63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. The House will be in order. The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Verzell Taylor who is with Main Street Church of the Living God in Decatur. Pastor Taylor is the guest of Representative Scherer. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Taylor."

Pastor Taylor: "Father, first, let me say thank You on behalf of each individual here this afternoon. We thank You for yet another opportunity to serve Your people. We thank You for Your many abundant blessings. We thank You for life itself, for the measure of health we need to fulfil our callings for re... resources and for friendship. Thank You for the ability to be involved in useful work and for the honor of bearing appropriate responsibilities. I ask this day that You give each person in this House wisdom in every decision they make and help them to think clearly. Bless our Governor and our Senators as well. Grant each of them discernment and commonsense so they will be strong and effective Leaders. Help them to lead and govern with integrity and may their integrity guide them and keep them on track. Give them the ability to work in harmony, even when there is honest disagreement, for they are men and women of high moral character, not compromising the standards that Your word lays out for them. Direct their steps, Father, according to Your word, for their decisions have a great impact on our lives, we the people, who reside in the State of Illinois. Be their defender, Lord, and protector and keep them always on guard

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

and/or please give the personal peace in their lives and joy for their task. We give You honor, Lord, as your eyes observe and keep watch over this House. In Your precious name, we pray, Amen."

Speaker Lang: "Be led in the Pledge by Mr. Hays."

Hays - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

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

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Cabello, Phillips, Reis, Sosnowski, Stewart and Sullivan are excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. We have 108 Members present, we do have a quorum. Mr. Martwick is recognized."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Martwick: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the chamber up behind me, I have a person here, a friend of mine, joining me in the chamber. He is a volunteer for many of the things that I do on the northwest side, but it's not that that I ask you to acknowledge him for. This is a man who's made his whole life about civic involvement, involved in the process, involved in helping several elected Leaders at any given moment through many years of time. He's really been a help to everyone. His name's Mike Bawiec; he's up in the gallery. Mike, stand up. And would everyone please welcome him to Springfield."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, reports the following committee action taken on June 9, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 691; approved for consideration for the Order of Concurrence is House Bill 3219. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on June 9, 2015: recommends be adopted is the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3237. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on June 9, 2015: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 690; Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill to 691."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Andersson: "Thank you. I have figured out a good reason to be in summer Session. When Inauguration happened, my daughter couldn't be there 'cause she was at college, in school. When we had regular Session, my daughter was in college and couldn't be here. But now, it's summer and she's home. So, I have the pleasure of introducing to all of you, my daughter, Sara Andersson. Please give her a warm welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining us today.

Representative Ammons is recognized. Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't... I couldn't hear over the wonderful applause that we gave for the young lady, Mr.

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Andersson's daughter. Welcome her. I also want to take a moment and welcome my Page for today, which is a graduate of the University of Illinois, my cousin and friend, Wayne Williams. If you raise your hand, they can see you. He just graduated from the Master's Program in accounting at the University of Illinois. Welcome Wayne to our Assembly today."

Speaker Lang: "Congratulations and thank you for being with us. Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you. I stand... where is he? I stand... I rise for the happy birthday of my friend and my colleague, and for some in the Capitol are completely confused, that he's also my ex-husband. Happy birthday, Keith Wheeler... Keith Wheeler."

Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday, Representative. We must have missed that marriage thing. Mr. Brady."

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

Brady: "I, too, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, want to introduce my son who's here with me today, a recent graduate of seventh grade at Evans Junior High School. Mr. Tom Brady, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for joining us. Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You look dashing today."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Sandack: "I was using the line..."

Speaker Lang: "Was that... was that spin, Sir"

Sandack: "It was."

Speaker Lang: "Okay. Go right ahead."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Sandack: "But you do look dashing. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Sandack: "And the Clerks... the Clerk's by you. I just learned that the Senate has a June schedule. Are we in this House going to have a June schedule for the remainder of the month?"

Speaker Lang: "We could move you to the Senate and then you'd have a schedule."

Sandack: "I've already been there. I wish not to return but I would think it's helpful for the Members on both sides of the aisle to know a schedule, if there is one."

Speaker Lang: "We'll take that request under advisement, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "But thank you for the important question. Mr. Hays is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Hays: "Let's be mindful this afternoon of many across our state, specifically, in east central Illinois, who were the victims of some very severe storms and rain, more than 8 to 10 inches of rain in the last 48 hours. In some parts of Illinois, city streets and communities like Danville that look more like rivers, flash floods, basements, farms that are totally flooded. Power outages that last for 8 and 10 and 12 hours. Please keep those people in your thoughts and prayers. Some parts of northern Vermilion County have had 18 inches of rain since the beginning of May. Please keep those folks in your thoughts. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Moffitt."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Moffitt: "On our wing, not only did we celebrate Representative Wheeler's birthday, but there are two additional ones. Representative Cavaletto and Representative Charlie Meier's also celebrating birthdays. Would you help wish them a happy birthday?"
- Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday, guys. Our side of the aisle likes chocolate when the cakes arrive. Mr. Clerk, page 9 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 3237. Representative Feigenholtz. Please proceed, Representative."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3237, as amended, is a long term agreement between the Associated Beer Distributors and the Craft Brewers Guild. It allows small beer manufacturers the ability to grow in the marketplace while maintaining the integrity of the three-tier system. Ninety-nine percent of all craft brewers manufacture fewer than a 120 thousand barrels of beer. So, I believe that this change in the law is a fix, permanently, likely, to the craft brewing... the growth in the industry and responding to the marketplace. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I'd like to thank the Sponsor for my outfit today. And then, I have some questions for purposes of legislation intent. Is the pur..."
- Speaker Lang: "Are you... before you proceed, are you going to give us the background story on that or..."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Nekritz: "No."

Speaker Lang: "All right. Please proceed, Representative."

Nekritz: "Thank you. Is the purpose of House Bill 3237 to permit small Illinois or out-of-state brewers who, prior to July 1, 2015, also held a brew pub license to continue to hold the brew pub license regardless of the annual beer production level?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct, Representative Nekritz. This legislation protects a small brewer's right to continue to hold a brew pub license after its annual production exceeds 3,720,000 gallons. This legislation renames the craft beer license as a class 1 brewer's license, permitting production of 930,000 gallons of beer and a class 2 brewer's license permitting production up to 3,720,000 gallons of beer. For purposes of legislative intent, this has been agreed to by ABDI and the Craft Brewers Guild. It is, again, a long-term solution affording the marketplace an opportunity to develop their markets, but it is also is consistent with the three-tier system on alcoholic beverage regulatory structure as we know it now in the State of Illinois."

Nekritz: "Would it be the intent of the legislation that, upon enactment, only an entity which held a brewer or non-resident dealer license and concurrently held a brew pub license prior to July 1 of 2015, and which during that time manufactured no more than 3,720,000 gallons of beer, may continue to hold a brew pub license even should its annual production exceed 3,720,000 gallons of beer?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes. So, to be clear, as defined in this legislation, a brewer up on the north side such as Revolution

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Brewing, or Two Brothers, and DESTIHL, that I intend for this legislation to... for these businesses to model... to be grandfathered under this legislation, and the Sponsor and proponents of the Bill intend for these businesses and this model to be judged in compliance with all State Laws following the enactment of this law."

Nekritz: "Finally, a class 1 brewer may self-distribute a certain amount of gallons but not own a brew pub, while a class 2 brewer may own a brew pub but under no circumstances may they self-distribute. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Nekritz: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, obviously, it's coming back on Concurrence. What changes were made by the Senate?"

Feigenholtz: "This, essentially, was a gut and replace, Representative..."

Sandack: "Right."

Feigenholtz: "...Sandack. This has been an issue that's been debated for a very, very long time, as I'm sure you're aware. And this is actually a final agreement that has been reached by the parties. And as I mentioned earlier, it is a reflection of the marketplace as we know it. I'm sure you see it in your district."

Sandack: "And it maintains..."

Feigenholtz: "I know I..."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Sandack: "...it maintains the three-tier system and is fully agreed by all the interested parties in the industry, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "For a long, long time, yes."

Sandack: "Thank you. And lastly, did you give Representative Nekritz your coat to wear today?"

Feigenholtz: "I... I refuse to answer that on the record."

Sandack: "Is she wearing your entire wardrobe today?"

Feigenholtz: "No. She's wearing her entire wardrobe."

Sandack: "I sense perhaps not a candid response there. Thank you anyway."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Ladies and..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays. We'll give you a chance, Representative."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, can you walk me through, again, the dynamics with the craft brewers or the brew pub as it relates to distribution... under the new dynamic?"

Feigenholtz: "Class 2 brewers will be able to use the classification of brew pub."

Hays: "Well, I... I know this ..."

Feigenholtz: "Are you talking about gallonage, is that what you want to know?"

Hays: "Yeah, I guess... I guess if you would kind of walk the Body through. I know that there's... there's this concern, this historical concern, about what is commonly known as the threetier system, right? The... the brewers, the retail outlets, and the distribution community. And that has been something that has been, I think, a point of contention over the last several years as it relates to brew pubs. And as you well know, we

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

kind of had incremental discussions as it relates to what the gallonage should be, and I think I heard you suggest in your opening comments that this might be a longer term, a more permanent solution. Could you just kind of walk us through the dynamic if one is a craft beer producer, and maybe they have their own onsite retail kind of an outlet, what is the threshold at which they can distribute their own wares to other retail markets, and when they would need to come under that historical three-tier system?"

Feigenholtz: "Cla... class 2 cannot distribute, Representative."

Hays: "And what is the gallonage related to... to class 2, again?"

Feigenholtz: "A hundred and twenty thousand barrels, which is the equivalent of 3,720,000 gallons or 1,653,333 cases."

Hays: "So... so, the 120 thousand barrel and below threshold, then the distribution would fall under what I'm calling the historical three-tier system? Am I articulating that correctly?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct. Yes."

Hays: "And then they... but their... but their production would be capped at 120 thousand barrels regardless of the distribution dynamic?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct. And I think both parties feel that this amount is going to be sufficient for a long, long, long-term fix. Some estimate, perhaps, even 20 years."

Hays: "Is there a different threshold for, let's say, the even smaller distributor that... that produces, like I said, maybe has their own retail onsite outlet, but then maybe they go to the corner market or just a few retail outlets. Is that a different threshold for those smaller producers?"

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Feigenholtz: "That would be... I believe you're describing the class 1 brewer. They are formerly known, after we pass this into law... Class 1 brewers, are what we know now as craft brewers, and they may only manufacture 30 thousand barrels of beer per year and they are permitted to self-distribute."

Hays: "So, they can go to the local corner market, the restaurant, maybe in their general vicinity. If they're below that \$30 thousand threshold, that would remain the same?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct. And they're also not entitled to be... to own a brew pub. That's..."

Hays: "The 30 thousand and below could not own... Okay."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Hays: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As someone whose district contains several craft brewing facilities, I want to very much thank the Sponsor and those that have been working on negotiating this item for, oh, it must be two years now. So, I can't tell you enough how much they've worked, how much give and take there's been to make this happen, and acknowledge the changing market for craft brewing in Illinois. So, my thanks to ABDI and to the Craft Brewers Guild for their very hard work in making this happen."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, just to make clear, this... this Bill, initially, as we had sent it to the Senate, had a couple of

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

exceptions for some 100-foot rules. Those are no longer in the Bill, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Breen: "Okay. Then to the Bill. I... this is a great measure. It is absolutely one that... I mean, I hope it comes out of this chamber unanimously because we all have craft brewing. Craft brewing is a new thing in Illinois that has taken off. I would venture to say that many of our districts have craft brewers, including mine. The issue of providing social media is a minor point, and one that certainly, in 21st century, there's no reason that a brewer or other interest shouldn't be able to provide that to various interests that are selling the product. So, again, would strongly urge a 'yes' vote on this measure."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Leitch: "For the benefit of the newer Members, can you share with us what a three-tier system is?"

Feigenholtz: "The three-tier system is manufacturer, retailer, and distributor."

Leitch: "And how long has Illinois had that system in place?"

Feigenholtz: "Just after prohibition, I believe."

Leitch: "And can you tell me the virtue of a three-tier system?"

Feigenholtz: "I really can't express a historical perspective to satisfy your needs."

Leitch: "Okay. The... are you of the opinion that this Bill, reinforcing the three-tier system, will help Illinois preserve nonhorizontal collaborations of beer in the future?"

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

- Feigenholtz: "The intent of this Bill is to... is a reflection of the craft beer marketplace, an agreement between other beer interests in the State of Illinois, to modernize. It has maintained... or the intent of this Bill is to maintain the integrity of the three-tier system. I believe that we discussed that a few times already, Representative."
- Leitch: "Well, the... I guess I didn't ask that question very well.

 But as the world breweries and beer manufacturing has horizontally become more and more centered in one or two companies, my question is, the concern that's been on this floor over a number of years, about the horizontal combinations that could threaten the three-tier system. My question then is, how will this protect the three-tier system?"
- Feigenholtz: "I think the legislation provides for very clear definitions for the different classifications as I described with class 1 Brewer, class 2 brewer, et cetera. I'm... you know, as I said earlier, this is not about divesting ourselves from the three-tier system. It is about a reflection of the current marketplace around craft beer. It's an agreed Bill."
- Leitch: "So, you oppose horizontal combinations throughout the state?"
- Feigenholtz: "Representative, this... this Bill actually helps further define craft brewers who may have had a problem prior to this, but this is a clear definition between two parties that have agreed to maintain the integrity of the system by moving more product into the marketplace."
- Leitch: "Well, I'm very much opposed to horizontal combinations of the large beer companies in Illinois and very much in favor

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

of the three-tier system. So, I hope that that is the intent of the Bill and will strengthen the Bill. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

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? Anthony, Burke, Conroy, Frese. Mr. Clerk... Burke. Kelly Burke. Please take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting 'yes', 20 voting 'no', and the House concurs with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3237. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Brown is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Democrats will also caucus immediately in Room 114. Both caucuses, immediately. Immediately. Right now. Immediately. And the House will be in recess 'til the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 580, offered by Representative Cloonen. House Resolution 581, offered by Representative Hoffman. House Resolution 582, offered by Representative Daniel Burke. House Resolution 583, offered Representative Brady. House Resolution, 584, offered by Representative Brady."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sandack."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just wondered if you'd had a chance to inquire of the powers that be about a June schedule?"

Speaker Lang: "We'll be back to you on that point, Sir."

Sandack: "Should I hold by breath?"

Speaker Lang: "Actually, the Body would appreciate that. So, thank you for the offer. Yes. Mr. Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "I just wanted to make the Body aware that the Calhoun Lady Warriors won the Class 1A state softball tournament this weekend. And I would love to have them down here at some point, so if I could get a schedule of when we'd be in, I'd much appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "You can get that from Mr. Sandack."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "On page 4 of the Calendar appears House Bill 690.

Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 690, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm... I'm glad we're having the opportunity today to discuss property tax relief. And again, I wanted to thank Governor Rauner for this opportunity because, really, this... we would not be discussing this if it wasn't for his insistence on it. And this is one of the most important issues facing the State of Illinois today especially with us losing our population, losing manufacturing base, losing tax bases. We have some of the highest property taxes in the entire country, and this ... believe... this, I believe, will help address that. House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 690 would extend the applicability of the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law to all units of local government in Illinois including Home Rule entities, and it will cap the annual increase in levy extensions at zero percent going forward unless residents of those taxing districts approve an increase through a referendum. This Bill is similar to one we saw a few weeks ago. And in response to some of the criticisms of the Republican Members when we debated a similar measure, this language includes caps on extensions used to surface... used to serve as bonds that have been issued by a taxing district. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I'm looking at this Bill that it's very much like the Governor's ideas, only I think they're better, this Bill, because it takes out certain loopholes. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Sandack: "Representative Franks, you mentioned the Governor, I think, three times in your opening remarks. Have you spoken to him recently about today's Amendment?"

Franks: "I have not."

Sandack: "Well, wouldn't it be better practice if you were seeking to actually say that this Bill is consistent with and/or approved by the Governor, that you would actually had a conversation with him or one of his..."

Franks: "Well, actually, Mr..."

Sandack: "...folks in his office?"

Franks: "Actually, Mr. Bradley's Bill, that we'll be able to talk about soon, I think is the exact language."

Sandack: "Well, I'll get to that in a second, but I want to talk about what's before us now."

Franks: "No, this would... would be the idea that he had forward; and I've improved on them by two ways. His doesn't start... his idea wouldn't start until 2016, ours would start in 2015. So, that's one year of..."

Sandack: "You mean the tax levy year..."

Franks: "Correct."

Sandack: "...effective 2016?"

Franks: "Right, it would go a year..."

Sandack: "Right."

Franks: "...earlier which I think is better. And additionally, this
Bill would freeze the automatic increase for the debt service
payment to the extension on the levies as well... as well as
the debt service where they..."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Sandack: "Well, let me stop you right there, Jack, because you said that's an improvement. That's not part of the Governor's plan."

Franks: "It's not."

Sandack: "Right. So, that is a distinguishing characteristic."

Franks: "Correct."

Sandack: "Freezing taxes that would also have an affect on indebted bond... bonded indebtedness that municipalities already have."

Franks: "It wouldn't have any effect on those that have already passed through referendum. It would be for the non-referendum debt. And they'd still get the same amount of money, Ron. It's..."

Sandack: "Yeah, but I get that. But how many... have you done a survey as to how many, you know, debt issuances are out there via direct referendum versus just your local unit of government action?"

Franks: "No, I haven't done that."

Sandack: "So, I mean, like, it may be that there's more of the latter than the former. You don't know, right?"

Franks: "Correct."

Sandack: "Okay. And again, to be clear, the concept of the freeze affecting bonded indebtedness is not part of the Governor's initiative?"

Franks: "That's correct."

Sandack: "And to be clear, again, your Bill, the one on the board right now, would be effective tax levy year 2015, payment year 2016?"

Franks: "Correct."

Sandack: "And that also is not part of the Governor's initiative?"

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Franks: "Correct. I think it's better than his."

Sandack: "Okay."

Franks: "I like his ideas. We built... we built on them."

Sandack: "Fair enough. How many votes would it take to pass your Bill so it becomes effective the time... at the time you want it, immediately effective?"

Franks: "Seventy-one."

Sandack: "And... are there 71 of your brethren on your side of the aisle here?"

Franks: "We're all brethren."

Sandack: "On your side of the aisle?"

Franks: "And I'm hoping together we'll stand together to help all the taxpayers of the State of Illinois and I'm counting on forty-seven on that side..."

Sandack: "I love the ... "

Franks: "...because most of us have campaigned on this. If we have all 47, I'll try to give you the 38 we had last time, and we're going to send this out of here with flying colors."

Sandack: "Jack, I love the gratuitous aspect of the answer, but the question is..."

Franks: "We're all in this together, Ron."

Sandack: "We are. Have you surveyed and polled your colleagues on how many votes you're going to deliver?"

Franks: "I think probably similar to what we did last time."

Sandack: "And that was 38."

Franks: "So, you don't have to bring that many. You guys don't have to bring that many."

Sandack: "There were 38?"

Franks: "Yes."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Sandack: "And by the way, speaking of last time, 695, you were very vociferous saying, this may be the only chance..."

Franks: "I know."

Sandack: "...we have to vote on a property tax freeze. Do you remember that wonderful articulation?"

Franks: "I think you called it bloviation."

Sandack: "Yeah, it really was."

Franks: "I was... I'm surprised that we're having this today. I thought we might be voting on something else."

Sandack: "And I sus..."

Franks: "But let me tell you, I am really happy we're here today, because we have to keep shining a very bright light on this issue."

Sandack: "I agree with you."

Franks: "It's not something to goof around about because you know what's happening in our districts. We know how bad it is."

Sandack: "I agree with you. To the Amendment. I agree with the Gentleman's last few comments. This is not something to goof around with. This is not something to play around with and it is serious business. Unfortunately, this Amendment isn't. And while I would not characterize the Gentleman's intentions other than legitimate, the fact of the matter is, this isn't the Bill meant to pass. This Amendment won't pass. I suspect it won't be 38 on the other side of the aisle. It's not a real Amendment. It's not a real Bill. It's a rehash of what the Gentleman proposed last time with the same type of outcome. It is a shame that we continue to perpetrate this gamesmanship and use this time so unwisely, so unwisely. So, I'm going to vote 'present'. I'm going to recommend to my

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

colleagues a 'present' or 'no' vote. And Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask for a verification on this Amendment, please. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, let me just... let me just make sure I understand. This Bill is similar to House Bill 695 that we voted on just a couple of weeks ago, right?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Harris, D.: "Right. They both apply to the 2015 levy year, right?"

Franks: "Yes. Yes, Sir."

Harris, D.: "They both explicitly apply to Home Rule units of government, right?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Harris, D.: "This one explicitly applies to tax... debt tax extensions, correct?"

Franks: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "The other one did not?"

Franks: "It did, but it wasn't... we changed some of the terminologies. I think there was some confusion because some on your side of the aisle were arguing that it didn't, and then there was issues. So, we wanted to make it very clear that it did."

Harris, D.: "Wasn't there... you may have misunderstood the concern on this side of the aisle. Wasn't the concern on our side of the aisle that if indeed there is a bonded indebtedness, the taxing body has to have the ability to levy to pay off those indentured bonds, correct?"

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Franks: "And they still would. Nothing would change that. I mean ... "

Harris, D.: "But aren't... aren't..."

Franks: "...they'd still be getting the same money."

Harris, D.: "Aren't we... but aren't we limiting their ability to levy for the bonded indebtedness?"

Franks: "No."

Harris, D.: "That's what... that's what the..."

Franks: "No. I don't see it that way..."

Harris, D.: "...as I read, what the Bill says."

Franks: "...because this only applies to those debts that were taken on without voter approval. So, they'd still get the same amount as the prior years and if they felt like they needed additional funds, all they'd have to do is bring it to the taxpayers. 'Cause what happens oftentimes, as you know, is when they pay off the bonds and they fall off and just reissue new ones."

Harris, D.: "Well, they may..."

Franks: "Right?"

Harris, D.: "I appreciate the answer. There may be a concern because there's some confusion here about... about how this applies. There may be a concern about that bonded indebtedness. But let me ask you this. Let me go back for a second. As you know, last year, you had a Bill that said if the EAV in a district goes down, that the levy would be frozen... or the tax rate would be... the tax that could be extended would be frozen to any taxpayer, correct?"

Franks: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "That it could not go up in any way. It couldn't pay any more."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Franks: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Right. And I voted for that Bill because I think it made sense. Let me ask you now, if the EAV goes down in a district, under this law, could that property tax payer pay more? 'Cause all you're doing here is freezing the extension, correct?"

Franks: "But... but none, in any of the proposals that we've seen, including the Governor's exact language, there's nothing that deals with individual homeowners to guarantee that their individual tax may not go up. We understand that. What we're trying to do though is to level the playing field so it doesn't automatically go up. Because right now, as you know, and we... and our districts are very close to each other, we saw property values fall in excess of 40 percent, while at the same time, property... the property taxes increased for many of those homeowners at about 30 percent. So, at a time when their home had fallen almost in half, their property taxes went up by..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Franks: "...almost a third."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Franks: "That is absurd."

Harris, D.: "No, and I understand and I was not... I agree with you that what really what needs to be done is rather than a... rather than this limitation, I think what really needs to be done is a genuine, complete overall of the property tax system, which I agree with you is broken. People can sit around in a circle saying it's his fault, his fault, his fault, and you can't give a direct answer to the

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

property taxpayer, what's the cause of my property taxes going up."

Franks: "And that's why we have to start, because we have to have to... you know what the problem is?"

Harris, D.: "But let... let me ask you this."

Franks: "Okay, go ahead."

Harris, D.: "Let me ask you this. On this Bill, since this Bill is so similar to 695, which we were here two weeks ago debating... if this Bill is so similar to 695, the only thing that's different as I understand it, really, is this... this limit on the debt extension..."

Franks: "Right."

Harris, D.: "...levy, correct?"

Franks: "Right."

Harris, D.: "If the Bill were... if 695 were to pass, if there were some sort of an agreement and the Bill were to pass, couldn't the Governor amendatorily veto that Bill to include this kind of language? It would certainly be in keeping with what the subject matter of the Bill is?"

Franks: "Well, it would... It'd have to pass with 71 votes anyway if he amendatorily vetoed it. And it's easier to pass it cleanly. But can I go back to one something you just said a minute ago? I think what we have to look at, and you're talking about blaming and stuff, the problem as we have the system now, is that a guaranteed annual increase in tax levies sends the absolute wrong message to our local governments. So, instead of putting any onus on them to find new ways of being more efficient, they can do business that's always been done as business as usual. And we have to stop that business as usual.

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

I mean, that's one of the reasons, you know, there... we have elections. And the Governor came and said, hey, I want us to shake up Springfield. I want to stop business as usual. Nothing says stop business as usual than saying stop feeding the beast. And if you want more money, you have to ask the taxpayers for it."

Harris, D.: "Certainly. Restrain on the... on the finances is a restrain on what... what you call feeding the beast. But let me, if I may, to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. You know, two weeks ago... two weeks ago, we were here, we debated House Bill 695 Amendment #1 to House Bill 695 and apparently, that vote was not enough. That vote was not enough, so we have to all gather together and drive down to Springfield again and debate exactly the same issue. This is productive? I think not. Why in the world we all come down here again to debate an issue which we've already addressed? I will tell you. The last time it was out there so that you could have the recorded vote and you could send out the postcard. Well, here you go, here's my recorded vote again. You can send out postcard number two because my vote is exactly the same as it was before and that's a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, I know in committee you identified that special service areas, even though they are not referendum bonds, would not be impacted by that. Is this... is that correct?"

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Franks: "Correct. Because right now they're not subject to the PTELL issues. This only deals with the PTELL stuff."

Fortner: "What about alternative revenue bonds?"

Franks: "If this would... they would not be affected. They're outside of the caps now and they will remain outside of the caps because they have a different revenue source."

Fortner: "Right, but one of the problems with an alternative revenue bond is that the property tax is pledged as a backstop should the alternative revenue fail. And so the question is, if for some reason the revenue was not there in the amount needed to service the bonds for any bond agreement, would the levy be able to increase to cover the bonded indebtedness?"

Franks: "No. Nothing would increase. I mean, they've got that same issue now. So, if they, for some reason, they would default on a bond, they don't get the automatic increase. You know what I'm saying? Right now..."

Fortner: "Right."

Franks: "They would have to run a different referendum now, so nothing would change."

Fortner: "They wouldn't necessarily have to run a referendum if..."

Franks: "If you wanted to go above the CPI."

Fortner: "If it was within the CPI, they would not have to do that."

Franks: "Right. Right."

Fortner: "So, it potentially could put more of a pinch then what is existing at present on that?"

Franks: "I would say no more or less than anything else."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Fortner: "Well, but this is something where there is a specific contract with bondholders as to how to service the bonds. So, there's a little bit of difference there, that's why."

Franks: "But it would... it would still be backed by that."

Fortner: "And the other thing I wanted to do, just again for the benefit of the whole Body, with the other question... in the form of the referendum question that is in the Amendment..."

Franks: "Yeah."

Fortner: "...one of the things that it seems to me, that is something that works in PTELL, is the idea that there's a percentage cap, five percent, but it can be modified downwards by the CPI so that in years where there is very low or virtually no inflation, you can get a lower level. And in this language, if it's zero percent, the language provides for the public to choose to raise that extension limitation to a percentage greater than zero percent. But is there any way, then, to have that... if... let's say they pass a higher percent... let's say they want to go back to five percent. Let's say they want to go back to what we have today, would they be able to still have it adjusted downward by the CPI?"

Franks: "I appreciate you bringing that up, and I was looking at the Bill again, so I appreciate... that's a very legitimate question. And if you look at the Bill, itself, we've addressed that. Because there's specific language that you can... you have to put in the percentage that you're looking for but you also... you also have to put in the years in what you're looking for. So, you can say I want five percent for the next three years, okay, and then three percent for two years or whatever you like. So, it is addressed in here. And I would also submit

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

for legislative intent, but I think if you put a number like a... let's assume that we choose the number three... the three percent increase... I would say you could put up... up to. I'm not saying you would necessarily have to go to that amount. But they... because we have to say what years this applies, I think that takes care of your issue."

Fortner: "It would certainly take care of it barring, you know, though I suspect if we had, you know, the kind of economic collapse we saw in 2008, might not take care of it if people had said, oh, in 2006 I need five years at five percent, might not have worked 'cause I don't know that a lot of entities would have seen that level of..."

Franks: "But at least you have the ability now, if we did that, then to be able to go and change the law. Because then you could just run another referendum and say, hey, nobody anticipated our property values would be falling. So, what we'd like to do is, starting next year, change it to zero. So, at least you'd have that option with this Bill, which you don't have now."

Fortner: "So... so, you could... you could move it either direction?"

Franks: "Right."

Fortner: "You could move it after you moved it?"

Franks: "Correct."

Fortner: "Okay. Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

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

DeLuca: "Thank you. Representative Franks, a few weeks ago, we debated this at length and I won't rehash everything, but

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

you've come back and you recall we were talking mainly about unfunded mandates..."

Franks: "I am. I do."

DeLuca: "...and that there was no relief provided in these, and it seemed to me that you agreed that there should be a component of that in this legislation..."

Franks: "Not in this legislation, Representative. If I may, first of all..."

DeLuca: "Yes."

Franks: "...your daughter Francesca's here and she's terrific. So, thank you. I'm glad you brought her with you today and obviously you're arguing better because she's here. I want to make..."

DeLuca: "You're not going to soften me up."

Franks: "I want to make sure people understand that. I'm not going to pull a Batinick, all right? I didn't bring my folks. But my point is, we are working on getting rid of the unfunded mandates. I'm part of a task force with many Members here, with the Lieutenant Governor, and I agree with you but that's not part of this Bill. We can't put everything on one Bill. That's why we even break our budget Bills into many Bills. But I do agree that there are many unfunded mandates and this is just one portion of how we solve the problem. It's not the whole thing, but it's a very critical portion of how we help our taxpayers."

DeLuca: "Well, you're... you're back here, basically, with a second bite at the apple. There was an opportunity to include some language in there. You know, this is the mandate of all

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

mandates. We could have included some language to offer some relief."

Franks: "I would respectfully... you know what the mandate of all mandates is? The mandate of all mandates is when government automatically gets a five percent increase or a CP... or with CPI, whichever's lower. That is the mother of all mandates. I'm trying to take away that mandate to at least level the playing field for our taxpayers so our kids can stay here, so our grandparents don't have to move to Florida, so we don't rip families apart."

DeLuca: "I understand that and I want to be helpful 'cause I support the concept. If this passes, what's your intention in the Senate? I mean, can you give us some assurance that you plan on continue working on this..."

Franks: "Absolutely."

DeLuca: "...as we move forward to provide relief from the mandates if this eventually becomes law?"

Franks: "Absolutely. You have my word. And I'm working on it now and I wish it were going faster 'cause it's critical. We need it at many levels of government."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks to close."

Franks: "Thank you, everyone. I respect everyone's position on this issue and whether you agree or not, but I heard some of your... my colleagues urging a 'present' vote. And I'd respectfully urge you not to do that. Don't hide from the monster. It's not going to go away. Let's not do the ostrich defense. I believe a 'present' vote is an avocation of your responsibility to represent your district and your

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

constituents. And on a more basic level, its abandoning any obligation you have on what you think is right. So, if you oppose freezing property taxes, then vote 'no'. It's simple. But if you think that we need to freeze property taxes, and we need to help our taxpayers and that we believe that this is part of the solution, then I'd ask you to vote 'yes'. That's what we were sent down here to do, is to vote. And let's not get pulled into the petty partisan politics that seems to have seized Springfield. And let's try to breakthrough 'cause if we can pass this Bill, we'll have a real breakthrough that we can send over to the Senate and we can give the Governor a large portion of what he was looking for. A few weeks ago, he talked about he wanted property tax relief and he wanted workers' comp reform. Let's at least start the ball rolling. Let's stop the gridlock Springfield. Let's stand up for our constituents and let's vote our switches and let's do what's right. Please vote 'ave'."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. Mr. Sandack has asked for a verification of this vote, so Members will be in their chairs, vote their own switches, staff will retire to the rear of the chamber. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 43 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no', 34 voting 'present'. Do you persist, Mr. Sandack? Gentleman withdraws

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

his Motion for a verification. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 690, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "I appreciate the votes that we got on the last Amendment...
getting more. Folks, how I finished my last closing, I really
believe it. Let's at least pass it. Then if we need to discuss
it in the Senate or amend it, let's do something. Let's end
the deadlock. Let's fight for our constituents. You know this
is the right thing to do and if it needs to be tweaked, let's
tweak it. But let's at least pass it so then we can move on
it in the Senate and move the ball forward. We have to make
these gains. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Sandack: "How many votes... affirmative votes are required to pass this Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "This Bill preempts Home Rule and requires 71 votes, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you. To the Bill. While I respect the Gentleman's interest in trying to achieve property tax relief, and I join him in that effort, we know that this, unfortunately, is not a sincere effort. We know, unfortunately, that this is not a real Bill and we know, unequivocally, that this is not the Governor's initiative. As a reminder, this Bill would start

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

in tax levy year 2015 or be immediately effective. That's not the Governor's initiative. We also are being told by the Sponsor that this Bill would freeze bonded indebtedness, whether it was occurred by way of a referendum or not, of these existing Home Rule units and non-Home Rule units of government. That is not a part and parcel of the Governor's initiative. This is not real property tax relief. Vote 'no' or vote 'present'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Davis, W.: "So, Representative, I'm not an expert in this. I think all the experts spoke on the Amendment. So, just an average person asking questions. What... when we talk about property taxes, are we talking about the actual dollars paid as assessed on someone's property, correct?"

Franks: "We're talking about the levy."

Davis, W.: "The levy?"

Franks: "The levy."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Franks: "Because these individual parcels will have individual numbers, you know, depending on how much they're being taxed.

But we're talking about keeping the levy stable..."

Davis, W.: "Okay, so..."

Franks: "...keeping it the same as they received the year before unless the voters choose to otherwise."

Davis, W.: "So, what a taxing body suggest that they need to operate in a given year, keeping that steady? So..."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Franks: "Right. We're saying that no taxing body will get a penny less then they got before."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Franks: "But if they feel that they need more, all they have to do is ask. That's it. But we're just trying to take away the mandate that some of the others had talked about where governments automatically get an increase even when property values fall."

Davis, W.: "Right. And... and I appreciate, you know, particularly when property values fall. So, would you say, and this may not necessarily be germane to the Bill, but when you say in situations where property values fall, should there also be some... something commensurate relating to lowering the levy as well?"

Franks: "No. I... because I think... as someone said, we made some... we made some commitments and like if we have some of these bonds that are out there, we have to pay those. Okay? And I think it... we already are downgraded by Moody's, and if we did something like that, we wouldn't be able to sell a bond in this state. I mean, in an ideal world, I'd love for that to go down. But in the real world, the only fair thing is to keep it flat and not to have the automatic increases. So, I think that's fair. I would love to be able to bring it down but because of all this indebtedness we already have, it's not feasible"

Davis, W.: "Now, there is a correlation between the levy and the amount of taxes paid by the property owner?"

Franks: "Oh, of course."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

- Davis, W.: "The reason I'm asking that question because in some communities we have high tax rates..."
- Franks: "Right."
- Davis, W.: "...not necessarily what they collect in terms of property taxes."
- Franks: "Correct."
- Davis, W.: "So, does this Bill in any way impact the rate issue, particularly for communities that just don't have a lot of property wealth?"
- Franks: "No, it doesn't. It doesn't because we can't on how this...
 on how this Bill is drafted. I mean, there's other things
 that could be done at other levels, but not this Bill."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. But again, just for clarity purposes, what you are suggesting here invokes... invokes some of what the Governor has suggested that he would like to see happen as it relates to property taxes, right?"
- Franks: "Yeah. Well, I... I support the Governor's efforts. I think this Bill that we're debating now actually is an improvement because it takes out some of the loopholes that his has. So, I think this is... I think this is the most prudent course of action us going forward."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. And... and I guess the reason I want to make sure I ask that question because we heard from folks on the other side of the aisle that they aren't willing to support something that it seems like the Governor would like to see move forward. So, do you have any thoughts on why they wouldn't support something that the Governor has clearly said that he would like to see pass?"

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

- Franks: "I mean... all I keep hearing is it's not the Governor's Bill. It's actually an improvement. For those that are really concerned about property taxes, this is a much tighter Bill than what the Governor proposed because it also deals with the extension limitations which his doesn't, which is an insidious part of the problem. So, if we could also address that, this will help our... our taxpayers immensely."
- Davis, W.: "So, when we talk about the extension limits, I know we often... that often becomes a part of the conversation as it relates to schools..."

Franks: "Correct."

- Davis, W.: "...and school fundings and how sometimes we need to maybe limit that in some respect. So... so, you would probably see what you're doing as a way to even help schools in some respects?"
- Franks: "Oh... ab... you know what, this would also force the issue. We need to blow up our school funding formula because it doesn't work. In some of... you know, in the collars where I live, in those counties, we statistically pay some of the highest property taxes, not only in the State of Illinois but in the entire nation, because of the way we fund our schools and it isn't fair. And it shouldn't be where a kid is born, what kind of education they get and what's... I mean, they're all our children and we have to treat them all fairly and it's not fair as it is now. And the state is not doing their fair share, and that's the real problem. A few years ago, that's what we used to talk about until the pensions crowded everything else out. But remember our friend Senator Meeks, see, he talked about changing how we were going to do the

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

funding and he talked about maybe raising taxes to do that and lowering property taxes and then everything fell by the wayside when the pension stuff blew up. And we need... we need to talk about fair funding of schools."

Davis, W.: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, this Bill applies to home rule units of government, correct?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Harris, D.: "So, it applies to the City of Chicago?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Harris, D.: "So, the City of Chicago, which I think most of us would agree, probably needs some... some additional revenues that would be denied that capability, if you get additional revenues, would be denied to them to the City of Chicago through the property tax?"

Franks: "A hundred percent dis... 100 percent disagree."

Harris, D.: "And why is that?"

Franks: "Because all they have to do is run a referendum, which they haven't done in 50 years. But I can tell you, in my district, our schools run referendums. In your district, they run referendums. Why should they be immune from referendums? This isn't taking anything away from them. I would say this is empowering them."

Harris, D.: "Yeah, and... and I would respectfully disagree because, yes, we won... we run referendum, but they may or may not pass.

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

What we're doing, it seems to me, and to the Bill... I know we debated the Amendment, but to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, are putting our taxing districts in a financial straightjacket. We are not giving them any capability, whatsoever, to raise revenue through a mechanism that they have now, whether it's a municipality, a school district, or any of those other taxing districts, and you heard the Gentleman say we need to reform the school funding formula. Yes, indeed we do. Absolutely no doubt about it and I agree 100 percent, but it's a total package. We're taking a single Bill and saying this is the answer. No. We need a total package on how we do the budget overall, we fund schools, we handle property taxes and all the other issues that we've been talking about. It's unfair, it seems to me, to ... to take the taxing districts and say we are, potentially, not only going to limit your ability on property taxes; potentially, we're going to take away 50 percent of your local government distributive fund. Again, that's all part of the overall budget discussion. We are hamstringing their ability to have reasonable... reasonable ability to raise revenue that is needed. And yes, in my district, the property taxes are high and they go to fund the schools. And I want my schools to be funded to the greatest extent that they possibly can because I want my kids to have a good quality education and I recognize that's not the case all around the State of Illinois. But I come back and I will tell you, and I will close on this note: This is a single Bill that doesn't address the problem. We need to look at it in total, as a whole, and I think the right vote is simply a 'no' vote."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to request a verification should this Bill somehow achieve the requisite number of votes."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Jack, a few questions from a country farmer. I'm curious. In your Bill, what is not included in the aggregate extension?"

Franks: "I'm glad you asked that. I was actually working on that and I'll put out my little memo. The limitation does not apply to new property, recovered TIF value, annexed property, and any voter improved increase."

Kay: "Okay. Well, good. Now we got a base line. Let me... let me just back up a minute. Did you say that TIFs are subject to PTELL?"

Franks: "They're not subject to PTELL, because when the TIF expires, the recovered value would be included."

Kay: "Okay. I thought maybe you misspoke. So, a few practical questions, if I may. If you have a general obligation bond that's issued prior to a referendum, what are you going to do with your Bill?"

Franks: "If it's... nothing will affect it if it's voter approved."
Kay: "What if it's not?"

Franks: "Well, then they would still get the same amount of money as they did before to pay that bond. They just wouldn't get the automatic increase. And if they wanted that automatic increase, they would just have to go to the voters. And so, I just want to be very clear that this in no way represents

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

a cut to local governments. It simply does not permit them to get automatic tax increases. They're not going get a penny less then they got the year before."

Kay: "Are you sure?"

Franks: "Yeah."

Kay: "Okay. Second question. Bonds that are issued with respect to refinanced bonds, what's going to happen to those?"

Franks: "Refinanced bonds are already exempt from PTELL. So, this wouldn't apply."

Kay: "Well, they're called double-barrel bonds. I thought they
were... certainly they were included in PTELL."

Franks: "Double-barrel bonds..."

Kay: "Yeah."

Franks: "...are outside of PTELL altogether, I believe."

Kay: "Oh, I don't think so. I don't think so."

Franks: "I think they are."

Kay: "We're talking... remember now, we're talking about what's not included in the aggregate... aggregate extension, and I'm trying to bring forth some problems that your Bill has."

Franks: "The Majority Leader just said that I was right. I believe her."

Kay: "The who?"

Franks: "The Majority Leader."

Kay: "Oh."

Franks: "She does this stuff for a living."

Kay: "Oh. I see. Good for you, Majority Leader. Sometimes we disagree. How about limited bonds that are used for debt service. What's going to happen there?"

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Franks: "That will come into play. Those... so they will get the same amounts as they had in prior years, but they just won't get the automatic increase."

Kay: "With or without referendum?"

Franks: "Only if they were issued without referendum. If they were issued with referendum, then they would still get those increases."

Kay: "Not sure that's correct. What about general obligation after
PTELL, if your PTELL Bill becomes law, and it's at zero
percent? What happens then?"

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

Kay: "Yeah. What happens to general obligation bonds after PTELL and your rate is zero percent? That's all right. We'll skip that one. The answer is you got a problem with that."

Franks: "No, I'm not sure we do. I think because if it was approved by voter referendum, it won't be an issue. And if wasn't approved by voter referendum, then if they needed an increase, they'd have to get voter approval. That would be the answer, so I don't think there's a problem."

Kay: "Well, here... here's where I'm concerned though, Jack, is if we stick our neck out on line and we don't have voter approval, then where does that leave you?"

Franks: "Well, you're still going to have the same amount. There's nothing here that will cut money to local governments. They're getting the same amount as they got before."

Kay: "With or without voter referendum?"

Franks: "Correct."

Kay: "Wow. Then what does the not in..."

Franks: "They're just not getting an increase. That's all."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Kay: "I understand that. So, again, I'm going back to the topic I began with. Those things not included in the aggregate extension are things that I just mentioned here today. So, let me... let me throw one other out and see what your answer is to this. What about building commission leases that are used... that are used to retire bonds?"

Franks: "Are used for what?"

Kay: "To retire bonds. What's going to happen to those? And I
should add to that, before referendum."

Franks: "They are outside and will continue to be outside of the tax cap."

Kay: "Well, help me out. What's inside and what's outside of the
 aggregate extension?"

Franks: "Well, as I said, the limitation does not apply to new property, if that's an issue. And I also want to be very clear, it does not apply to recovered TIF value; it does not apply to annexed property; and it does not apply any voter improved increase."

Kay: "Okay. Well, here's my problem, Jack. If you go back and read Section 18-185, you're going to find that some of your answers were wrong. And for that very reason, after you read that, you may want to amend your answers. But... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. There's been some... I think, not intentional, but I think there's been some questions and answers provided that are not correct. And for that reason, I'm going to ask for a 'present' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of observations.

And for those who are joining us today from Illinois, or from

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

any other part of the nation, or from overseas, I want to welcome them to week two of summer stock in Springfield, Illinois. That's all it is. Summer stock, summer theater. We did this last week with the Work Comp Bill. We're going to do it again with property taxes. Make no bones about it, this is all about mail pieces for the upcoming weeks to come, folks. There's nothing sincere about this and we know it. We've seen this play before. I just wanted... just make mention of a couple of things. And I'm glad that the Sponsor brought up petty politics. We need to move beyond petty politics. Well, I tell you what, it started last week. It started last week in a Human Service Appropriation Committee and it, hopefully, it finished today. But that was an embarrassment. It was an absolute embarrassment what's happened the last two weeks in that committee. Unworthy of this building, unworthy of this chamber, what happened. We need to get back to negotiating; that's the four Legislative Leaders and the Governor. We can do that. We've got time to do it. I'm just going to make that formal request to the Speaker, let's get back to the table. But I also want to make mention of the fact of another statement that the Sponsor of this legislation talked about is that we've got to continue hiding from the monster. Well, folks, this isn't the monster. The monster is the budget that you passed last month, three and a half billion dollars out of balance. A little bit more than last year's out of balance budget, the one that we fixed with 46 votes out of the 72. So, let's not talk semantics about hiding behind the monster. The monster is the budget that you're imposing upon Illinoisans year in, year out. That's what's driving families

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

and businesses out of Illinois. Let's continue on with this process. You'll have your negative mail pieces; you'll have plenty of fodder with that. But folks, those of you who are watching us today, it's unfortunate... it's very unfortunate you're here witnessing this 'cause there's nothing sincere, nothing here today is going to help you with your quality of life. It's unfortunate. We should be negotiating a good, fair, reasonable budget for Illinoisans and our job... job creators. We're not doing it. Myself, the Governor, and the Senate Republican Leader are prepared to go back to the negotiating table. That's how you do it. That's how you do it as adults."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks to close."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues. And to the Minority Leader, I was glad you got up and said what you had to say. I was hoping you'd ask me some questions. I miss our debates. They were... they've been fun. One of the prior speakers had talked about some issues on the bonds and I wanted to just indicate that I believe that his statements were incorrect. There is... this, in no way, represents a cut to local governments. It just simply does not permit them to raise taxes. Understand that. The previous speaker, friend, the Minority Leader, said we need to get the budget done. He's a hundred percent right. A hundred percent right. And I voted with you to fix the 2015 budget. I voted with you against the 2016 budget. But we also understand that the Governor says that he needs some structural reforms before we... before we address those budgets. This is one of the two items that he had addressed, and had ... and said had to be addressed for us to get to the budget. So, if we're going to

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

get to the budget, we have to do property tax relief. That's what your Leader said. I want to get there. I believe you want to get there too. I also believe that this Bill improves on the Governor's ideas because it takes away certain loopholes and it starts a year earlier. It is a strong Bill. It was based on his Bill with some tweaks to make it better. Understand, folks, that if it doesn't pass, we just had 43 people, 42 of them on the Democratic side, voted to pass that last Amendment. If this Bill does not pass, it's because I can't get the support of the people on that side of the aisle. That isn't right. You don't' ... this is not heavy lifting. This is what we all believe in. This is not exact language that you want, we can fix it, maybe a minor tweak. But the fact is, this will move the ball forward. This is our best chance. It needs your support to pass. If you don't vote for it, if you don't support this, the failure of this property tax relief will be on your shoulders. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Mr. Demmer has asked for a verification of the vote. This Bill requires 71 votes. Members will stay in their chairs and vote their own switches. Staff will retire to the rear of the chamber. 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? Members, please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 41 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', 34 voting 'present', and the Bill fails. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 691. Please read the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 691 (sic-690), a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. 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 Bradley."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to what just happened with House Bill 691, which differed with the Governor's proposal on a tax freeze, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 691 is identical to the Governor's proposal. It is identical to the Governor's proposal. It is identical to House Bill 4224, filed on May 22, as a manifestation of the Governor's proposal. It is identical to Senate Bill 1046, which I understand is being discussed and advocated for currently at a press conference taking place across the street, dealing with the issue of property tax reform. It is identical on the effective date, tax year 2016, payable in 2017. It identical to the Governor's proposal on expanding PTELL statewide, including Home Rule units of government. It is identical to freezing the automatic extension consistent with the Governor's Bill of House Bill 4224 and Senate Bill 1046. It is identical with regards to the referendum language to the Governor's proposal. And it is identical to not including certain debt service payments as outlined in the Governor's proposal. This is an opportunity and an offer for compromise. This is identical to the proposal that's been put forth. And I would ask for a bipartisan 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sandack: "Representative Bradley, remind us, the first property tax freeze Bill that you had, I forgot the number. What number was that Bill?"

Bradley: "I don't remember."

Sandack: "What was the outcome of that Bill?"

Bradley: "I don't remember that either. I really don't."

Sandack: "You don't?"

Bradley: "No."

Sandack: "Wow. You had an Amendment on it, you spoke pretty articulately about it, and you don't recall the outcome of the..."

Bradley: "Well, as the Chairman of Revenue and Finance, Representative, I've sponsored many property tax Bills over the years. I've sponsored..."

Sandack: "Well, I'm talking about one two weeks ago, John."

Bradley: "Tell me the Bill number and I'll look it up."

Sandack: "You don't remember the Bill you presented two weeks ago,
 whether it passed or failed?"

Bradley: "I'm not going to argue with you."

Sandack: "I'm not arguing, I'm asking."

Bradley: "I stated I don't remember the specific vote on that."

Sandack: "Okay. So, what I was going to ask you, but I guess I can't, is distinguishing this Amendment from your previous effort. Is that... is that something you can recall or don't recall?"

Bradley: "I... I don't know the answer to that. I know that this
Bill is identical to the Governor's proposal, and to the
extent, it differs from efforts that have been previously

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

made. Another example of attempts to work together or compromise."

Sandack: "Well, I appreciate that."

Bradley: "I'm not going to fight with you over that."

Sandack: "I appreciate that. Well, that... I'm sure is genuine. When did this Amendment... when did you draft this Amendment?"

Bradley: "Well, to take credit for LRB's skills in drafting, I don't want to mistake, this Amendment was filed earlier today.

It's been a work in progress. But again, it's identical to a Bill that was filed by your side on May 22."

Sandack: "And... and I'll get to that. But I..."

Bradley: "So, I guess if anybody drafted it, it came out of the Governor's Office, because that's where the original language came from."

Sandack: "When did you submit to LRB Amendment #1?"

Bradley: "Gosh, I don't know the answer to that. It's been the last couple days."

Sandack: "Okay. And it was presented for the first time in committee earlier today, correct?"

Bradley: "That would be correct."

Sandack: "Okay. And while I'm not going to hold you accountable as to when we're coming here next, but what is the emergency about pushing out an Amendment on the same day you seek, you know, the Amendment to be adopted, and then ostensibly a third vote?"

Bradley: "This is... this has been out here for a while."

Sandack: "A while?"

Bradley: "It's been filed since... Hold it. You asked me a question."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Sandack: "Yes, Sir."

Bradley: "It's been filed since May 22. I am taking your proposal, the Governor's proposal, I'm offering it as an Amendment, and I'm going to vote for it."

Sandack: "Okay. And what we're going to see next is Amendment 2, correct?"

Bradley: "Perhaps. We have Amendment #1 to deal with first."

Sandack: "Well, yes, we are. It will be dealt with. And what I'm asking you are, what's your immediately precei... subsequent intentions? Do you seek to adopt Amendment 2?"

Bradley: "We are going to vote on a Floor Amendment #1 and then proceed accordingly."

Sandack: "Wow. To the Amendment. Anyone that may be listening and/or watching the back and forth with the Gentleman from Marion, may be struck by a lack of genuineness. I don't know if amnesia hit in comparing this Amendment with something you presented two weeks ago. Not entirely sure when he presented his Amendment to LRB, and now he can't tell us with a straight face if he's going to move to adopt the next Amendment. Why he won't tell us is because this is still part of the continuing game that's being played. Amendment #2 is entirely different. It has nothing to do with property tax freezing. So, while the Gentleman can continue to pound his fist and say, this is just like the Governor's initiative, it isn't. Ιt is more games playing; it's disingenuousness; and it's absolutely wasteful. We come down here... we... we're hauled down here again to vote on something we've already voted on, and now he's going to tell us... the Gentleman's not going to tell us if he's going to adopt

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Amendment #2, which is incongruent that has nothing to do with Amendment #1. What a waste. What an embarrassment. What a shame. Vote 'present' or vote 'no'. Don't play this game."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Question of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Currie: "Representative, are we on Amendment 2 or are we on Amendment 1?"

Bradley: "One."

Currie: "Then I'd like to address my questions to Amendment 1, the Amendment that is before us. But my understanding is that there are some relevant differences between this Amendment and the one that earlier came to a vote on this floor. And I'd like to explore with you the differences between your Amendment and Representative Franks'."

Bradley: "Sure. If you're..."

Currie: "My... my understanding is that under Representative Franks'
Amendment, as under yours, this would preempt Home Rule and
it would leave out, from under the freeze, bonds approved by
referenda, FFA and so forth."

Bradley: "You was right."

Currie: "Those are identical in that respect, as I understand it..."

Bradley: "Correct."

Currie: "...but there is one big difference. And that is that under his legislation, all those extra nonreferendum bonds would find themselves frozen, but under yours, they could continue to grow revenues, taxes, levies, could continue to grow even

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

though those bonds were never approved by the voters. Is that correct?"

Bradley: "Correct."

Currie: "So, I guess I would have to describe that as a loophole and I'd ask your advice. What size loophole would you call it? Is it a little baby loophole? Is it bigger than a bread box? Is it the kind of loophole through which you could drive a truck? What would be your estimation, Representative?"

Bradley: "It's at least as big as some of the egos around here.

Oh, well."

Currie: "That's saying something. There's another big difference between your Amendment and the one that we voted on, Representative Franks', and that is that yours would be a delayed freeze. That is, it wouldn't happen next year. It wouldn't happen until 2017."

Bradley: "It's identi..."

Currie: "And I'd like our advice, Representative. I know that you took this language from the Governor. Generally, that's a sign of respect when you borrow from other people. But is it your view, is it the Governor's view, that while the people may want property tax relief, there's no reason to give it to them any time soon? It's okay to make them wait. Would that be your estimation? Is it a little like backloading bonds or backloading pension debt? We're going to give them a treat but we're going to wait... make them wait until the day after tomorrow? Is that your understanding that you..."

Bradley: "Yeah. It's... it's the Governor's proposal. It's the Governor's drafted proposal. And under this proposal that the Governor put forth, that is identical to the Bills he had

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

introduced, it would give some time to the local districts to make these decisions."

Currie: "So, it's not your idea. It is the Governor's. And that is sometimes called the highest form of flattery to copy exactly what that individual planned to do. I just wanted the Members... the Members to understand the differences between the freeze that Representative Franks' Bill offered and the sort-of freeze that is the Governor's proposal. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley to close."

Bradley: "This... I'm just thinking about some of the comments that took place. Not on the prior speaker, but before that. This is the Governor's proposal. It's being offered by a Democrat. He was in my hometown yesterday talking about property tax relief. He's up here today, and my understanding is talking about property tax relief. The Democrat Chairman of Revenue putting this on the board, saying he's going to vote for it. It's his language; it's his Bill identical to his proposal. If this isn't an offer, or an opportunity, or an attempt to compromise, to work together, I don't know what is. So, please join me as Illinoisans, as elected sworn officers of the State of Illinois, and let's take a step forward here. I'm not giving a fiery speech. I'm not fighting. I'm saying to you this is what he asked for. Here it is. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Amendment will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question,

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

there are 44 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no', 33 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "This is one of the criticisms that came up in committee was that the Floor Amendment 1 did not include all of the provisions of the previously referred to House Bill 4224 and Senate Bill 1046, and that it wasn't fair to take the property tax piece that was identical to the property tax piece put forth by the administration and not offer the other two pieces that go with it. So, here are the other two pieces that were put forth with it, again, identical to the language drafted and presented by the administration. Identical with regards to the local control or reset of collective bargaining; identical to the prevailing wage aspect of this House Bill; identical to the notion that it resets collective bargaining for units of local government and school districts; identical in that it would put seven items on the list of potential resets to be determined by voters of referendum: use of third party contractors, certain pay increases, health insurance benefits, use of time for labor organization benefits, staffing levels, procedures, and criteria, and curriculum and student discipline in the context of school districts. It can be adopted... identical to the language... can be adopted by ordinance, or Resolution, or by binding referendum. The prevailing wage, identical to the Governor's proposal, removing units of local government in school districts from prevailing wage requirements. I do not support this. But

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

again, in the spirit of compromise, in the spirit of working together, and in the spirit of criticisms that were made, and only voted on the one piece, I offer this for a vote here in the House."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I want to make sure I understand exactly.

Amendment #2, if adopted onto what we just adopted, Amendment
#1, would then be the Governor's proposal completely?"

Bradley: "Yes."

Franks: "Without any changes, was this introduced by... previously as a different... as a different House Bill?"

Bradley: "House Bill 4224 and Senate Bill 1046."

Franks: "Okay. So, this would be verbatim if you would... if we... if we took Amendment #2?"

Bradley: "Identical."

Franks: "Okay. Do you support Amendment #2?"

Bradley: "No."

Franks: "Okay. Well then, I'm going to ask... I'm going to ask the folks on the other side, is there anyone there who does support Amendment #2, who should... I think that you should give it up, John. I don't think that we should be... to say that people who don't bring these Bills should be supporting them. I think that we should have someone who supports the Governor's position on this carry the Bill and let's have a real debate right now. Who wants to stand up on that side of the aisle and take this Bill? I would ask John to sign it over to them. Let's do this now. You want to get this over?

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Let's do it now. Let's do it now. Let's give it to someone who believes in this, because obviously the Sponsor doesn't. I'm not going to vote for Amendment #2, but I did vote for Amendment #1, 'cause I want to move something forward whether it be my Bill or John's Bill. But now you have the opportunity. I'm going to ask the Sponsor to sign it over to a Republican who believes in this Amendment #2 and ask them to carry it. Who will stand up on that side and take this Bill? Who will stand up and take this Bill? Come on, that way we can have this heard, then we can vote on the Governor's proposal, up or down. Up or down, then move forward. You want to move the ball forward, let's do it. Please someone stand up who believes in this, who will carry it. If Mr. Harris will carry it, I think he'd be a terrific Sponsor. I trust this Gentleman to do the right thing. If he'd like to carry it, I think we should give it to Mr. Harris. Give it to anyone over there who believes in this and ought to carry it. Let's not have you attack John like you attack Jay last week on his stuff, saying that he didn't carry stuff that you agreed with. Let's have one of you who believes it, carry it. Stand up. Give it to Mr. Sandack, if he wants to carry it. I'll yield my time to Mr. Sandack if he'd like to discuss this, like to have this discussion with him or Mr. Harris, but let's move this along."

Speaker Lang: "Have you just yielded your time to Mr. Sandack?"

Franks: "Yes. Yeah, but I might come back."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "That was mighty nice of the Gentleman from McHenry. The better suggestion, the genuine, legitimate discussion, would

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

be to actually vote on House Bill 4224. Because what we've heard from the Gentleman from McHenry, and the Gentleman from Marion, is an orchestrated sham. It's embarrassing. Oh, I know... because it entirely is a phony process. We've been all brought down to Springfield, we've been brought down here to engage in gamesmanship. It's embarrassing. Mr... Mr. Bradley stands and says, well, I want this now to be the Governor's Bill. So, I'm going to put this forward, although I'm going to vote 'no' because I don't believe in it. There is a Bill that has the comprehensive language of property tax relief in it. It's 4224. That Bill ought to be discharged from Rules and then, Mr. Franks, we can have that honest debate that your showmanship, so... yeah, you yearn for. Yeah. Let's have it. Release it for ... yeah, let's release it right now from Rules, and we'll have that debate in earnest. Not in... not in disingenuousness."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "I just want to clarify with the Sponsor of this Bill that you're asking this General Assembly to support the initiatives in House Amendment 2..."

Bradley: "No."

Ammons: "...that would..."

Bradley: "No."

Ammons: "You're asking us to..."

Bradley: "Consider."

Ammons: "Consider? In consideration of this Bill, I would encourage my colleagues on both side of the aisle to not support this

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Amendment for this reason. A) That even if it was 4224 or 4221, 22, 23, 26, any of these Amendments would be adverse for the people of Illinois. We could not support this under any number. Regardless to the number that you put on it, the language is the same, and so I encourage a 'no' vote for that reason. We are, in essence, this Amendment would impact the staffing levels at our fire departments in some communities that only have a few firemen to start with. This Bill would impact the ability of teachers in our schools, in our districts, to really negotiate for fair wages. I think this, under any number, is a bad number, a bad Bill, a bad Amendment and I certainly encourage a 'no' vote on this number and a 'no' vote on any future number. Thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Burke, K.: "John, Amendment 2 contains provisions amending the Illinois Public Labor Relations Act and a host of other local government Acts as well as the Prevailing Wage Act, including that in a Bill that also affects property taxes. Does this violate the single subject rule?"

Bradley: "I'm simply putting forth an identical proposal to the Governor's proposal."

Burke, K.: "So, you have no opinion on whether it does or does not?"

Bradley: "The Governor had the opinion that it did not."

Burke, K.: "And my second question is, does this Amendment,

Amendment 2, have an immediate effective date?"

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Bradley: "These would... my understanding is the Bill, by virtue of Amendment 1, would require 71 votes, so I guess it's moot."

Burke, K.: "So, does the Bill contain... as far as you know, does the Amendment contain a savings clause for units of government that may be in... have a contract pending currently?"

Bradley: "No, Representative."

Burke, K.: "And do you know how the... if this Amendment were to pass with this Bill, how that would affect governments who are in the midst of a current contract?"

Bradley: "Not well, probably."

Burke, K.: "And what about this situation where a contract has expired and they're working toward a new contract. Would... is there a savings clause for any provision of that to allow the current contract to stay in effect while they're working on..."

Bradlev: "No."

Burke, K.: "...another contract?"

Bradley: "No."

Burke, K.: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, based on the impassioned challenge given by the distinguished Gentleman from McHenry County, if the Chairman of the House Revenue and Finance Committee wants to sign this Amendment over to me, I will pick up sponsorship of this Amendment. But oh, by the way, the Sponsor controls the Amendment. I'll take the whole Bill. The Sponsor controls the whole Bill. I will call the Bill, I will call the Amendment at the appropriate time. But you want me to take sponsorship of it? I will take sponsorship of it, proudly. That may or

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

may not meet the challenge that he just issued, but I'll control it. I'll call it when it's ready to be called."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Speaker. Question of the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Yes, Sir."

Kay: "Can you tell me who's got the Bill and who's got the Amendments?"

Speaker Lang: "This is Mr. Bradley's Bill and his Amendments, Sir."

Kay: "Notwithstanding what Representative Harris just said?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley controls the Bill, Sir. It's his Bill."

Kay: "Okay. Well, I... I guess just a quick question, since we're challenging one another today, and I see a lot of moxie from my friend from McHenry County. Maybe the thing to do, Jack, would be to just do what you really want to do and get that tax crease out there...... tax increase out there so we can balance the budget. You're not interested in saving any taxes. You're not interested in a tax freeze. You really want, since we've got so much moxie today, so much backbone, you really want a tax increase. Let's be fair. You want to carry that Bill, carry it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A couple of questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, C.: "Well, first of all, I want start with the fact that somebody just said Jack Franks supports tax increase. Let's just all reflect on that for a second 'cause that just happened. I was in the Revenue Committee with Representative Franks and also Representative Bradley. And Representative

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Bradley, I want to make sure I understood. On... on the property tax Amendment, Amendment 1, one of the challenges... one of the questions, I believe actually from the Gentleman from Mount Prospect was, well, this isn't the whole Bill. This doesn't include certain elements of the Bill carried by the Leader, the Republic Leader, both in this House and over in the Senate; therefore, I'm not sure I can support it. That was something that happened in Revenue Committee was it not?"

Bradley: "Yes."

Mitchell, C.: "And if you include Floor Amendment #2, this becomes the Governor's Bill, does it not?"

Bradley: "Yes."

Mitchell, C.: "So... to the Amendment. Look, I... I think that we've reached the time for choosing. And I think one thing that I respect the is the Gentleman from Mount Prospect, the Gentleman was very clear I think, in his last statement on the last Amendment, that he opposes cuts to local government distributive fund. Now, it may be that people on the other side of the aisle oppose what's contained in this Amendment. That's fine, you should vote 'no'. But you should stand up and have the courage to say that rather than saying that because this isn't the Bill that was filed by our Leader, we're not going to vote it. That would be like... I can't even think of an exam... almost be like if Martin Luther King said, because I'm not carrying the Civil Rights Act, I won't vote for it because it's being carried by somebody else in the Senate. It's ridiculous. Ultimately, if a Bill accomplishes what you want it to accomplish, you ought to vote for that Bill. That just makes sense. So, I just think it's a time for

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

choosing, Members, and I think that... I hate to quote scripture, but there's a great verse in Matthew that says that no man can serve two masters. Either you will hate the one and you will love the other or you will be devoted to one and you'll despise the other. So, you will either... you cannot serve both god and money. Now, I'm going to change that and say, in this case, you cannot serve both the middle class and money. And that's what's on the line in this Amendment. So, if you don't think that we should gut protections for working people who are trying make a decent wage, you should vote against this Amendment. But if on the other hand, your argument is because it's not our version of that Amendment that guts protections for the middle class, that's absurd. Vote 'yes' or vote 'no', but the Bill is on the board. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I don't usually get up here and speak too much, but to all of us here, answer me one question. When is the appropriate time? When is it the... when is it the appropriate time to get this done? Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't give a darn who's the Sponsor of this Bill. It's here before us today. So, the Governor's holding the budget hostage right now, when is the time? After all of our state facilities close? After all the employees don't have paychecks? After all the employees are about to lose their homes? Who's that going to come back on? I'm going to do this right now. One of my facilities is on the chopping block. I'm here right now ready to fight for my closure to stay open, and I know you

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

guys are scared too. So, here we are today; let's get this thing done. Quit giving excuses. It's right here before us today, folks. Let's vote on this."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "I was going to yield my time to the lovely Gentleman in front of me. I don't know if he would like it. Okay. Before I completely give up the mic, I just want to note that in states without collective bargaining, without prevailing wage agreements, without health insurance being part of the negotiations, we see our workers and the working class families doing far worse than here. When we look at states that have an active right-to-work legislation, the wages decrease by almost \$6 thousand annually, which obviously also has an impact on the state income tax revenue. The health care insurance is pathetic. There are greater health issues, more poverty, lower funding of education. So, I just wanted to state that for the record as to why I will vote 'no' to this Amendment. And I yield to Representative Franks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks. What a surprise to hear from you again, Sir."

Franks: "Thank you. Thank you. I'm glad I was able to surprise you today, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, three weeks from today, we run out of spending authority. Think about that. Three weeks from today. Maybe we'll meet a few more times before then, maybe we won't. But three weeks from today, we will not have spending authority. This, to be very clear, is the Governor's proposal. All you have to do is vote 'yes' on this Amendment, pass this Amendment, and it becomes part of the Bill and then we vote on the Governor's proposal.

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

That's all you have to do is to vote 'yes' on the Amendment. So, my friends on the other side of the aisle, if you believe it, vote for it. I still wish someone would stand up and take it now so they can argue for it impassionately, unlike the Sponsor who has it now. And I understand, but he's put in that position. The Governor is clear; he has been clear that he wants movement on his turnaround agenda. He's talked about two issues; this is one of those issues. We can move forward today on this issue. So, I would ask that we take this seriously and I'm thinking of Mr. Mitchell's saying when he was quoting scripture, it doesn't matter whose this is. There's an old Chinese saying; it says it doesn't matter what color the cat is as long as it catches mice. So, if this will work for you, you should vote for it. Someone on the other side, again, I'm asking you to ask Mr. Bradley to allow you to argue for this, or just argue for it. Do the closing. Do whatever you need to do, but Ladies and Gentlemen, we are quickly running out of time here and then we are going to be in chaos. You think what we're doing now is bad, wait 'til July when we're here. Wait 'til July when social service agencies are closing down, when people aren't getting money. Think about this. This is an opportunity to move the ball forward. So, let's please... let's please do so."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kifowit: "Leader Bradley, what... what would this Bill do that would, for the most part, help Illinois jobs and Illinois companies maintain employment opportunities in the public sector?"

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Bradley: "It's a proposal of the Governor's Office, and the Governor's Office feels that it would. I don't necessarily agree with that, so I can't answer that from that perspective."

Kifowit: "Do... do we know what percentage of projects are composed of just labor costs? So, when we're looking at a whole project cost, when we're looking at building a school, do we know about what percentage?"

Bradley: "I don't know the answer to that."

Kifowit: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. And... and I will say similar to my... the Gentleman behind me, I don't speak much but on this issue, I'm going to speak because it's Amendment #2. This is the proper way to bring this Bill forward because on Amendment #1, I'm in favor, I have been in favor of lower property taxes, freezing property taxes and representing my district, because too many... many middle-class families are being hurt by property taxes. This Amendment #2, which again, I would say is the proper way to bring about this Bill, not conjoined together into one big Bill, one big Bill that has different issues in it. This Bill, this Amendment, I'm against, and I'm against specifically because this Bill will hurt the middle class. It has been shown that when laborers make a decent wage, they stimulate the local economy, they spend money in their areas, they help small businesses, and it grows. By eliminating prevailing wage, we are opening up... opening up our borders, losing jobs of Illinois families and workers to other companies, lower cost companies, and individuals from other states that come and take the jobs that we have here. What we are looking at is 20 percent of construction costs,

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

20 percent only of construction costs, that is proposed to be the saving grace of our municipalities and our school districts. And I have to argue that when we are going to disenfranchise our middle-class families and we are going to say that this proposal will help tremendously, we are not. What we are doing is we are disenfranchising middle class families, middle-class families that are in their homes, and middle class families that need good-paying jobs. Therefore, I am against this Bill. I'm rising and expect individuals to vote against this Bill 'cause this is not a Bill for working families. This is not a Bill for the district that I represent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley to close."

Bradley: "At the same time that this debate is going on, across the street at the Mansion, there's a press conference going on. And my understanding in terms of what's being said at that press conference... first of all, with regards to the Committee of the Whole taking place only on property taxes, currently. And this is as close to a quotation as I can get it in real time. 'The Senate, so far, is leaving out far and away, the most critical elements of the Bill we introduced several weeks ago. Until and unless they're ready to talk in good faith about those issues and include them, there is no real reform. The ideas on the table didn't include what really matters, I'll say that. So far, we've seen no good faith compromise on their side, referring to us. On property taxes, this is the critical issue for us. We need the power away from Springfield so Springfield isn't mandating the cost of local government, local voters, local taxpayers, control the

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

costs in their government. So, here's the critical thing that we're, the administration, proposing and that's right in our Bill. Let me rephrase that. That is right in our Bill. We want local voters to have a voice and control over when and how property taxes are increased. Local voters have a voice in that, local control. But even beyond that, we want local voters to control and decide what gets bargained. What gets bid. That is going on at a press conference as we vote on it. The proposal is here, the wishes are granted, the Democrats are at the table. Vote your conscience on this and don't say it's not out there."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment 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. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 0 voting 'yes', 69 voting 'no', 26 voting 'present'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

 Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes Representative

 Wheeler."
- Wheeler B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell everybody that Carmel Catholic Girls Soccer won their first State Championship with my niece, my goddaughter, hitting in the winning goal. Yes. It was magical. A Resolution is forthcoming, but I'm wondering, I'm hoping, they can come down this summer to receive their recognition. Any idea when we'll be back this summer? Could I have a schedule?"
- Speaker Lang: "So, we would love to see those young ladies down here, Representative."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Kifowit: "So, I'll let them know a good date..."

Speaker Lang: "Let them know to be at the call of the Chair."

Kifowit: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Anthony."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Anthony: "You know, I, too, want to know that schedule 'cause, you know, that's why I brought these four kids down here. I brought my four kids down, my oldest Jada, my son John, Kirsten and everybody knows Kylie. So, give them a warm welcome, guys. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Springfield's a wonderful place for kids to spend the summer, Sir. While we wait further action, I'm wondering if the chairman of the Farm Caucus, Mr. Franks, has a report for us? Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The Health Care Licenses Committee will be meeting immediately following Session."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. Personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Mayfield: "I just want to announce to everybody that's brought their families down here, considering bringing their families down here, we do have some wonderful things to do in Springfield. I have my daughter with me today. So, Knights Action Park, they've got miniature golf there. They've got the... what do they call that? The speed racing. They've got the batting cage; they got a roller rink; there's a movie theater, Route 66 Drive In. There's plenty to do in Springfield this summer, everybody. Let's enjoy it."

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Absolutely. Please proceed."

Butler: "I... I love to hear that from Representative Mayfield, and if the Chair would like the Chamber of Commerce... the Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce to give a briefing to the Body on what to do in Springfield this summer, I'd be happy to have him come in if we knew what the schedule was when we could bring him in to brief the chamber."

Speaker Lang: "Well, Sir, you don't need the Chamber of Commerce.

You've got Representative Mayfield here on the floor."

Butler: "She might be on retainer."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Tabares."

Tabares: "Speaking of family, I brought down my mom and my grandmother down to Springfield. They're up in the gallery watching Session. So, just want to welcome..."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Happy you're here with us. Thank you. Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Brady: "From my legislative district, up in the gallery, Mr. Frank Hoffman and his wife, who's down seeing Springfield, either at its worst or at its lukewarm. Thank you, and please welcome them."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Members, I have an important announce for you, just came to my attention. Look at Mr. Wheeler, he just can't wait. Members, the House will be in Session the next three Tuesdays, the next three Tuesdays. And

63rd Legislative Day

6/9/2015

no time has been set for those days yet. Mark your calendar for the next three Tuesdays. And now, leaving Perfunctory time for the Clerk, pursuant to House Joint Resolution 85, the House will adjourn until Tuesday, June 16 or until the call of the Speaker. House is adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on June 9, 2015: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3219. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4227, a Bill for an Act concerning education is offered by Representative Barbara Wheeler. House Bill 4228, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."