back to it eventually."
- Morrison: "All right."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 1102, Mr. Anthony. Please read the Bill. You have a Floor Amendment, Sir? Please move the Bill back to the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Clerk, and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1102, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted.

 And Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Anthony, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Anthony on Amendment 2."
- Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 provides that the local public entity may... may reimburse for reasonable defense costs if the accident... action of the employee's... is amiss... give me a second. Yeah. May reimburse for reasonable defense costs if the action is dismissed or the employee's not... is found not guilty. I seek a favorable vote."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1102, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Anthony."
- Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1102... Senate Bill 1102 was an initiative of the Senate Sponsor. The Bill simply states that if an individual commits a criminal crime as a state or city or local employee, that that state or local entity would not be on the hook for their defense. I seek a favorable vote."
- 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? Breen, Sente. Take the record. There are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: approved for floor consideration is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 563 and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3763. And correction, it's Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 563 is approved for consideration."

58th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "On page 13 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1229, Mr. Smiddy. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1229, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted. No further Amendments.

 A fiscal note and a mandates note have been requested on the Bill and have not been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Smiddy."
- Smiddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask that the fiscal note be held inapplicable."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the notes be held inapplicable. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please take the record. There are 68 voting... 67 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no'. And the notes are held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further notes. No further Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1229, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy."
- Smiddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amend... this Amendment will amend the Illinois Public Relations Act and it will bring about a change in how contracts in Illinois will be negotiated. Instead of allowing labor to strike or the administration to lock out employees, it would allow for mediation and if needed, due an impasse,

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

interest arbitration. In a normal situation, a strike is a useful tool in negotiations; however, at this point in time, I think we're in a very unique situation. I will take any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Tryon: "To the Bill. This was in committee yesterday. And I rise in opposition of this Bill. I think this is a dangerous precedent that's being set by the General Assembly. The right to strike is fundamental to the bargaining process. It is, in fact, what motivates each side to be able to come to an agreement. I don't think a Governor wants a strike. I think a Governor wants a fair contract, no matter who it is. could see this precedent carried to the local school districts, to other units of government at some point in the future. But more importantly, in committee, AFSCME said that they felt this Governor wasn't bargaining in good faith on... on the issues that was before them in the bargaining process. There's also another issue. We passed a \$4 billion deficit budget to the Governor. In an... in arbitration and in this process and the negotiations don't work out, then the mediation comes in. If the mediation doesn't work out, then the interest arbitration takes place. And what happens then is the arbitrator doesn't negotiate, he listens to both sides and picks one or the other. And when he picks one, that becomes the contract. That's a contract that would have to be honored over some of the things that we funded with the \$4 billion deficit like community service contracts with our

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

community service providers. What you're... if we don't come and we don't have the incentive for both sides to come to an agreement, we're not doing the taxpayers' service in the State of Illinois. I don't even think we're doing the collective bargaining process service. Interest arbitration historically has been for police and fire and security personnel, things that are... are basically part of ... of law and order, not ... not bargaining interest for the positions that are normally subject to strike. So, I think basically voting for this and setting this kind of precedent sets the future for this to go to other units of government. I think it sets a bad position not just for our Governor to come to an agreement, but for us to be able to fund our social service programs if we don't come to an agreement on revenue. So, I... I think this is ... is the wrong move for this General Assembly. And I hope... I hope this doesn't pass."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, we talked about this a little bit yesterday in committee. And I've got some concerns I just want to make sure that I'm clear on. Number 1, in your opening remarks, I thought you mentioned this would remove the ability for the strike option for the local. Is that accurate?"

Smiddy: "It would remove both the strike and the lockout option once mediation is asked for."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. At what point in time in the calendar would be the earliest that that could occur?"

Smiddy: "As far as mediation?"

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Wheeler, K.: "Yes, Sir."

Smiddy: "Whenever the legislation would go into effect."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, if we backed up a little bit. If the election... if the legislation were to go into effect, let's say, what, July 1? At some point in time after that depending on when the Governor would sign it or we'd override that... a Veto that could come with that. It'd be some point after that, that... at that point in time, they could no longer strike. Is that right?"

Smiddy: "They would have to go to mediation first and then that's when they would start giving up the right for a strike..."

Wheeler, K.: "Right."

Smiddy: "...or a lockout."

Wheeler, K.: "So, right. But so either parties could then still have that ability up until the mediation..."

Smiddy: "That is correct."

Wheeler, K.: "...were to begin?"

Smiddy: "That is correct."

Wheeler, K.: "But... and then, the media... we talk about yesterday that the mediators would be selected under what process?"

Smiddy: "It goes State Board of Labor. They have a list and they would actually go down str... each side would be able to strike individuals from that list until they can agree upon an arbitrator."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. And that would take a period of time of what would you es... estimate?"

Smiddy: "I... I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question? Sorry."

Wheeler, K.: "Can you give me an idea of what time frame you would estimate that that could actually take? So once the mediation

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

process was... is selected, there would still be an opportunity to strike up until the mediation process actually begins. Is that my understanding? Is that right?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "So, my question then, Representative, would be how soon would you think that would take place?"

Smiddy: "Mediation is only 30 days."

Wheeler, K.: "So, if you had a 30-day period of time where, even after mediation's been requested, that a strike could still take place or a lockout?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "I'm sorry?"

Speaker Lang: "Your answer was yes, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. And Representative, is that arbitration or mediation we're talking about there?"

Smiddy: "You asked about mediation..."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay."

Smiddy: "...and that's 30 days."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. The arbitration process would be how different? As far as the time frame is concerned, where did...

I'm trying to understand very clearly what... at what point in time..."

Smiddy: "There..."

Wheeler, K.: "...both the union would be able to lose their strike ability and the... and the administration would lose the lockout ability?"

Smiddy: "There... there's no time with the arbitration."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay."

Smiddy: "No set time."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Wheeler, K.: "No set time? So, after 30 days arbitration would begin at that point in time?"
- Smiddy: "Only if the... either side is unable to come to an agreement and there's an impasse declared by either side."
- Wheeler, K.: "All right. We... we talked about yesterday in... in our committee that... and this is just... I'm... I'm trying to get this very clear, Mike, so I appreciate your patience with me. The option would be that with this legislation in place that either side could raise an impasse and go straight to this process. Is that accurate?"

Smiddy: "After mediation."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. So, at some point... All right. There... there's a... so, ultimately, what I'm trying to get at, Mike, is that there's a... a process by which the union could effectively raise an impasse and get to a binding arbitration that would then have no recourse at any elected official. In other words, the administration's not going to be part of that negotiation where it's going to be... the arbitrator's going to be the... the ones whose set the final situation."

Smiddy: "I... yeah. I believe that is correct."

- Wheeler, K.: "So, in effect, are we creating a process for a local union unit to be able to... to get through the whole process without having... go ahead..."
- Smiddy: "No, we're not. And we're just making... we're wanting to make sure that State Government continues to run during this negotiation process."

Wheeler, K.: "But that's already happening. Is that not right?" Smiddy: "Well, currently we have a contract."

58th Legislative Day

- Wheeler, K.: "Correct. And in... in years past we've been and we haven't got a contract agreement in place before the end of the contract. We've continued on and the last time it was on a 10-month process."
- Smiddy: "Yeah. We... we have agreed in the past for that to happen.

 We have no indication that that is going to happen this time,
 so we just want to ensure that our state agencies under the
 Governor will continue to stay open."
- Wheeler, K.: "I understand that process. I just remembered specifically asking the gentleman from AFSCME yesterday if they intend to... to go forward through the entire process in good faith with the administration collectively bargaining until we get to some kind of an agreement. And I thought the answer from both parties was yes. Do you recall that same thing?"
- Smiddy: "I believe that... that was what the gentleman said. We are trying to be..."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, help me understand one other part of this, Mike.

 Why is it that this legislation would expire in 2019 and not be permanent?"
- Smiddy: "It would be the length of the contract that they would be entering into."
- Wheeler, K.: "So, this could specifically be up again in four years and we'd be at the same original process we have in place today with the current Governor or with a new Governor in four years. Is that an accurate reflection of this... of the situation?"
- Smiddy: "I would say that's accurate."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

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

Wheeler, K.: "I'll work on that. Thank you. Mike, I appreciate you answering the questions and I may have more shortly. To the Bill. This is, in my opinion, setting an unusual precedent that allows, in this case, our good friends from AFSCME to... to bypass the product... the process we have in place now which would have an elected official elected by the entire state, our Governor, be at the bargaining table. And with this Bill, and in a situation where we go past the initial process, the... the union could just raise an impasse and go straight to... to binding arbitration which, again, excludes the negotiation with the elected official, in this case our Governor, whose been held there by the people to... to negotiate on their behalf. With that said, I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Smiddy, yesterday in committee, the union representative, I believe it was Mr. Mike Newman, spoke and he talked about this being an unprecedented time. He talked about the Rauner administration having extreme and farreaching demands. He talked about things being harsh. So, I'm just wondering, do you know what he's talking about? What's harsh? What's extreme? What's the far-reaching demands that he's discussing and why this Bill?"

Smiddy: "I don't know the details of the contract negotiations. What I'm doing here is trying to ensure that the cate... the

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

state keeps running, as far as the Governor's departments, until such time they have an agreement in place."

Ives: "Okay. So, we're sitting here... the Legislature now is basically being asked to insert themselves in a contract negotiation that we really don't know anything about, that we don't know what's being considered, what's on the table, what's off the table. We have no idea what they're talking about. And would you say that that's what we should be doing as a Legislative Body or do you think that it's best left up to the collective bargaining process that has been in place for a long time?"

Smiddy: "I believe it is this Body's responsibility to make sure the citizens of Illinois are protected and ensure that state agencies stay open during what, from listening to the individuals yesterday, could be a long drawn-out negotiation."

Ives: "So, if there's still negotiation, what's wrong with that? I mean, Governor Quinn took months to negotiate the next contract. Literally nine months to negotiate it and then the public didn't find out for a good 45 days after it was ratified and signed. So, why do... why are we doing this now befo... while the new contract is still... or the current contract is still in place? I don't understand."

Smiddy: "We want to make sure that the government stays open past the May 30 deadline, if they still continue to negotiate."

Ives: "Has AFSCME told you... told you that they are considering a
 strike, then?"

Smiddy: "No."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Ives: "So, then, why is all this conjecture about the government not staying open?"

Smiddy: "Because..."

Ives: "What specifically are you speaking to? I have no idea about what you're talking about, the government not staying open.

And I think, when you're wanting us to insert ourselves and change collective bargaining agreements to this extent, that we deserve to know what you think is going to happen."

Smiddy: "Well, I can... I can give you a quote from our current Governor that says I might have to shut down the government. That is a possibility and I will do it proudly. So, I want to be proactive here to ensure that we keep state services going during these negotiations. So, we have... we can tell our citizens that we are going to still function and we're not going to let negotiations dictate what happens."

Ives: "So, now, you do then... then obviously you think it's okay for us to insert ourselves in this collective bargaining process. Is that correct?"

Smiddy: "Not into the collective bargaining process. But I'm..."

Ives: "Well, that's what we're doing."

Smiddy: "No, it's not."

Ives: "Okay. You also, just in your opening remarks, said that this is not a normal situation. Can you clarify that more? What's not normal about this situation?"

Smiddy: "I think I just did with what the Governor had... has spoken to."

Ives: "Okay. To the Bill. Well, I will tell you, guess what, Illinois is in an unprecedented time frame. Things in Illinois are harsh. It is not a normal situation when you look across

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

other states. And there's no doubt that we need some collective bargaining reforms; however, I'd say it has to do with the arbitration process. And I know from our DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference that we put forward a number of initiatives that we'd like to see changed with arbitration, but of course, those, even when written to Bill format, never get into a Bill like this. They're completely outright rejected by the other side and the ruling class. So, there's no doubt that these are sweeping changes. They are changing entirely a construct that has been in place for many years, beginning with Governor Thompson. You should be very careful about handing over to an unelected unaccountable arbitrator without any taxpayer at the... at having a seat at the table and letting them decide what the taxpayers can and cannot afford in the future. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, I've listened to a couple of questions and a couple of your answers about strike times with regard to arbitration or mediation. Clarify that for me. What... what... what are you saying the strike... when the strike begins and ends with respect to mediation and arbitration?"

Smiddy: "I'm not sure exactly what you're trying to ask me, Sir?"

Kay: "Well, you... you've given two different answers about when... how... how long a strike would carry out from mediation or arbitration. Is it one or both?"

Smiddy: "We don't know how long the strike will last. Mediation can last up to 30 days."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Kay: "When... when does it begin? What it... Is it mediation or arbitration?"

Smiddy: "You have mediation and if there's an impasse by one or the other side, they can ask for arbitration. And you can't strike during arbitration."

Kay: "Yeah. I... I just want to clarify it for the record. I think you're... you're wrong. If you look at State Law, it says the right to strike shall be consi... Oh, well, this is... yeah, excuse me. It's not the law. It's your... your language. Pardon me. The right to strike shall not be considered waived pursuant to Section 17 of this Act until the actual convening of the arbitration hearing. So, you... you must agree with that."

Smiddy: "And that's what I said."

Kay: "So, you can strike during the mediation period?"

Smiddy: "You have to wait until you decide if there's an impasse.

Then you need to decide to strike or then... or look for arbitration."

Kay: "Well, when's the impasse, then, to you?"

Smiddy: "When either sides declare it."

Kay: "In mediation or arbitration?"

Smiddy: "After mediation."

Kay: "Okay. Let me back up to some questions that we... we walked through yesterday because I agree with some of the previous speakers and I'm not sure the ramifications of what you're trying to do here today have a good ending for us. Yesterday, we heard from AFSCME that there's a contract in place. Is that correct?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Kay: "And we heard that contract was a valid contract. Is that
 right?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Kay: "And didn't we agree that there was a valid contract in place because, actually, there was no material mistake of fact, misrepresentation, lack of free will, all the other legal elements that a contract needs. In fact, we even... we even heard from the union. They were happy with the contract. Didn't we?"

Smiddy: "I don't believe they clarified that they were happy. They were satisfied."

Kay: "Well, okay. Satisfied is good enough. And didn't we also hear that the... the contract is fine, absent they had some grievance procedures, which is pretty normal."

Smiddy: "Yeah. You can grieve the contract if you feel...

Kay: "Yeah."

Smiddy: "...if either side feels that one... they've done something inappropriate."

Kay: "Okay. So, one other question, Representative, or two. Have
you ever negotiated a contract?"

Smiddy: "I've been on the executive board of a union during two contract negotiations."

Kay: "So, you... you indeed have executed national master
agreements?"

Smiddy: "Not national."

Kay: "Okay. And... and you say two?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. So, tell me, for a moment here, if your Bill is to
 pass and there's a matter that is considered to be at an

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

impasse and you go to arbitration, is that going to be binding?"

Smiddy: "Regarding..."

Kay: "Well..."

Smiddy: "...my legislation?"

Kay: "Well, I'm... yeah. Would your legislation..."

Smiddy: "Yes."

Kay: "...make it binding? So, in other words, if it's binding, then this General Assembly really couldn't approve or disapprove of the work rules, the conditions, the time frame, or the compensation. Is that not correct?"

Smiddy: "If the arbitrator comes to an agreement, it's presented to both sides and if both sides do not agree to them, they can continue with arbitration."

Kay: "No, that's not... that's not..."

Smiddy: "So, the Governor will have a say."

Kay: "...that's not my question. My question is, if there is binding arbitration that means something. That means full and final. My question to you is, does the General Assembly then have the ability to go in and change the agreement in binding arbitration?"

Smiddy: "They don't have the ability for the police and fire, so I would say no to your question."

Smiddy: "But that's the process we're using, Sir."

Kay: "I'm asking you about your Bill, Representative."

Smiddy: "And that's the type of process we are using."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Kay: "So, we don't have any... you're saying that with respect to all unions, if we put this Bill in place and there are work rules and there are time limits and hour constraints and people constraints or increases in people and cost increases and COLA increases and days off and vacation days, that we're not going to be able to approve those moneys?"

Smiddy: "If the Governor agrees to it and the labor organization agrees to it, yes."

Kay: "Well, wait a minute. What if he doesn't?"

Smiddy: "Excuse me?"

Kay: "What... what if he doesn't?"

Smiddy: "Then they continue to arbitrate, Sir."

Kay: "I see. Well, binding is binding. And it seems to me like you're saying we're going to use an arbitrator up to the point where we get a favorable outcome and then we're going to stick it, literally, to the Governor. And now, I need this..."

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

Kay: "Yeah. Speaker, this is a pretty important Bill and I... if
you'd please bear with me a couple more minutes."

Speaker Lang: "I'm bearing."

Kay: "I know. Thank you. So, I'm assuming that what we're doing here is really taking away the collective bargaining agreement process from the administration and putting it in the hands of a third party. Is that a fair assumption?"

Smiddy: "I don't agree with that. No, Sir."

Kay: "Well, I don't know how else you'd characterize it. Let me ask you a separate question. How do you think the taxpayers are going to like it when your Bill, if it passes, passes and there's binding arbitration that takes place and something is

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

put in play that they don't like and we can't adjust? What do you think they're going to think? You know, you're taking the taxpayer out of the equation because we're out of the equation and everybody in government's out of the equation."

- Smiddy: "As I had stated before, at the end arbitration when there is an agreement, both sides have to agree with the arbitrator on what they say. So, the taxpayers are still in."
- Kay: "Yeah. They're in... they're in for the agreed amount of the arbitrator. Isn't that correct? Yeah and... and frankly, isn't it true that the union can just continue to refuse until they get what they want?"
- Smiddy: "It's an arbitration process and Governor has the same right, Sir."
- Kay: "Well, you just said that. I was just trying to get you to say yes, but you did say that. So, here... here's... Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. We no longer are going to value contracts as we've known them in the past. We are, in this particular case, because we have one union that doesn't want to live up to their agreement, are attempting to short circuit, circumvent the General Assembly, use us to get away from a contract that they think they don't like now because it doesn't quite allow them to negotiate and arbitrate the way they'd like the outcome to be. They're coming to us 30 days prior to the finalization of the contract and essentially, unilaterally saying we want to go do something else. We want to be a part of mediation, arbitration, oh, by the way, and during this period of time, you're going to continue to pay us while things go on as normal. And likewise, what you're saying, Representative, is that we're taking

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

everybody that's been in the process out of the process. And that includes the General Assembly who, by the way, used to approve Bills that no longer will approve Bills, and that's simply not right. So, I'm going to ask a strong 'no' vote to this Bill. It's another... another excuse to break a contract which is valid up until the 30th. And we heard both parties say yesterday, they were willing to continue to bargain in good faith. That's the collective bargaining process. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the extra time."

Speaker Lang: "We still have nine speakers wishing to speak on this legislation. Representative Wallace is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "Thank you, Representative Smiddy. And my que... I have a few questions. My first question is, when does the current AFSCME contract end?"

Smiddy: "June 30."

Wallace: "Okay. And then you mentioned in your remarks that the Governor stated he had no problem with shutting down government. Am I... Did I hear that correctly?"

Smiddy: "And he would do it proudly."

Wallace: "So, the Governor says that he would do such a thing proudly. So, individuals who man and staff our Department of Corrections are AFSCME workers, correct?"

Smiddy: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you, Ma'am."

Speaker Lang: "Lots of people wishing to debate this Bill. We'll get through this better if the Members calm down. Shhh."

Wallace: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Please."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Wallace: "I mean, he's right behind me and he can't hear me. Okay.

I stated that workers for the Illinois Department of
Corrections are by and large members of AFSCME, correct?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Wallace: "Okay. I'm going to just speak to the Bill. I appreciate you answering the question. To the Bill. I think that we are going to allow ourselves to step into a very dangerous situation should we allow for someone to proudly shut our government down. A strike of IDOC workers will pose a number of threats in terms of safety, also as well as human rights violations. If we're looking at the overcrowding that could take place in our county jails because individuals won't be... because individuals will not be able to go to IDOC. I understand that everyone's really excited, but you can't even hear yourself think in this chamber. But hopefully someone is listening and recognizes that if we have overcrowding in our county jails, that is not going to be a great situation. We also put ourselves at risk of shutting down state facilities for mental health. So, we have individuals who will go untreated. And then, as I often do on a personal note, I work in the Zeke Giorgi Center in Rockford, Illinois, which holds all of the state offices in Winnebago County. Should a strike occur, not only would the DCFS office in that building shut down, there's the state investigative unit, the lottery office, Central Manament... Management Services particular building, the Department of Revenue is in that building, and then, of course, my offices, the offices of Senaors... Senator Syverson and Senator Stadelman are all in that particular building. We would pose ... we would face not

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

being able to provide services to our constituents, the 108 thousand people that I represent, and the tens... hundreds of thousands of people within the county who depend on state services. As such, I would ask that this Body will definitely consider how we do our negotiations and how we will not allow for one particular person to impact so many people throughout our state negatively. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. You know, we've all seen in... at the federal level in recent years how government shutdowns negatively impact communities and operations of government across our country. And I don't think we want to have a government shutdown happen here in the State of Illinois. While one of the previous speakers said, well, law enforcement and prisons will continue to operate, there's a lot more to the well-being of the people of Illinois than just law enforcement and prisons. A government shutdown, particularly one that was extended, could have, you know, immediate and lasting impact on health care delivery in our state, the delivery of child care services, the care for people with disabilities, the care for senior citizens, the processing and determination and claiming of Medicaid for hospitals, pharmacies, and clinics. Now, all of these are going to have an immediate negative impact on our communities, on the state's finances, on our economy and community life. I think making sure that as these labor negotiations go on in a very appropriate and measured way with an arbitrator that vital

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

services are delivered to our state is a very good thing. I would strongly suggest an 'aye' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this measure. This is an issue, which under different circumstances, might not be necessary. I've had my own disagreements with the union representing the majority of our state's workers and I believe that our Governor both deserves the chance to and in fact should negotiate an agreement that is fair to workers but also one the state can honestly afford. But this is an administration that's made it clear that in its view, whether it be on why we lack the necessary revenue to pay for services or why we don't have the ability to build new schools that the problem is organized labor and they must be ground into dust. Now, there's been talk about proudly wanting to mimic the strike of the Reagan era. That's not something that's been said in this chamber, but certainly by the incoming administration during the campaign. Now, there may be things that President Reagan did well. I don't think that the strike was one of them. If that's the goal and if that's the endgame, then we've already given up on organizing and... sorry... on even the premise of working on this contract with any sort of good will. So, let's set aside for a moment that the real reason why we have a government that's so cash-strapped is the tax system where the middle class pays twice as much of the share of their income compared to the top one percent. It's not immaterial, but we'll put it aside. Be ... what folks should understand is that strikes aren't a good thing. They're difficult. And these

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

are real people with families, with mortgage payments, with tuition, with car note payments to be made and on the other side, we have the end uses of government that Representative Harris just talked about. Those who rely on a little bit of aid they receive from food stamps, or unemployment insurance, or child protection investigators, or those folks who process people in and out of IDOC. Something that, if suspended, could actually lead to civil rights violations. And we're talking about workers and people from all parts of the state. People who look like me and live in my district, but also people who look like everyone in this chamber, white and black, urban and rural, from all around the state. And all this Bill does, as Representative Smiddy so ably explained, is create another tool, another incentive for both parties to come to an agreement. And if they don't, an independent arbiter will help reach a fair agreement and achieve peace. This is after mediation, during which time both sides can on the one hand either strike or... or lock folks out. This is not a perfect solution, but given the current circumstances, it makes a lot of sense. It deserves an 'aye' vote. It's not extreme. Everyone vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Costello: "Mr. Smiddy, for the purpose of legislative intent, is this legislation designed to cover all state bargaining units, subject to the Governor, to include the School for the Deaf, the School for the Visually Impaired, and others?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Costello: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill.

In my opinion, the goal of this legislation is to keep government functioning for the people of the State of Illinois. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, I just wanted to I... again, clarify the timing on this. You've got a Bill that will, even if we get it passed through both chambers, the Governor's got 60 days to act on it and that's about 30 days after the expiration of the current contract, correct?"

Smiddy: "I believe so."

Breen: "Okay. And then, presuming then you're looking at an override Motion in both chambers, sometime in the summer you've got to find a place or a time when you can get 71 Members together and then... so, that'll delay it more. And then I see here that the mediation requirement, that doesn't even start until 30 days after the effective date of the Bill, which wouldn't be 'til a Veto was overridden, right?"

Smiddy: "Yes. And that will give them enough time, hopefully, to come to an agreement where we won't have to worry about this."

Breen: "Well, so I mean you're months into this process when you will have had possibly strike, lockout, what have you and which can happen almost right after the... the contract's ineffective. Is that right?"

Smiddy: "In theory, yes."

Breen: "Okay. Let's see, number 2. I did notice here, too, this expires... this is only really for one contract. It's... it's

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

only for just the contract that's in place with AFSCME right now."

Smiddy: "That is correct."

Breen: "Okay. Now, I'm also looking at this and saying now, help me on interest arbitration. Because as I understand interest arbitration, that does not take account of the state's finances, in other words, the finances available to pay for the services."

Smiddy: "That is incorrect."

Breen: "Is it required?"

Smiddy: "I'm sorry, Sir."

Breen: "Is it required?"

Smiddy: "Under the statute, the abil... it will take into account fiscal ability of the government unit."

Breen: "However, we can always raise taxes to improve the fiscal ability to pay the contract, can't we?"

Smiddy: "If you would like to introduce that Bill, absolutely."

Breen: "Well, and again, I... I only have limited experience with this from a village board perspective, but as I recall, we were presumed to have fiscal ability to pay almost any contract. I also want to make sure an... and ask, are health insurance benefits guaranteed under the... the current contract?"

Smiddy: "They are negotiated."

Breen: "They've been negotiated. They're in the current contract.

And I... I do notice, too, that we... I believe the budget that just passed, or at least the spending Bills that just passed this House, cut \$700 million from health insurance benefits.

So, I... what... how would we pay then for the continued... the

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

continuation of this contract other than by reappropriating or raising the spending level on all those benefits that otherwise would be cut?"

Smiddy: "It would be under negotiations."

Breen: "Now, I mean, you've got \$700 million in health benefits then that instead of being de... determined by this Body would then be determined by an interest arbitrator, correct?"

Smiddy: "We do not determine. We only set the parameters by appropriating. It's the Governor who would be negotiating."

Breen: "So, in other words, we would be 700 million short on... I mean, at this point, you're taking it out of our hands. You're taking it out of our hands and putting it the... in the hands of an arbitrator."

Smiddy: "It's not in our hands no matter what."

Breen: "Well, it's at least in the hands of an elected official."

Smiddy: "Which is the Governor."

Breen: "Right. He was elected. I mean, look, this contract is worth millions if not... I mean, hundreds of millions and if not, maybe even a billion to the members of AFSCME, isn't it?"

Smiddy: "I'm not in the negotiations, Sir. So, I do not feel comfortable in answering that."

Breen: "Okay. But either way, they've got a lot at stake in this contract, don't they?"

Smiddy: "I believe the whole state has a lot of interest in this, Sir."

Breen: "Now, and... and as well, I mean, I did a quick Google search here and I... I saw that it appears, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, that... that AFSCME has contributed roughly \$350 thousand to your personal campaign fund and that's not

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

including all the rest of independent expenditures and the like."

Smiddy: "I'm not sure why that's germane to this."

Breen: "Yeah. Actually, that's... that's more for one person than the Governor has given to the entire Republican Caucus in this House."

Smiddy: "As of today."

Breen: "As of today. Certainly, he also happens to be the Leader of our Party. It's not the Speaker. To the Bill. Look, we... we have interest arbitration for public safety because we don't allow them to strike because of the grave needs they serve. This is not the same situation with regular state employees. And what, I think, the answers at least have alluded to is this is not a good faith effort at preventing labor strike or in some way, keeping the government open. This is a time of crisis and in this time of crisis this is bald faced power grab. It's a tax increase Bill and it's a budget busting Bill. And every Member of this chamber should vote 'no' and vote 'no' strongly. Thank you."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 563, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 836."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Representative Smiddy, you... you had this Bill in committee yesterday, correct?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Bradley: "And at that time, the Governor's representative, his negotiator on this contract was there, was he not, correct?" Smiddy: "That is correct."

Bradley: "And he was representing the Rauner administration, the administration on behalf of the Governor with regards to his testimony there yesterday, right?"

Smiddy: "That is correct."

Bradley: "And he recognized the anti-union position or rhetoric that had come out of the office of the administration regarding, in particular, state workers, did he not?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Bradley: "And he recognized or accepted the anti-collective bargaining statements or policy agenda that has come out of the Governor's Office, correct?"

Smiddy: "Yes."

Bradley: "And he recognized the anti-worker benefit activities that had taken place with regards to the administration that he represented, specifically with workers' comp, did he not?" Smiddy: "Yes."

Bradley: "And he indicated their belief that there should be the elimination of prevailing wage and many other policies that went and flew in the face of workers... working men and women's rights in the State of Illinois, did he not?"

Smiddy: "That is correct."

Bradley: "And yet, despite all of those policy positions and despite the efforts of the administration to eliminate collective bargaining rights, he indicated that the unions' willingness to give up one of their rights, specifically the right to strike, was something they opposed."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Smiddy: "Yes."

Bradley: "He indicated that the administration that was for the elimination of collective bargaining that had been for the elimination of many benefits to workers was against the workers voluntarily giving up one of their rights, did he not?"

Smiddy: "That is correct."

Bradley: "And he indicated that he was against binding arbitration in case the talks broke down. He indicated he was against binding arbitration only if the talks broke down, did he not?"

Smiddy: "That is correct."

Bradley: "Binding arbitration only takes place in the event that the strikes or that the negotiations break down, does it not?" Smiddy: "That is correct."

Bradley: "And they were against the union giving up its right to strike."

Smiddy: "Correct."

Bradley: "Is there any other way to interpret those actions, those answers, that conduct other than to believe that the administration wanted a strike?"

Smiddy: "No."

Bradley: "And so, to the Bill. Representative Smiddy is trying to keep State Government open. He is trying to keep things going in the event. This is a significant concession by the working men and women of the State of Illinois. This puts a process in place to allow government to continue to allow a third party independently to settle something in the god forbidden event it can't be settled... settled and I don't understand why each and every one of us, as citizens of the State of

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Illinois, regardless of Party, regardless of whether or not when the Legislature or the administration, wouldn't support this attempt to keep government open. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'll keep my comments very brief. It is imperative that we keep our State Government open and running. Key services need to be provided to the people most in need. I can't imagine anyone being opposed to such a thing. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the previous speaker, I'm not going to speak long. But I've been a fifth-year member of the Plumbers and Pipe Fitters union. I've been the President of the union for 11 years, a business agent for 7, and a business manager financial secretary for 16. And I've negotiated a fair amount of contract... contracts in that time either as a part of the negotiating team or as who actually negotiated the contract. And our contractors actually came to us... we had the right to strike... actually, came to us and asked us for binding arbitration. So, it definitely works both ways. Some of the previous speakers says it takes the su... and lack of a better term, the hammer away from the state. Well, it doesn't. And it's no secret that our Governor is anti-public union workers. His heroes are Mitch Daniel from Indiana and Scott Walker from Wisconsin. And it just amazes me when the ... the presenter of this Bill has... had the foresight to keep this government open if and when there is a impasse. And when they have an impasse, it goes to the arb... arbitrator. There's

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

usually seven arbitrators that they present to negotiate and each side has a chance to pick and choose one that they do not want to use. When it comes down to the seventh, then it's down to the one they're going to use. And these... these arbitrators are fair. They work. They work trying to get the best contract and do the best they can for both sides tried to be cooperative effort. The endgame here, as I see it, and the Governor has not been bashful about saying it, he wants right to work. And in Illinois, it's not going to happen, in this day and age, anyhow. In future years, I can't predict that, but it's not going to happen. So, I applaud the Sponsor for bringing this Bill forward. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As many of the prior speakers have said, this is quite simply the responsible thing to do. And if you haven't yet, take a minute and think about what a lockout or a strike would look like in our state. Our facilities in... in DJJ and IDOC, our parole officers, skeleton crews there would mean no education, no programming, youth and inmates on permanent lockdown, long-term indefinite lockdown. As someone who represents Cook County and what we have referred to in the Cook County jail as the largest mental health facility in the state, would add significant additional concerns. Prisoner transport would stop. Prisoners would los... lose access to their attorneys because they couldn't be brought back to Cook County to meet with their attorneys. They would miss court dates. It would cripple the court system. Victims and witnesses would not have access to

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

justice. Chicago Reader Madden would stop taking mentally ill prisoners, adding further to the burden in the Cook County jail that is already struggling to provide adequate treatment for mentally ill detainees and exceedingly and really outrageously long waits for treatment beds. The implications of a shutdown are very real, very troubling, and should have each and every one of us looking at this responsible solution as the right thing to do. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Bill. And as I've sat here and listened to the debate, I've thought about the 18 years that I've practiced law. For 18 years, I have represented the management side in collective bargaining matters. I've sat across the table and rep... represented school districts and negotiated contracts against unions like the IEA and the IFT. I've sat across the table in municipalities and negotiated contracts against unions like AFSCME. We win some, we lose some. This is right for Illinois. We have to stop choosing sides. We have to do the right thing. This is not a Democrat issue; this is not a Republican issue. We're not trying to stick it to the Governor. We're trying to do the right thing. That's what this Bill is all about. Who wants to close down State Government? Who wants to close down essential services? This is about doing the right thing, not sticking it to your Governor. If you push the green button in support of this Bill, you are supporting State Government. You are supporting state workers. You are doing the right thing. I ask you to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Ammons: "I... I wanted to ask a question about your Bill,
 Representative Smiddy. Why are you proposing this
 unprecedented legislation?"
- Smiddy: "I want to be proactive and ensure that both sides stay at the bargaining table and allow our State Government to remain open until there is closure to the negotiations."
- Ammons: "And one final question for you. If this does not happen, what is the impact of them walking away from the table on child welfare services for our state? What... what do you think the impact is for that?"
- Smiddy: "It's absolutely devastating and I'm not sure what implications it... there... there might have."
- Ammons: "Thank you. To the Bill. Under normal circumstances, I would not stand in support of such an idea. As a fundamental right, I believe it is the right for unions to make the decision when it is necessary for them to strike. Under these circumstances though, I don't believe that I can stand on... in opposition to Representative Smiddy's Bill under that premise because I understand that child welfare services, services at our state universities and public institutions, all of these things are critical to communities throughout the state. What would happen to child welfare services under an idea that they would walk away from the table and not negotiate? Investigations would not happen in child abuse and neglect cases. Complaints won't be addressed in foster or group homes, centers across the state. relationships with wards of the state and their custodial

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

parents may not happen. The state is in a really difficult situation. And I just want to say for the record that I completely understand why our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be concerned about this legislation. I really, really do understand because I believe that, unfortunately, the Governor has put you in a situation that makes you have to stand with decisions that don't meet the needs or the interests of the state and that is a very difficult situation to be in. As a Legislator, we are sent to represent our district, not the other unit of government, and that's what this really boils down to. I encourage an 'aye' vote across both sides of this aisle for this reason that we must have vital services continue in our state and force the discussions to continue until they come to an agreeable contract. That is our responsibility. Our responsibility is to make sure that children and our schools and our services and the Department of Corrections are still functioning at the end of the day. That is our responsibility. And so, I encourage you. Unfortunately, Representative Smiddy is in a position to have to carry a Bill like this, but we believe, he believes that this is the right thing to do at the ... this moment in time that we are experiencing because we do not want to experience what the Federal Government experienced with a shutdown of the State of Illinois. We are already in a position that is quite difficult for us to dig out of and this does nothing more than to hurt us if they walk away from the table. With that, I will encourage every Member to have an 'aye' vote along with myself. Light the board green on this issue."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I've heard a lot of people talk about the net effect of this Bill and wanting to keep State Government open and I... and I applaud anybody that would like to keep State Government open, but this Bill is really more about getting our names in the paper and... and put on TV because this Bill doesn't do that. It doesn't keep State Government open. And there's two ways that it doesn't keep State Government open. The first one is, we send this Bill to the Governor, he can wait 60 days and it could be the end of July. The contract ends in June 1... July 1. State Government workers can strike, but if this really was about not striking or not locking out, they still have the ability to strike even under this Bill. And I'm going to lead... read you a part of the Bill that says the right to strike shall not be considered waived pursuant to Section 17 of this Act until actual convening the arbitration hearing. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, what that means is Section 17 is the enabling legislation to allow a strike. When this contract ends, they have the right to strike up until an arbitration hearing. At least a month, probably longer, for an arbitration hearing. So, if the true intent was not to strike and to keep government open, this Bill does not accomplish that. So, just take that off the record. That's not the true intent of this Bill. The true intent of this Bill is actually get... to get to that arbitration hearing because in the arbitration hearing it's take one side, take the other side. The government is locked out of the bargaining process. Everybody's locked out of the bargaining process. That's the intent of this legislation. So, call a duck a duck. That is what we're trying

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

to do here. We're trying to not have to negotiate with the Governor. We can negotiate with all other Governors, but we don't want to negotiate with this Governor and that's fine. That's a good sound piece for anybody that wants to go hang with AFSCME. No worries with that, but let's make sure we know what this is about. It's not about keeping government open. It's about getting to an arbitration hearing. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just wanted to address the previous speaker's comments. And he couldn't be ... it couldn't be further from the truth what he's talking about. This... these provisions have been in law for correction's officers, for juvenile officers, for State Police, for sheriff's officers, for members of police departments. It is... this is... these provisions are law for our safety workers. And why is it... why is this the law of the land currently? Because we don't want them striking. We don't want to put the ... the people at risk. We want to make sure that our correction's officers are doing their job. We want to make sure that the State Police are doing their job. This isn't new. This isn't new. We have it in place in Illinois today. We're just saying that we're not going to let state workers... we're not going to let the administration use state workers as a pawn in order to move forward his agenda. We're not going to allow that to happen. I... I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy to close."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Smiddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today it isn't about being on the side of organized labor and it's not about being on the side of the administration. It's about being on the side of the citizens of Illinois. We must keep both sides at the bargaining table to ensure that vital services here in Illinois keep going until we are able to come to an agreement. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? One more time. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 11 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 96. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 96, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention. That... this Bill in front of you is the Telecom rewrite. And we all know the way people communicate today has changed. Today, people are using modern... more modern technologies like voice calls, voice Internet protocol, and wireless, but our communications law just hasn't kept pace. So, this Bill represents one more step forward in our efforts to modernize the Illinois Telecommunications Act. The existing local only calling packages will end beginning July 1 of 2017. Until then,

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

existing customers are grandfathered in and new customers can meet... must meet low-income eligibility standards. In addition, we're also making it a change, video authorization is extended by five years to ensure competition is available to millions and millions of Illinoisans. Finally, this Act will sunset July 1, 2017. At that time, the General Assembly will have but one final issue to address before we transition from the old switch network to the more modern Internet network. This Bill is necessary for that transition. I'm going to urge an 'aye' vote. But... but before that, I'm going to yield my time to Representative Bradley to let him explain to you the changes he's done and the hard work he's done on 9-1-1. Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. About a year ago, myself and Representative Moffitt, on behalf of the Republican Caucus, were selected to be part of a 9-1-1 services advisory board. Along with Senator John Sullivan and... excuse me... Senator Darrin LaHood, we set forth for hundreds of hours of work with Chief Brad Bloom of the Illinois Chiefs of Police, Ralph Caldwell with Illinois AP CO, Larry Deetjen... Can we have some order please, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, could we have some... could you... along with the 9-1-1 advisory board, Brad Bloom, the Chiefs of Police, Ralph Caldwell, Illinois AP CO, Larry Deetjen, Illinois NENA, Marci Elliott with the ICC, Jana Fear for the small counties, Patrick Fucik for the large wireless carriers, Glenna Johnson for the counties between 50 and 250, Deno Perdiou, incumbent local exchange carriers, Deborah Prather, nonincumbent local exchange carriers, Colonel Kelly

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Walter, the State Police, Colleen Wright, small wireless carriers, Sheriff Claque on Illinois the Sheriffs' Association, Linda Zerwin for the large counties, Colleen Wright for the small wireless carriers, Karen Boswell with the industry, and then my own 9-1-1 coordinator from southern Illinois participated in this open meeting process, Ken Smith. These were all open meetings that took place over the course of the last year and essentially, when we passed the Bill last year, we had a one-year sunset of 9-1-1 in Illinois. As of July 1 of this year, if no action is taken, the 9-1-1 system in the State of Illinois will collapse. There will be no dial tone in many areas of the state. Unfortunately, there is no dial tone in some areas of the state currently because we have nine counties in Illinois that have no 9-1-1 service. Did you hear what I said? We have nine counties in Illinois currently with no 9-1-1 service. So, we also have a patchwork of fees. We have a patchwork of charges. And depending on where you live and whether or not your phone is plugged into the wall, there's a whole different assortment of what you might pay for 9-1-1 service. In addition, we have tens if not hundreds of systems on the verge of dis... dissolution, on the verge of not being able to continue. So, we've gone to a uniform rate in this package. We've put forth a consolidation plan to allow the locals to make decisions but to ensure a more efficient, a more connected, a more redundant system throughout the State of Illinois to ensure that there is 9-1-1 in all of those nine counties that are not currently covered. We expect that this is going to move a lot of areas in the direction that we would all like to see go. We have

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

adjusted ... we have adjusted the wireless rate in this Bill as well. We have called for the eventual elimination of the Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund. And we have put in process a plan which would get the State of Illinois to nextgen within five years. The advisory board that has worked so well will continue to exist and the 9-1-1 system administrator within the State Police and they will make recommendations that will then be presented to the 9-1-1 administrator for a final decision. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ladies and gentlemen of the State of Illinois, this is, I think, a groundbreaking piece of legislation with regards to 9-1-1. We put a Band-Aid on the system last year. We got to this point. We gave ourselves time. We worked together in a bipartisan manner and we've come up with a long-term solution for going forward with 9-1-1 in the State of Illinois for greater efficiency, for consistency, for certainty that when you make a 9-1-1 call regardless of where you're at and regardless of what your need, that it's going to go through and it's going to be delivered. I want to compliment the folks that participated in this process. I want to compliment all of you that have asked me questions concerning it. I do expect at some point in the future as we have issues that come up and some that have already come up, like, for instance, with the City of Aurora, where there will be trailer language at some point to deal with issues as they come along. But we're going to have a sunset of two years. We're going to evaluate this and continually evaluate this and we're going to let the experts work through these issues as we move forward. I would ask for an 'aye' vote to save 9-1-1 in Illinois."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Representative, I have a few questions and I want to congratulate you on getting to this point. My question is simply about the 9-1-1. Does that require an increase in cell phone rates?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley will answer your 9-1-1 questions."

Bradley: "I failed to mention that the City of Chicago's rates will remain the same."

Ford: "They will remain the same."

Bradley: "Yes."

Ford: "Does it extend the possibility that... I think we passed a Bill two years ago or last year to allow Chicago to control their own rates. Will this extend that possibility?"

Bradley: "It will keep the rates at where they are now at 390."

Ford: "It would keep it at 390?"

Bradley: "Yeah, it's status quo."

Ford: "If we pass this, it keeps it at 390?"

Bradley: "Set... It's set by Chicago and that's the rate it contemplated. That's where the rate would remain."

Ford: "And what's the purpose of 9-1-1?"

Bradley: "To deal with emergency situations and make sure that people get help when they need it."

Ford: "So, 9-1-1 is for people, when they are in need, to be able to call the police. Is that right?"

Bradley: "Well, or fire, or ambulance, et cetera."

Ford: "All right. To the Bill. I just want to read something, a few notes right here. The ACLU filed a motion for discovery

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

in late March and what they revealed is that predominately minority communities in Chicago on the south and west side of Chicago continue to face an inequitable police service. And so, I'm going to read some things from an alderman in the City of Chicago. South side alderman, Alderman Roderick Sawyer, whose ward is in the 6th Ward of Chicago which serves Calumet, Grand Crossing, Gresham, and Englewood's police district said he has heard concerns from local police commanders about delays in the time it takes 9-1-1 calls to get passed from the old EMC to the impact districts. He goes on to say, taking to my commanders... talking to my commanders, they say that there is actually a communication problem between the time that the call comes in and the call getting dispatched to our affected districts, the alderman told a reporter. This seems to be a big lag in time to the speaker. And then it goes on to say in another report, it gives examples. It says, in July, residents in Grand Crossing, a minority neighborhood, waited an average of 11 minutes for an officer to be dispatched in response to a priority call, number 1, in contrast to a different area without naming... I won't name it ... but that area was a predominately white community and the average wait time was 2.5 minutes. So, I talked to the Chicago lobbyist and the Representatives from Chicago and I told them that I would not vote against it because that would be taking away money from the possibility of keeping the system in place. Now, I'll just read into the record some commitments that they have given me that they will be doing to make things better in Chicago to serve the people in minority communities, especially the Austin

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

community where I live. So, it says that they will provide and ensure that they will be working with elected officials, myself included, to make sure that we improve response times in the Austin community and all other areas where the response time is low. They encourage me to work with them to bring the superintendent to the Austin community and other parts of the west side to improve response times on the west side so that people feel confident about police services on the west side of Chicago. I'll close by saying that I want to thank the police that's doing a good job on the west side of Chicago, but studies also show that they have a tough job, just like a teacher with a full classroom, not enough help, they're going to have a difficult time. Just like doctors and nurses having a lot of work to do and not enough support, they're going to have a difficult time. So, I'm going to urge the Chicago Police, the mayor of the City of Chicago, and the superintendent to do everything that they can to hire more police for the City of Chicago so that they can get better response time. I'm going to vote 'yes' for this Bill, but I want the City of Chicago and everyone to know that the police response time on the west side of Chicago is unacceptable and I expect better as I was promised by the City of Chicago today to vote 'aye' for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. While the weather's dark outside and sometimes it's dark outside in here, this is a good bright light. Occasionally, we get things right and this telecom Bill with the 9-1-1 component is a good bright future and good start and hopefully, we can build upon that.

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

And I want to thank the two Sponsors on that side that spoke earlier. You know, there's a little bit of something for everybody in here. If you're for probusiness, we're going to help our telecommunications carrier by giving certainty for their business model going on in the future and to help with their video portion of their... of their business model. If you don't like to see fee increases in Chicago, there's not a fee increase in here for Chicago. But the 9-1-1 component is one that we've spent a lot of time on in reports to know that things aren't running very well, especially in southern Illinois. We have a lot of dysfunction going on in 9-1-1. We don't have good strict rules in how to ... on procedures. Under this Bill, by '17, the state will... will run 9-1-1, but we'll also start to put in procedures that everybody must follow. And so, it'll be standardization that we're really trying to push here. With that, we're also trying to push to the next generation of 9-1-1 and by 2020, I believe, we will have that as well. Yeah, in 2020 and that... that will be a next leap forward in this. Those that want to see property tax decreases, if your county spends property tax dollars on 9-1-1, more than likely they're not going to have to do that and they're going to be able to save property taxes. And so, I commend the Sponsors and I commend everybody that's worked with this. On my side of the aisle, Representative Moffitt has done a yeoman's job sitting in these committees and getting this to move forward and I commend him as well and all that'll put in here because this truly is reform. This truly is going to push our state forward. And this truly is

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

going to save lives and that ultimately is what we're trying to do. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. First, I want to acknowledge and thank the METCAD 9-1-1 director from Champaign County, Ralph Caldwell. Ralph came and worked as heroically as all of the other members of this committee to... to negotiate, in essence, this Bill. I come from the City Council in the City of Urbana prior to here and this was one of the major issues for us in the City of Urbana because our 9-1-1 services were certainly growing by leaps and bounds in ways that we could not accommodate and we weren't able to realize much revenue from cell phone service charges. And so, I know this is not the Bill ultimately that will help the City of Urbana maintain its 9-1-1 services, which is already consolidated throughout Champaign County, but it has gotten us a little further down the road. And I just want to acknowledge to Representative Bradley who's worked and negotiated and fought and heard all of these arguments over the last several months to even get us to this point that clearly he does a great job trying to bring folks together. But I just wanted to point out a couple more things that I understood as a former county board member as well that downstate we have nine counties without 9-1-1 services and many of us really don't understand what that means. But to have no service at all and have to depend on communities much further away, certainly we have a long way to go to at least eliminate some of those disparities downstate. I'm also happy that this Bill sunsets in two years. It is critical that we

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

talk again in two years to see if what we put in place right now really brings equity to the system across the state. And so, I encourage Representative Bradley and all of the Members who served on this community... on this particular task force that came up with this Bill, I encourage them to stay at it, of course, and continue to work to evaluate what we did today and look at what we need to do tomorrow to build a better more concise 9-1-1 system for the state. And I encourage an 'aye' vote for this matter. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. I'll be voting 'yes' on this and I really appreciate the hard work that both Re... Leader Bradley and Leader Phelps put into it. And I appreciate the continuing effort to accommodate a un... unique situation with the City of Aurora. Aurora, with more than 200 thousand residents, is also located in four counties and has the largest portion of Aurora in Kane County. Aurora is part of the Kane County ETSB, but Aurora would like the opportunity, Leader, to determine its own fate when it comes to starting its own ETSB, if the ch... the city chooses to take that opportunity. I know we can work together. I know in the... your opening remarks you mentioned Aurora, so I greatly appreciate that. And I will be a strong support. I hope that everybody can support this amazing piece of legislation as well. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative Bradley really did an excellent job by explaining how we got to this point. He thanked a lot of people, but if it wasn't for the leadership of Representative Bradley, we wouldn't be

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

here today with this Bill. So, I just want to commend him for all that he did. I'll be brief, but I just want to remind you of a few rules of thumb in terms of an emergency response. Basically, in the case of a fire, a structure fire, it doubles in size every minute on an unsuppressed fire. Response time is so critical. In the case of full cardiac arrest, the chance of survival is reduced about 10 percent each minute of delay of getting medical help. So, a good 9-1-1 system, it's about life and death, it's about quality of life. We have a tendency to talk about our home communities, our home districts, but as you or your constituents, your family travel the state, the kind of response you get will depend on the kind of service they have in that area. This helps ensure that you're going to have a good 9-1-1 service across the State of Illinois. It makes sure that we have a sustainable revenue stream. We have some call centers that were about ready to close their doors, lack of funding. This is going to make sure that they continue to operate and service. It really helps us modernize and become more efficiency... have more efficiency in this system. Fire, police, and EMS, probably the most basic of government services, but to access them and get their service delivered takes a good 9-1-1 system. Your vote today, a vote 'yes', helps to make sure that we have that for all citizens of the State of Illinois. Thanks to everyone, the stakeholders that sat around that table for meeting after meeting after meeting, the ICC, all the staff. Thanks to Chairman Bradley for... for his leadership. Glad this time is here to vote for this. It's a good day for Illinois. Vote 'yes'."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to those who have worked so hard. To echo my colleague Don Moffitt, it's... this is a terrific step forward. One of the things that I would encourage, as we go forward and take a look at this again in a couple of years, we have some communities that inherit by definition a huge number of students every year and as we go to this kind of calculation, communities like Champaign-Urbana and Carbondale and Bloomington-Normal and DeKalb and others, particularly those that are our very large state universities, Champaign-Urbana for example, inherits upwards of 45 thousand students, all of whom are in that community for at least nine months, many of whom are in that community all year long, but with the new calculation, the fee on the cell phone will flow back to their home community and not to the university where those individuals are for most of the year. And I think we do need to take a look at that to ensure that those communities who inherit the responsibility for the safety of those students have an equitable calculation that will allow them to do that. So, again, thank you for the work. And I hope we can keep that in mind as we go forward for those communities that have the responsibility to take care of so many young people that call their community home almost yearround. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a quick question of Representative Bradley."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley will yield."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Hoffman: "Representative, I just discussed with you... first of all, congratulations, I'm totally in support of your Bill. But I was contacted by Charter Communications, which found some technical problems with the Bill. Would you be willing to work on a trailer Bill that takes care of some technical difficulties that were..."

Bradley: "You know..."

Hoffman: "...were announced?"

Bradley: "...the request of Charter came in very late in the process.

And we're very happy to look at that and work with them to see if additional remedies need to be made."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I will be voting 'no' on this Bill. What this Bill does for the residents, the taxpayers in my district, is that it creates a 75 percent additional increase in the fee that they're going to pay. What this Bill does for DuPage County which, by the way, has already done the consolidation necessary, has already got the increased enhanced technology that's good for 9-1-1, which already does 9-1-1 services very well, what this does, though, this Bill takes out every single year \$2 million out of DuPage County and it gives it out to the rest of the state to do things that, quite frankly, they have ... don't want to do or haven't done on their own. On our own, DuPage County has set the standard for 9-1-1 services. We have enhanced our ability to get to people. Nobody in my district feels threatened that 9-1-1 is not going to be there, nobody. We send ladder trucks to accidents. But meanwhile, what you're going to do is you're

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

going to take our tax dollars and send it to other places and I don't know what they've ... they've already been doing themselves. Additionally, in Wheaton alone, not only do we pay the surcharges on the wireless and the wire lines, we also, in Wheaton alone, supplement our DU-COMM system with nearly \$1 million a year in property taxes. So, my residents are already paying for these services time and time again. And now, you're going to extract every year in perpetuity \$2 million to send to other places when we've already done this. Part of the reason for this Bill and part of the reason people in my county did actually agree to this is that there was also a threat to take our \$18 million in reserve that we had shored up from our own taxing authorities for these types of systems. So, we basically got threatened. We're going to take your \$18 million reserves so you better agree to \$2 million instead. Now, it's interesting how a previous Representative noted that there's nine counties without 9-1-1 service. Well, our analysis says that the nine counties without 9-1-1 service have never enacted a referendum for a wire line surcharge. And four counties that have enacted referendum have yet to create and operate a 9-1-1 system. So, perhaps, those counties and their administrators and their elected officials should get their act together and do what the rest of the state has done in terms of providing the 9-1-1 services necessary for their counties. But I'm an adamant 'no' because this happens in... to DuPage County all the time and I'm going to stand here and stand up for our taxpayers. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this Bill today. This has been a huge issue in my district for a long time. Two of those counties that do not have 9-1-1 services are my counties and they don't do this because they're not willing to pay for it. They don't have the EAV to cover the cost of these things. It's... it's crazy. And the... the ones that do have 9-1-1 systems right now, frankly, they're at their... end of their funding. The only thing they really have left is maybe a chicken dinner or a pancake breakfast jus... to try to fund it. So, I really appreciate the work that everyone's done on this. It's been a long time coming and I real... I want to say I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This effort today... and thank you, Representative Bradley... 9-1-1 are critical services in our communities and throughout our state. Police and fire really maintains the essence of our communities. When you put forth this type of proactive legislation to reform services that need to be improved, it makes our community safe and brings us comfort. I believe this... this legislation has an opportunity to improve our 9-1-1 services and to expand our 9-1-1 services for the citizens of Illinois. And to propose to do this within two years, by 2017, that presents efficiency and effectiveness. I commend the effort. I applaud the... the movement and the proactive to make sure that all citizens get improved 9-1... 9-1-1 services to make sure that our children, our families are safe. I say vote 'ves'."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, there's two people that I want to point out here at the end that I think deserve special recognition. The first one is Chairman Dan Cronin of DuPage. And Chairman Cronin has been instrumental. As a former Member of the Legislature, he has been instrumental in making this happen. The other person I want to compliment is a guy I grew up with, Brandon Phelps. And we grew up seven miles from each other. And we were rivals in high school. And now, we have the opportunity to serve together in the Legislature. He is the chairman of the Public Utilities Committee. He is a bipartisan worker. He gave me the ability to go out and work on this issue and he supported each and every thing that we did and continues to do so. And so, on behalf of the people of the State of Illinois, not just the 9-1-1 piece, but the entire telecommunications, everyone owes Brandon Phelps a round of applause and a great debt of respect for what's happened here tonight. Thank you, Brandon, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to... I don't want to forget somebody. He's right here... where's he at? Justin Cox, thank you for all your hard work you've done and putting up with us on this. Representative Sullivan and also, Representative Bradley, right back at you, but Ladies and Gentlemen, just let me tell you one thing. Eighty-two percent of the people we represent are leaving the old network. It's time to move Illinois into the modern times. Help me. Vote 'yes'. Thanks." Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kifowit, Manley, Phillips. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #2, under the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 3763, Mr. Davis. Mr. Clerk, put it up on the board and we're here on Mr. Davis's Motion."

- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3763."
- Speaker Lang: "Maybe you should tell us a little bit what... about what's in the Amendment, Sir."
- Davis, W.: "I thought we'd adopt the Concurrence Motion first, but Ladies and Gentlemen, this Concurrence Amendment Concurrence Motion houses the remainder of the K-12 education budget that we've all been anxiously awaiting to receive from the Senate. It provides all of the resources from the State Board of Education to schools across the State of Illinois. Some of the highlights is that it maintains a 92 percent proration of General State Aid based on full funding. It also provides a \$85 million lump sum that will be used to provide what we will call a lost cap to all districts across the State of Illinois which will ensure that... that the loss based on proration will be minimized to a certain amount of money. It also provides full funding for our Maintenance of Effort obligations, so we're not in danger of losing any additional federal funding. It adds \$25 million to early childhood education, which is something that the Governor requested. It also provides additional resources for transportation and

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

again, Ladies and Gentlemen, while transportation is always a challenge, particularly for some of our larger downstate districts, we're not fully funding transportation, but we are maintaining flat funding of transportation reimbursement from the previous year. Oh, well, there we go. How about that?"

Speaker Lang: "Those in... Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Thank you. I just was concerned. Is there a cut, Representative, in the money? I know in the other Human Services budget there was the TAP Group for the autism. But here I notice that there was a reduction and I want to say \$98 thousand for autism services. I was just concerned about that. I don't know where."

Davis, W.: "So, I'm told that ISBE did not make that request as it relates to autism 'cause I think we've heard, through previous budgets, that they're trying to streamline services for autism."

Bellock: "Really?"

Davis, W.: "So, that wasn't a part... it's not a part of this budget.

It will be done through another mechanism."

Bellock: "But you're taking it out of this budget? I think I saw 98... 97 thousand... 97,800 being taken out of autism. So, it is..."

Davis, W.: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Bellock: "...being taken out?"

Davis, W.: "So..."

Bellock: "Oh."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Davis, W.: "...so, yes. As it relates to the budget, but I'm told that the State Board of Education will fund autism through a federal grant that they are receiving."

Bellock: "All right. Thank you very much."

Davis, W.: "For training."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, I just want to go through some of these line items so that we're sure how our budget is... is fitting with some of the needs that we have. Because as we've heard earlier, education is our priority, so I want to make sure we're funding our priority. So, as we look at the General State Aid, how does that compare to last year?"

Davis, W.: "Well, before I directly answer your question, Representative Pritchard, you indicated something interesting. You said education is our priority. Now, you and I will probably agree that the way we fund schools is a challenge. And in order for us to make education a real priority, at some point it's going to require us to come up with a completely different mechanism to fund schools that will change the way we deliver resources to districts, but also, we'll talk about adding more resources to that as well. Your question about the difference between General State Aid, are you talking about through... are you talking..."

Pritchard: "GSA."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Davis, W.: "GSA. Are you talking about through GRF dollars, the difference from '15 to this year?"

Pritchard: "Yes. To... to what you're proposing."

Davis, W.: "It's approximately a hundred as I'm flipping through pieces of paper here and I apologize. Just give me a moment.

I want to make sure I get you the right figure. It's approximately \$195 million, just under \$195 million."

Pritchard: "So, it is putting additional money into GSA?"

Davis, W.: "Yes, it is."

Pritchard: "Okay. So, you also mentioned transportation was at flat funding. What's the percent that we're reimbursing districts for the costs that they incurred last year, not this year, but last year?"

Davis, W.: "I'm being told that transportation is at 57 percent."

Pritchard: "Sixty-seven percent."

Davis, W.: "Fifty-seven."

Pritchard: "Okay. That's what I was thinking. We were somewhere in that general area. So, as we look... you mentioned the... the point about early childhood being extra. Is that meeting the commitment that we have made in a contract with the Federal Government?"

Davis, W.: "You talking about in early childhood?"

Pritchard: "Early... 25 million for early childhood. Does that meet our increase requirement?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I... I think it's at least a good step in the... in the right direction. I think their... if you're talking about that early childhood application that the Governor's..."

Pritchard: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "...Office of Early Childhood..."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Pritchard: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "I... if I'm not mistaken, in conversation I heard, it... it does re... it required, based on what I remember in the conversation, it required 50... a \$50 million investment, but the 25, so we're told, at least is a good faith effort toward trying to meet that obligation. Obviously, we won't know what the impact is right now, but we hope that the Federal Government will recognize what we're attempting to do and will still provide us with those additional resources."

Pritchard: "And in total that amount of money that we're putting into early childhood is how much?"

Davis, W.: "Well, it... it's 25 more million dollars."

Pritchard: "So, the total is what, 325 million?"

Davis, W.: "Approximately, \$325 million."

Pritchard: "You have in a line here for assessment and that's what I'm assuming we're required by the Federal Government to assess our K-8 and then one year in high school to meet our federal requirements. How much money are we putting into that assessment line?"

Davis, W.: "Well, it's flat from the previous year based on what ISBE said that they will need to... to do all of the necessary assessments."

Pritchard: "And that assessment this year, the current year that we're in, included the ACT for college testing? Is... is that money set aside? I know that contract has matured and we're going to be bidding out for SAT or ACT next year, but is that money included in this, then?"

Davis, W.: "It will... it will cover the federal requirements and the ACT, Sir."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Pritchard: "A lot of us have been worried about those kids that graduate from high school and may not be going on to college.

 Career and tech ed is important, ag ed, vocational agriculture is important. Are those line items funded in this proposed budget?"
- Davis, W.: "Yes, it is funded, Sir. Flat from the previous year."
- Pritchard: "I know we have money here for low-performing schools.

 We've also got intervention funds. How much are we investing in North Chicago and East St. Louis school districts?"
- Davis, W.: "Approximately \$11.2 million for a district intervention."
- Pritchard: "For district inter..."
- Davis, W.: "Which is different than low-performing. Those are two different lines."
- Pritchard: "Correct, correct."
- Davis, W.: "Okay."
- Pritchard: "'Cause we've taken those school districts over. Is there an endpoint in sight for those two districts and the takeover that we have taken in local... a local school district?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, the appropriation was reduced from the previous year, so a reduction could mean that the end is indeed in sight. I... if you recall hearing from the superintendent from East St. Louis, and I forget the gentleman's name, but you know, we recognize that he is doing a fantastic job with what is made available to him. And I think he would argue that their objective is not to just rely for in perpetuity on state aid and at some point, they do want to be self-sufficient and just fall back into the normal mechanisms of receiving state

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

dollars versus receiving any additional funds for this particular purpose."

Pritchard: "Okay. I notice we have some additional money in here for art and foreign language. Do we have any money in there for gifted education?"

Davis, W.: "I'm told that there is no specific money for gifted education?"

Pritchard: "And is..."

Davis, W.: "And I'm told that hasn't been funded in a few years."

Pritchard: "Now, that's an area that we ought to talk about. Free and reduced lunch is an item that is important. Are we funding that at the federal level?"

Davis, W.: "Yes, we are."

Pritchard: "'Cause I know eac... every year we talk about whether we can shave a little bit off of that area or whether we're meeting the federal obligation."

Davis, W.: "True."

Pritchard: "So, that... that is helpful to know. Ladies and Gentlemen of the... of the House, as we look at this proposed spending plan, I think it is a plan that meets a lot of the needs that we have. It's very similar to what we have done in the past. The only element that's missing in this budget proposal is a bipartisan development of that budget. And I would hope, as you mentioned, as we look at changing the formula for education, that we could do that in a bipartisan fashion and that we could do our budget in a bipartisan fashion, and that the only trouble I see in this budget is that we don't know if we have enough money for it. So, we're going to be telling districts that we're promising you or you can count on about

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

what you had last year, a little bit more in General State Aid, with no way of knowing for sure if we're going to be able to do that. That's problematic. I appreciate what you have done, the values you've put into this budget. I just wish you would have put in here also the value for a balanced budget. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Reggie Phillips is excused."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "What was this originally, this Bill?"

Davis, W.: "Excuse me?"

Davidsmeyer: "What was this Bill originally? It passed out of the House, when it went over to the Senate, what was it originally?"

Davis, W.: "I... I don't know."

Davidsmeyer: "It was... it was... actually, it was a couple years' worth of work. I know Representative Scherer and myself had both worked on both sides of the aisle trying to make sure that our state employees, our AFSCME employees, our Illinois State Police, all those individuals were paid that back pay and then, all of a sudden, this comes back gutted and replaced on a partisan... partisan budget Bill. I think its... it does all of the work that Representative Scherer and I put into that Bill, it does us a dis... disservice. And I will be voting 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis to close."

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the questions. Despite some of his comments, I do want to thank Representative Pritchard for all of his work toward coming up and helping to develop priorities. While he talked about this particular budget being... not being done in what he will call a bipartisan fashion, the reality is that a lot of this budget is the same budget that we had last year. And that did... that budget was done in a bipartisan fashion. So, it's not like we're changing drastically any of what we're funding this year from what we did last year. We're fortunate enough to have some increases, which is going to help a lot of districts, particularly those that rely heavily on General State Aid for their funding sources. But even those that didn't rely heavily on State Aid are going to acknowledge or ... a... a smaller cut from General State Aid. So, again, as Representative Pritchard mentioned about prioritizing education, again, I hope that we get to the point where we do prioritize education and we take it in a direction where we are not only recognizing the challenges that exist, but also recognizing that one of the challenges that we have is the fact that we need more resources as well as a different way of distributing those resources. So, therefore, that being said, thank all of you for all of your questions, your comments, your concerns, and certainly, even though this will probably be a partisan vote, you know, just recognize that your school districts are indeed going to benefit from the work that we're doing. They are going to benefit from the work that we're doing. There's a lot of correlation to be made between downstate districts and suburban districts. So,

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

in the same way I'm proud of the help that suburban districts will receive, I hope those of you in downstate districts will be proud of the help that your districts are going to receive as well. So, again, here we are at this point. We hope that you will consider voting for this Bill because this is the right thing to do at this time, recognize that we are providing resources to districts throughout the entire State of Illinois. And why wouldn't we support that effort? Why wouldn't we do that? Let's not let this get too bogged down in the broad politics that exist. This is a good budget for K-12 education. And I certainly hope that everybody votes for it. Please vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Anthony, Franks. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, if I may, and to the Members of the House, we just passed the last of the spending Bills that make up the appropriations that have been put together for FY16. There is no one in this House, no one in this House or on the other side of the aisle… or excuse me, the other side of the rotunda, who will disagree that the spending that

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

we have just authorized is three to four billion dollars out of whack. Let's use the conservative side, \$3 billion out of whack. We passed spending Bills that we have \$3 billion less money in the bank to pay for. Now, I listened yesterday or the day before to a harangue from the Majority Leader about values. That... about values. Oh, the Republicans vote 'no'. The Republicans vote 'no' because we don't care about autism, because we don't care about cervical and breast cancer, because we don't care about Amtrak service throughout the State of Illinois and nothing could be farther from the truth. You know, it's kind of like a family that says, gosh, wouldn't it be nice to go out and buy a new car or buy a new refrigerator or take a vacation, but you know, we don't have the money to do that. We'll just put it on the credit card and pay for it sometime later. The Republicans voted 'no' because we are acting like adults. The adults in the room who sit there and say when they're sitting around the kitchen table, if we don't have the money, we can't spend it. And I'm not suggesting that we shouldn't look at additional revenues at a time to fund what we want to do, but as I said in my initial remarks, there's 71 votes on that side of the aisle. You could do additional revenue right now without passing spending Bills that don't have the revenue to back them up. We know we're going to be back. We know this is a bargaining chip. But really, \$3 billion out of whack. It's not the right way to do business. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman that just spoke talked about acting like adults and I can

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

appreciate that. Acting like adults mean that we would've all voted 'yes' on the K-12 budget because it was the right thing to do. Now, we've gone back and forth about spending and revenue. I would argue that the conversation is not over yet, at least not on this side of the aisle. Maybe on your side it is over with. But there is plenty of work that we need to do and it shouldn't be just about having a 71-vote Majority. Let's recognize that the best thing for us to do is provide resources for the State of Illinois. And again, I have introduced revenue Bills, as have many on this side of the aisle. Maybe even some on your side of the aisle have actually introduced revenue Bills and that's a good thing. hopefully, very soon, we'll get to that conversation and when we do, we hope that you'll support us there. Or will it just be another 'no' because you want to play partisan politics? 'Cause that's what this is really coming down to, partisan politics. Now, I can't speak for the second floor, ultimately whatever we pass here is going to go down there and he's going to make a decision. But if we're talking about partisan politics, then let's not be scared to do the right thing, put revenue on the table, vote for revenue so we can meet our spending obligations. Again, we know that this is spending and we still have yet to deal with revenue. But if we're going to act like adults, then we should be talking about supporting the revenue along with the spending because the spending that we're doing is taking care of human services, it's taking care of the least vulnerable... the most vulnerable people here in the State of Illinois, it's taking care of children. Why is that such a bad thing? Please help me out. Doing all the

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

great things that we've done in these budgets, why is that such a bad thing? Now, the funny thing about it is that your displays... and you talk about doing YouTube and I see the young man... you guys got a guy down there that's taking video. I see him, he's uploading those right to YouTube on your behalf. But you talk about doing the right thing, then the right thing is to support what we're doing. Let's provide resources for the State of Illinois, so we can fund all of the great things that we're doing. But again, the irony is that we have these displays, but when we have quiet conversations with you, you go, yeah, I'd like to support revenue, I'd like to do that. Well, let's take these conversations public. Let's stand together and support the revenue necessary to fund everything that we passed that you want to pass but since you didn't vote for it, that's okay. We'll bring you along with us, if you're willing to support what we're trying to do. So, hopefully... hopefully, as this conversation moves forward, we'll all get there together. Not this just... not just this side, but both sides working together to support all of the great things in the budgets that we pass. Let's get there together, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Turner: "On a lighter note, last week some of you may remember, or a week or two ago, we had a... the Walgreen's Red Nose Day. It's a national event of comic relief where the proceeds go from the sale of the red noses to help lift children out of poverty. As of May 21, 17 million had been raised in donations

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

around the program. It's a great event. And the funds distributed go to different charity partners including Boys and Girls Club of America and the Save the Children. There were many people who participated here on the House Floor with the red noses and took nice pictures. And one of the willing participants was one of our doormen, Wayne Padget. And I just wanted to take this time to thank all of the Members who came around and signed the picture of Wayne that we had taken. And I just wanted to present it to him today. If you haven't had the chance to check it out, ask him if he... he'll maybe display it in the back or something like that. But he was a good sport and a great guy all around in general. So, thank you, Wayne, and thank you, Members."

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Turner. On Supplemental Calendar #1, Senate Bills-Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 455, Mr. Acevedo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 455, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1672, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1672, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Nekritz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 repre...
 represents a negotiated... negotiation between the Illinois...
 the Attorney General, the Illinois Environmental Council, the

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Illinois State Chamber, and the Illinois Environmental Regulatory Group."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 1288, Representative Hernandez. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1288, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 was adopted previously. A fiscal note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez on a Motion."
- Hernandez: "I move to hold the fiscal note inapplicable."
- Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Those in favor... On the Motion, Mr. Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, can you explain to me again what we're going to be doing with your Bill and why a fiscal note would not be applicable?"
- Hernandez: "There will be... well, there will be no fiscal impact on the Department of Labor."
- Sullivan: "There's going to be no fiscal impact on the Department of Labor to actually do the work that we're talking about through this legislation?"
- Hernandez: "That's correct."
- Sullivan: "Mmm. Okay. To the Bill. I... I do believe there's fiscal reasons why we'd want to listen to the Department of Labor.

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

They have voiced an opposition to this. They're the ones that are going to have to look at this Act, should it become law and move forward. So, I... I would... I'd disagree with the ruling this inapplicable."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Bellock, Franks. Please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no'. The Lady's Motion prevails and the note is held inapplicable. Mr... Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further notes are requested."

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1288, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 1288 creates the Domestic Worker's Bill of Rights. Domestic workers are critical to the Illinois economy. They help families meet many of the most basic physical, emotional, and social needs of the young and the old. They hate... help to raise those who are learning to be fully contributing members of our society. They provide care and company for those who... whose working days are done and who deserve ease and comfort in their older years. While their contributions may go unnoticed and uncalculated by measures of productivity, domestic workers free the time and attention of millions of other workers allowing them to engage in the widest range of social pro... productive pursuits with undistracted focus and commitment.

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

The lives of these workers would be infinitely more complex and burdened absent the labor of the mil... domestic workers who enter their home... homes each day. Household labor, paid and unpaid, is indeed the work that makes all other work possible. This legislation amends four State Laws that currently exclude domestic workers: the Minimum Wage Law, the Illinois Human Rights Act, the One Day Rest in Seven Act, the Wages of Women and Minors Act. The passage of this Bill means that domestic workers will now be included in these State Laws, the most basic protections available. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, I just have a few questions. We, obviously, know what this... this Bill does. Why do we remove the Domestic Servant Act or a new Act that you have? Why do we remove that from the Illinois Human Rights section... employment section? If you're going to try and give all kinds of rights, why do we exclude the Illinois Human Rights section?"

Hernandez: "On the contrary, Representative, it would include domestic workers into the Human Rights Act."

Sullivan: "Okay. I'm... I'm looking... It's completely my fault. I'm looking at that... that wrong. Second, this is a House Bill, is it not?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "So, we're going to adjourn on Sunday, potentially. Do you have an idea of how we're going to get this through here

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

and then over to the Senate and to the Governor should it pass?"

Hernandez: "I... I'm hoping, quickly."

Sullivan: "Unless you know a different way to warp time, we cannot get three days in the Senate for this Bill. Thank you. I'm..."

Hernandez: "We could..."

Sullivan: "I jest."

Hernandez: "Okay. Okay."

Sullivan: "I'm trying to prove a point..."

Hernandez: "Yes. Yes."

Sullivan: "...that this Bill isn't going anywhere. To the Bill. I understand what the Lady's trying to do and... and, you know, we can negotiate this further, but the reality is the Department of Labor is opposed to this because they indeed believe that this will worsen the case log of people already in the system. And so, by adding more to this without working out all the rules and details and getting the proper folks that can handle this, we're going to make things worse for people. And that's the problem and why the Department of Labor is opposed to that. And for this reason, I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Bryant, Cabello, Hammond, Stewart, Sullivan, Unes. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 31 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

- Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 541, offered by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 542, offered by Representative Ammons. House Resolution 543, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 544, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 546, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 546, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 547, offered by Representative Bennett. House Resolution 549, offered by Leader Durkin. House Resolution 550, offered by Representative Cloonen. House Resolution 551, offered by Speaker Madigan. House Resolution 552, offered by Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements. Members, please pay attention to the committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after Session. The Executive Committee is meeting in Room 118. Labor & Commerce is meeting in Room 114. Human Services is meeting in D-1. Community College Accessibility & Affordability is meeting in C-1. Judiciary... Judiciary-Criminal is meeting in Room 122. Personnel and Pensions is meeting in Room 115."
- Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk,

 Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til

 Saturday, May 30 at the hour of 10 a.m. Those in favor say

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned 'til Saturday, May 30 at the hour of 10 a.m." Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4226, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. First Reading of this House Bill. Committee Reports. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1717; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 33, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 33, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate 1265. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 526. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Community College Accessibility & Affordability reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 527. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 777. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: do pass Short Debate is Senate Sims, Chairperson 1281. Representative from Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 836, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1747, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1747.

58th Legislative Day

5/29/2015

Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 1281, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1717, a Bill for an Act concerning the Prairie Wind Trail. Second Reading of these House Bills... these... or... Second... Second Reading of these Senate Bills. These Senate Bills will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution #20, offered by Representative Manley, is referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."