71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

- Speaker Riley: "The hour of 9:30 having come and gone, the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois will come to order. Members and guests are asked to be in their seats, refrain from starting all laptop computers, silence all cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. We'll be led in prayer today by Reverend Bob Vanden Bosch who is with the Concerned Christian Americans in Illinois. Reverend Vanden Bosch is the quest of Representative Poe. Reverend Vanden Bosch."
- Reverend Vanden Bosch: "Thank you. Welcome to your Capitol and especially welcome to Monique Davis, who's back with us. Let's bow together in prayer. Father, as we come to You, we just are so grateful that You love us, that You care for us. We're grateful for Your hand and guidance upon our nation and guidance upon our Leaders. And we pray, Lord, that You would just really work in a tremendous way today in the hearts and lives of Legislators, the hearts and lives of the Governor, the hearts and lives of staff members. And Father, just help us to be able to get things accomplished today that must be accomplished. We thank You for bringing Monique Davis back with us again and giving her the strength to be able to be her... here, Lord, and we just ask that You will continue to bless her and help her and give the doctors wisdom as well. Father, we just ask You that Your hand would be upon each of us now. In Jesus' name we pray, Amen."
- Speaker Riley: "We'll be led in the Pledge by Representative David Harris."
- Harris, D. et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

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

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

Representative Brown, for what reason do you rise?"

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Meier, Morrison, Phillips and Poe are excused this morning."

Speaker Riley: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, take the record. With 113 Members present, a quorum is established and we're ready to do the work of the people of the State of Illinois. Representative Costello, for what reason do you rise?"

Costello: "Yes, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Riley: "State your point."

Costello: "I would ask the Body to join me in recognizing Carol Sente's birthday tomorrow. I think she's 30 tomorrow."

Speaker Riley: "Happy birthday. Representative Ford, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Riley: "State your point."

Ford: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like for us to collectively congratulate South Carolina for voting to take down the Confederate Flag on the State's Capitol. It was a bipartisan effort and hopefully the Governor signs the Bill and the Confederate Flag will be removed from the Capitol grounds of South Carolina. So, we should congratulate the Members of that Body for doing so. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "Thank you. Representative Wallace, for what reason do you rise?"

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege. I just want..."
- Speaker Riley: "State your point."
- Wallace: "Thank you. I just want to recognize that my little guy,
 Isaiah, is here. He's available to Page and help you out in
 any way you'd like. So, let's give him another welcome."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Phelps, for what reason do you rise?"
- Phelps: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Riley: "Make your point."
- Phelps: "Thank you. First off, Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to welcome back our dear friend, Monique Davis, back to the floor. Monique, we love you. Glad you're back. And second, Mr. Speaker, I'd... we don't give enough gratitude to our LIS support services. So, help me join today her birthday, Emily Deakin Harmony, happy birthday. We love you, too."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Costello, for what reason do you rise?"
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Riley: "Make your point."
- Costello: "I am surrounded by birthday girls. I did not realize it, but it's actually Representative Cloonen's 30th birthday today so."
- Speaker Riley: "Happy birthday. On page 10, Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 245, Representative Zalewski. The re... Out of the record. House Bill 2640, Representative Cassidy."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is... some of you may recall, we referred to it as the order of Cassidy, there were a handful of Bills from the Chicago Bar

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Association Condo Law Committee. This is... one of the questions asked of me was why weren't these combined? The Senate heard and combined two of the Bills that were passed unanimously into one Bill. I ask for your positive vote."

- Speaker Riley: "Representative Cassidy moves that House Bill 2640...

 I'm sorry. Representative Reis. Out of the record. I'm sorry.

 You... you were retract... making your statement. Okay. All right,
 let's get going. House Bill 2640, Representative Cassidy
 moves to concur with House Bill 2640. All in favor vote 'aye';
 all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted
 who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this record, with 110 voting
 'yea', O voting 'nay', O voting 'present', House Bill 2640,
 having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
 declared passed. House Bill 3389, Representative Bourne."
- Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With this Amendment, all this Bill does is change six months to 180 days to file reports with the Comptroller's Office. I move to concur."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Bourne moves to concur with House Bill 3389. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this record, with 112 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with House Bill 3389. House Bill 3389, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3484, Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1. This is a pension Bill that does nothing to

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

benefits. I... these are requests from the state pension systems to allow them to do their jobs more efficiently and effectively."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Sandack: "Representative, can you just elaborate on how this Bill lets these pension systems do their job more effectively?"

Nekritz: "So, one of the things that come to the attention of the General Assembly in recent months is that the pension systems don't have any ability to audit and to look at what is going... whether the information that they're getting from the employers about date of birth, length of service, pay, all those things is accurate, whether it be from a school district or from a state agency. So, this allows them to be able to go back in and... and double... and do some checking to make sure that the data that they're getting from the employers is accurate. It also does some very technical things like changes the def... for SURS. Clarifies the calculation of final rate of earnings for those who have service credit prior to September 1, 1941, adds to the definition of plan year and some of those kind of things."

Sandack: "Thank you, Representative."

Nekritz: "Thank... thank you."

Sandack: "Appreciate the elaboration."

Speaker Riley: "The House moves... I'm sorry. Representative Nekritz moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3484.

All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, with 111 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', Amendment #1 to House Bill 3484, the House hereby concurs. And House Bill 3484, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3593, Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill passed out of the House in a more restrictive version unanimously. This Bill went over to the Senate. They took out one small portion of it making it a less restrictive Bill and it passed out with only 1 opposed. This Bill is one Bill that recog... does ... takes the recommendations of the Senate Democrat Caucus for good government and puts it into a Bill format. So, what this Bill does is it says that community college folks who are negotiating severance are limited to one year in severance plus benefits. That's it. One-year pay and benefits for a severance. It doesn't say you do away with them. It limits it to one year. The other thing it says is that you must do this in the light of day. So, you must do this in an open meeting. You must let taxpayers understand how much it's going to cost them. And the final thing this Bill does is that it caps contracts with a defined start and end date to four years, four years. Currently, there are community college presidents that serve for 10 years or more. There's one that has a contract out to 2023. We think it's wrong to encumber future boards. So, this is something that was recommended by the Senate Democrat investigative report and it's just a good government practice. I encourage an 'aye' vote. Again, it

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

passed unanimously the first time and came out of the Senate with only 1 opposed. I'm open for any questions."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ken Dunkin."

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

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Dunkin: "Representative, we discussed this legislation several weeks ago. I am committed to trying to work with you to make it a significant Bill that will impact some of the problems that you're trying to address specifically in your district that is not going on in other districts across the state. I recognize the time and attention that you... the media has discussed with this, but I would ask if you can indulge me by taking it out of the record and keeping your commitment to having discussions over the summer and putting this Bill in the context... in the proper context other than really having punitive measures towards other community college systems across the state. Are you willing to do that?"

Ives: "Representative Dunkin, I'm more than willing to talk about other issues related to community colleges. I... I would like to try and run this Bill again simply because we are currently in a position now where I've asked for hearings... I've asked for statewide hearings. The Senate Democrats did their own this. This of their investigation on is one recommendations. This is a very simple, easy to understand measure. It does not ... you know, typically severance is given when there's been a problem or an issue. You could still, before we even get to the next Session to discuss this, have people retiring with multiyear severance packages that cost taxpayers lots of money and that includes state taxpayers. I...

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

I think this is a very reasonable ask, that there were a number of other Bills that I absolutely agreed with you. I felt like there... it was more discussion was necessary. To me, this Bill is very easy to understand, a straight... the impact is simply to limit severance to one year. It doesn't say you can't give it. It says it's limited to one year plus benefits. And so..."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "...that's... that's where I'm going with."

Dunkin: "Sure."

Ives: "But..."

"And I certainly appreciate your level of concern and due diligence. What I'm simply trying to do ... I know I didn't participate in any discussion as the chairman... Appropriations for Higher Education. This issue is not on deaf ears. Certainly in the context of myself and others... of the other 19 Members of the Appropriations for Higher Education Committee. This is a concern that has gotten all of our attention and we want to do it the right way without penalizing or being punitive to other community college systems that are functioning successfully. So, I did not participate and I don't know how many Members participated in the Senate hearings or discussions, but I wasn't privy to those unfortunately. Again, I would like to work with you, Representative. I'm not sure how long we're going to be here, whether we need to have formal hearings or not, but what I want to do is to get to a successful resolve that addresses this issue succinctly without having the community college affect... teachers, board of trustees

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

association be against this. I want to work with you to help make sure that the... that the Illinois Community College Board is successfully in compliance in working with you on this as well. Because ultimately, the trustees are the true Governors or provide the true governance over all of these community colleges. And so, I truly and genuinely want to work with you, Representative. I would like, again, for you to take this out of the record, if you will, and so we can sit down and come up with a substantiated strategy to make sure that the College of DuPage does not run across this level of issue or concern in the future and possibly other community colleges. So, are you willing to give me a bit consideration to take this out of the record and let's have time to sit down, to come up with a stronger, less punitive resolve for all the community colleges? Are you willing to do that, Representative?"

Ives: "Representative Dunkin, I'm more than willing to work with you on the numerous issues related to higher education and the unaffordability and the high cost it is to both taxpayers, parents and students. It's part of the reason we lose 16 thousand students every year to other places, other states. I'm more than willing to work with you on all sorts of other things we need to do to reform higher ed. However, I would like to see if the majority of the people here would approve of an idea that simply is not punitive. It's punitive to taxpayers; it's punitive to faculty who work hard."

Dunkin: "Sure."

Ives: "It's punitive to students who work hard to actually give
 multiyear severance buyouts."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Dunkin: "Right."

Ives: "And that's what this Bill's about."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "It's about multiyear severance buyouts. So, I mean, I've asked for hearings; I've been denied. I'm so thankful that the Senate Democrat Caucus was able to put together in a four... in a few short months. And by the way, I asked for these hearings back in February, but in that same time frame, the Senate Democrats were able to come together with a very lengthy investigative report that essentially asked for exactly what this Bill does."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "They asked exactly for what this Bill does and I think
 there's more things that we can do."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "I absolutely agree with that, but this is a ... "

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "...simple measure that limits it to..."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "...one-year severance, one-year severance."

Dunkin: "Representative, I want to work with you. I want to help get to the issue that your specific... you're one of 48 community colleges, one college is dealing with or has dealt with. If you can, this is my third time and I say this respectfully, if you can pull this out of the record, Representative, so we can work together in short order... I committed to you before, we didn't do it. I... you know, I know this is burning for you and your one specific college, but I want to work with you in earnest. Can you... will you pull this

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

out of the record until we can come up with a... an overall comprehensive approach. This is not a delayed stall tactic, by no means. I want to... I genuinely and sincerely would like to work with you, Representative. Are you willing..."

Ives: "Representative Dunkin..."

Dunkin: "...to do that?"

Ives: "...I am more than willing to work with you, but I'd like a up or down vote on this particular measure because this is an easily understood... easily understood measure to protect taxpayers and future people. Does anybody think here that any community college president should be getting 2, 3, 400 thousand dollar severance buyout? A severance buyout is there when things have gone bad. That's what it's there. It's for rent arbitration when there's a disagreement between the trustees and that's what this is for. This is not about anything other than that. And I tell you what..."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "...it is not strictly a problem in my area."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "It is a problem around the count... around the state."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "I... I can tell you about..."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "...a hundred thousand dollar buyouts throughout..."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "...the State of Illinois on... in this issue."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "I feel like I'm being badgered by the questioner, frankly."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Dunkin: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been here 13 years now and I've had the opportunity to work with a number of colleagues, both current and some who are no longer here, and never have I had a flat-out no... you don't want to work with another colleague... irrespectable of what side of the aisle we're on... on an issue of this level of high significance. All of us have community colleges in our respective districts that we either work with that we respect and that we want to see have the most impressive educational experience on every student. We want to make sure that every single college board of trustees is endowed with the ability to govern. We don't what to have anything to do with any community college or university for that matter that is going derelict his or her responsibilities financially, academically or governance-wise at any level. Representative, I simply tried to ask you several times if we can work together to make this thing correct. As the chair of Appropriation... this is my fourth year, Representative. I chair Appropriations for Higher Education. I work with community colleges. I work with state universities. I work with the Illinois Community College Trustees Association. I work with the Illinois Community College Representative, I'm not some johnny come lately or willynilly. You have a number of individuals who want to see the community college system successful, but you cannot ramrod legislation down the throats of 48 colleges across the State Illinois without working out something with other colleagues and Members here. So, I'm perplexed of why it is that you want to allow this Bill to marinate with some further

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

evaluation, assessment and intelligence in a different perspective that can only add to the Bill. So, this ... for some reason in my 13 years, this is a problem where you don't want to work with colleague who want to help you out with your one specific college, one out of 48 community colleges, and you're saying no. Ladies and Gentlemen, I hope everyone is paying attention. This is not a good Bill. It is not soup yet. For some reason, you know, the sense of urgency or the arrogance of this legislation moving forward without even considering working with your colleagues over here, not the Senate, over here in this chamber to get some clarity, to come to some successful conclusion. And the last time we discussed this you, Representative Ives, you promised that you would hold hearings, that you would work with us and so, now, you have this Bill up here and you're reneging. Now, here's one thing in my... in my conclusion."

Speaker Riley: "Ex... Yeah. Would you bring your comments to a close? We have five other speakers."

Dunkin: "Every Member here understands pulling things out of the record so work with Members, not lobbying groups, not associations, but with Members to help shape the Bill, in sincerity, in earnest. But for some reason, my colleague across the aisle simply is not having it. She wants to have this Bill... she wants to have it her way or the highway. I would encourage a strong 'no' on this vote. This Bill is not ready. I want to get to a resolution, but also want to work with someone who is sincere about coming... crafting legislation that makes sense for every community college, Representative. So, you know, I'm taken aback of how it is

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

and why it is that you want to go against what you stated on this House Floor, what you stated in committee and what you committed to Members that now, all of a sudden, all bets are off. You're going to do what you want to do because you can. And I would encourage Members to provide a strong 'no' on this legislation."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. We have discussed and debated this legislation in the past and it was defeated as it should have been. In my area, I have the Illinois Valley Community College. I attended there. My family has attended there. It is a tremendous asset... one of the greatest assets in the Illinois Valley area. Our community college system is just that. The way I feel about mine... there are 48 other community colleges that provide a brighter future for ourselves, for those continuing on in working, for being... those being retrained, for new students it gives opportunities that are affordable. And they are run by local boards of trustees who are elected locally. A lot of people in here have said that they believe in... in keeping government local. That is truly where it's at the local level. At the College of DuPage, some things happened which should not happen anywhere. They had a president who was smarter than his board of trustees and the local elect ... electoring bodies eliminated those trustees. They took care of that problem as it should be taken care of at the local level. There are some good things that were brought about from hearings, maybe some changes that we can make, but the Senate Sponsor and the House Sponsor had said they will hold hearings

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

and take a look at. Because those of us who care about our community colleges and our opportunities for growth and our ability to have local control want to make sure that a broad brush does not adversely impact us because of a community college president who not only did this at the College of DuPage but did the same thing at Harper College. So, we have a person that's changing the ability of us to have local control to attract the best and brightest people to come and lead our postsecondary institutions and provide opportunities for our families. There was an agreement that this Bill would not advance. It was brought up a few weeks ago and rightly so, it did not advance and should not advance. Those of you who voted 'no' voted 'no' properly. And I would ask you to stand by those 'no' votes, stand by your community colleges. Allow the hearings to take place this summer, as they're supposed to do. If we need changes made, let's bring them through the committee. Let's bring in the community colleges to actually look at what the new processes are and should be and let our local people and our local officials do their jobs. This Bill was defeated. It should be soundly defeated again. If you voted 'no' the last time, I ask you to re... to stick with that 'no' vote and do this for the community colleges and for our systems downstate that we are very proud of. We should not change things with a broad, sweeping brush. We should follow what the Sponsor's said they do. And I ask you to hold to your votes on the last round. Vote 'no' and defeat this legislation."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Speaker Riley: "There are six Members requesting recognition. I would just ask that Members try to keep their remarks succinct. The Chair recognizes Leader Lang."

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

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Ives: "I will."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, we have voted on this before.

That's correct?"

Ives: "That is correct."

Lang: "And how many 'yes' votes did you get when we voted on this before?"

Ives: "I got 96 'yes' votes when it went out of the House April 24 in a more restrictive version."

Lang: "And how many votes did you get on your previous Motion to Concur?"

Ives: "I believe it was 52... 51... 52."

Lang: "All right. And I've been told that the Senate Sponsor, who I believe is Mr. Connelly. Is that correct?"

Ives: "That's correct."

Lang: "I've been told that he promised some people there would be summer hearings on this issue. Do you know anything about that?"

Ives: "He did not say that to me at all. He did not say that."

Lang: "Well, if you found out that he said that, would you be more inclined to hold this Bill for those summer hearings?

After all, he's the Senate Sponsor."

Ives: "He... Well, I don't see the reason to hold summer hearings when Senator Cunningham, a Democrat, is very much in support of this Bill and actually helped bring the Bill back up. And

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

they voted on this Bill with only 1 'no' vote. The Senate passed this Bill nearly unanimously, nearly unanimously that this... in this same version. They... they passed Bill. I don't know why they would pass this Bill if they felt like this Bill was complicated and needed additional hearings. This is not a complicated Bill. This Bill says that if you are going to offer severance, you're limited to one year plus benefits. That's what this Bill says. Now, anybody who thinks that community college presidents making hundreds of thousands of dollars should receive even more than one... hundreds of thousands of dollars in the severance agreement, you... I guess you would vote this Bill down. But I don't believe that the majority of the people here think that severances... hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers should go to severances. I... I just don't believe that that's the case. And unlike my other Bills that were similar on talking about reform for higher ed, this Bill was defined and easily understandable so as to be run. Now, I asked for hearings and I'm still open to hearings on all the other issues that are going forward with higher ed. But I think this Bill... it passed unanimously first time, more restrictive. It passed the Senate in this same version. And I think this is a great taxpayer protection."

Lang: "So, Representative, we're all familiar with the mess and the problems at the College of DuPage, which I'm quite sure is what brought this Bill about in your mind. But it's true, is it not, that community college boards in the state, whether it be the College of DuPage or other community college boards, are elected officials. Is that correct?"

Ives: "That is correct."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Lang: "So, why would we not let elected officials do the job they were elected to do. Why would... why would we want to take over in Springfield the duties of another elected Body?"

Ives: "It's the same thing that we do when we limit governments, whether it's the PTELL limitation or whether it's deciding for the government... for local governments what they have to do with their pensions and everything else. At the local level, when state tax money is involved, we put in reasonable taxpayer protection but allow local control to... in other... to the other extent, you know, other extent possible. So, this is a reasonable taxpayer protection because state money's involved. That's... that's why we're doing this because state taxpayers around the state don't think for instance that Richard Underbakke from Black Hawk College should have received \$310 thousand in a 2011 severance. They don't think that that's fair. They don't think that's fair. So, this doesn't say you can't offer severance. This says you limit it to a reasonable amount which is one year plus benefits. And as far as the community college trustees and the ICCB, the ICCB in particular to Dr. Breuder completely failed the taxpayers of the state when he received a large severance out of Harper and went right into College DuPage. They should have sent out all sorts of alarms. And if we had had this type of in... this type of legislation in place, nothing... Dr. Breuder would have not gotten, first, a large severance at Harper and then a large severance... multiyear severance con... package at COD. But like I said with the Black Hawk example, Black Hawk College, this is happening around the state. And these trustees are not doing it in the light of day and the

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

taxpayers deserve reasonable protections. And it's no different than what we do, whether it's limiting for PTELL or decide... telling the people exactly what you have to do with your pension. We do this all the time when state taxpayers' dollars are involved."

Lang: "So, Representative, where does this start and stop? If we believe in local control then, why don't we allow local elected officials to do their job they're elected to do? Why would we decide in Springfield what's best for a local community when they have the ability under the law to make their own decisions?"

Ives: "Were you here..."

Lang: "Why do we want to make those decisions?"

Ives: "...were you here when they implemented PTELL? Were you here when they implemented PTELL?"

Lang: "Yes."

Ives: "Did you vote for PTELL?"

Lang: "I don't think I did."

Ives: "Well, plenty of others in this... this chamber felt like it was a reasonable limitation to protect property owners. That why they voted for this. Now, if you think that anybody in a government position should receive a multiyear buyout, if you think that that's a reasonable position, then you can go ahead and vote down this Bill. But state tax dollars are involved. And if they really truly want local control in everything, then guess what, don't accept any state tax money, period. That would be great."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. Certainly, a lot of nasty stuff happened at College of DuPage. And

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

certainly, the Lady is correct when she says that the severance package given does not seem reasonable. certainly, we should be wary of that and certainly, we have asked for an audit there and we've done all the things we can do. But the question is, do we believe in local control or not believe in local control? It's not, in my opinion, appropriate to pick and choose. You can't say, well, I'm a proponent of local control on these 25 issues, but on these 25 issues I think the state should take it over because there was a problem at one community college or maybe you can find five community colleges. It does not seem appropriate to me for us to take over the responsibilities of another elected Body, otherwise let's just disband the local elected bodies that run community colleges and let's just do all community college policy from here. Some of the same people who will vote for this today are constantly standing on the House Floor talking about why is the state in the business of local government. Let the local governments do their job. And yet, some of you will vote for this Bill today. It seems to me we have a responsibility to have a philosophy that we work under. Maybe you're a proponent of no local control, then vote that way. Maybe you're a proponent of local control, then vote that way. But to go back and forth as the wind goes because there's one egregious problem at the College of DuPage is not good state public policy. This is an inappropriate Bill drafted because people have a real problem with what happened at COD... I do too... but this is not the appropriate response to this problem. I strongly recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Andersson."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to make two brief points. Number 1 is that this ... I agree. This is an issue of local control, but what this Bill does is it brings the col... the community college system, not one college, all the community college systems into line with a fundamental tenet of local control. Which is that local control means that the board in existence at the time that a question is presented gets to decide the issue. In... in simpler terms, what this Bill does is it limits the time frame of an employment contract. All other local... local governmental entities are already quite used to that proposition. It is the proposition that you cannot bind a future board, with exceptions. There are exceptions: garbage contracts, for example. But for personnel, they all live with the consequence that you cannot bind a future board because that is the element of local control that the elected officials at the time have the ability to decide that contract, not the elected officials who are gone and who have tried to bind that future board. So, I think this is perfectly appropriate local control enforcement. It's not against it; it's for it. So, that's number... point number 1. Point number 2 is, quite a bit has been made about whether or not we should have hearings on this. I will tell you, on our side of the aisle, we requested hearings in the House on this issue, repeatedly and we were rebuffed on that. We were rebuffed, so we had no choice but to go forward. And... and to that point, I think that there needs to be some clarity as to what happened in the Senate. And I know that Representative Breen just spoke with Senator

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Connelly on the issue. So, I would yield the remainder of my time to Representative Breen. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Breen, you are listed, you know, as being on the record to speak, so why don't we do this. Why don't we go to the next Representative and you will be called very soon. The Chair recognizes Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I have heard, over the years, a term used in this Body 'golden parachute' a number of times. Buyout, bailout, a number of times. What's happened is and to the extent that we know because we really don't know what's happened in other community colleges, which I'll get to in just a second. What we don't know is really what's transpired in other colleges, but what we do know in this very simple Bill is that we've had a roque president able to control millions upon millions of dollars and get more. This Bill simply says, we're not going to give more to a roque president who has taken advantage of the system. My question, Mr. Speaker, would be, where are the auditors? Where are the accountants? Where are the internal controls and processes that most large facilities, companies, schools depend upon? And this, quite frankly, is a general question not only to the Chair but to all colleges whether they be community or otherwise, whether they be state facilities. We fire a football coach in the State of Illinois and we give him treble pay. We fire college presidents and we give them huge 'golden parachutes'. So, the question becomes, where does it all end? It's very obvious that the controls were lacking, people didn't audit, didn't pay attention, didn't have a process and so, whether it be Harper or DuPage now we have questions in

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

two other districts, which I'm not going to mention today, but two other community colleges. I'd even go back to a previous Representative and say, where was the higher ed department? Where were they? If we're going to be critical of the Bill, maybe we ought to say, what did we do? You see, what I see, Mr. Speaker, is nobody has done anything until we got to this very simple Bill which says we're not going to enrich a community college president for the wrongdoings of his past at the expense of the taxpayer. That's it. It's very simple. I understand local control better than anybody else, but when it fails and it fails as miserably as it has here and now we have indication of other cases in two other districts, two other community college districts, we need to take notice of this. We need to fix this now. If somebody wants to come back, Mr. Speaker, and fix this later and amend this and add to it and make it better fine. But I say today is the day. We've had enough. And I say enough is enough. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "To the Bill. I just don't get it. I don't get the opposition to this Bill. I'm a former member of the ICCTA. I am one of but a few who graduated and was a community college board member. I went through some significant problems back in the early 1990s and I wish we had something like this in the law at that time to solve problems that... of the issues we had with our president who thought at that time was the elected official. So, folks, the Lady has presented I think a reasonable response to a problem but one which is not just isolated within DuPage County. Something which I've seen

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

firsthand has happened. There has been approximately 12 Bills that have been introduced regarding College of DuPage, community colleges, have come out since this issue has arisen. So, it's not a question of this is something new that we need to have hearings. We've heard enough about it. Now, I think that what she's asking for is saying we're not going to have automatic roll... rollovers. We're giving the board the ability to go back and say that we're going to, you know, re up their contract. What's wrong with that? But also stating that we're going to have to limit the severances to one years ... one year of salary and benefits. I think we just got to realize that the whole notion of severance agreements is not to provide a pleasant sendoff to a public official. It's used as a way to avoid litigation when there's a problem generally with that individual and also to avoid embarrassing situations for the institution. Again, I don't get it. I don't understand it. But we talk about local control, give me a break, guys. There's been a lot of things that the Governor has asked, which he's asking for local control on a number of issues, so we just arbitrarily pick and choose what we think is right, what is worthy of us not putting our nose in, not interfering with. But the fact is, guys, we do this all the time and it suggests for some reason the sky is going to fall because we are interfering with the board of trustees, elected officials at community colleges, is not consistent with this Body. It never has been. So, I'm not going to buy that argument. And lastly, folks, there is not going to be a devoid of talent if we pass this for people who are going to move on and they're going to find employment somewhere else. The colleges are

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

going to find outstanding individuals to lead their institutions. Trust me. In this economy, if somebody leaves, someone's going to be right there who's qualified to pick up the ball and run with it. So, again, I don't get and I don't understand the opposition to this. The Senate, I think, was for the first time I will say, in my life, was wise with their vote. But the… this is something that I think is fair. It's reasonable. It's balanced. It's transparent. It is a reasonable, reasonable response, but one that should have statewide implications. So, folks, not only do I support this Bill, but I enthusiastically support this Bill and ask you to do the same."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the previous Representative Breen: had stated, I... after hearing the claim about Senator Connelly, I picked up the phone and called him. And the Senator said that I can state to this Body that the claim that he had promised to hold this Bill or hold further hearings is 'a misrepresentation'. As well, that claim actually was specifically rebutted and disproven by Senator John Sullivan during committee hearings on the other side. So, again, this is a bipartisan Bill. If you look at the names on the board, it's not all Republicans. And it's the same way in the Senate. It was two Democrats, two Republicans. This is one of those Bills that really should not get partisan. It looks like it got wrapped up in some other issues that it shouldn't have been. And again, I mean, the terms are very reasonable. No severance agreements of more than a year, so you can't pay people out more than a full year's salary and benefits. Again,

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

you can't have a contract of more than four years, which makes perfect sense. Same thing you do on the municipal side. Contract can't include those automatic rollovers that just kept extending people over and over. And that all those renewals need to be made during open meetings not during closed sessions. And that you need public notice prior to doing any sort of contract renewals and negotiations. All of these very innocuous proceedings and again, very bipartisan and all that. So, again, would urge a 'yes' vote, so that you can join bipartisan individuals such as the Senate Sponsors: Senator Bill Cunningham, Senator Tom Cullerton, Senator Jacqueline Collins, along with the many bipartisan supporters here in the House. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Dunkin, I don't recall your name being used in debate? I'm sorry. The Chair recognizes Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Dunkin."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Ives: "Yes."

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "I don't know."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "Yes."

Dunkin: "Representative, I just got off the phone with State Senator Bill Cunningham."

Ives: "Yes."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Dunkin: "Do you want to know what that conversation was about?"

Ives: "You can... I'm sure you're going to tell us."

Dunkin: "First off, he says he's never sat down and talked with you on this legislation. He ran into you, passing you in the hallway. He said he had picked it up. That's the first thing. Now, here's what the... what the..."

Ives: "He told me he's in favor of this legislation and that he... and he wrote it in his Bill. So, that's what he said."

Dunkin: "Representative, it's obvious that he's in favor of the legislation 'cause he's one of the Chief Sponsors. Here is my issue, Representative. Now, I respect you and I respect every other Member here on this Body, but I don't misrepresent the truth of a Senator or a Member or anyone else for that matter. Now, he's also having a hearing on the 20th of this month, July 20, 10:30 a.m. at the Bilandic Building on this subject matter. And so, to have you..."

Ives: "That's great."

Dunkin: "Hold on, Representative."

Ives: "That is great."

Dunkin: "Hold... Representative..."

Ives: "I'm thrilled that he's doing that."

Dunkin: "Now, nothing down here is so collaborative to a point where we have to lie, flat-out misrepresent our communication."

Ives: "I did not lie."

Dunkin: "So, all I'm asking you to do, Representative. All..."

Ives: "I said that he's in support of this Bill. He flat-out... He
 wrote..."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Dunkin: "...all I ask you to do, Representative, was to hold the Bill..."

Ives: "I appreciate his work."

Dunkin: "...until we have the hearing. Now, what is so tremendous about holding the Bill until we have the hearing...

Ives: "Representative Dunkin..."

Dunkin: "...so you can get another perspective."

Ives: "...we have asked for those hearings repeatedly on the House
 side, repeatedly."

Dunkin: "It's scheduled, Representative."

Ives: "I've asked for it repeatedly and I have been denied. So,
 this is a..."

Dunkin: "It's scheduled for July 20 at 10:30 a.m..."

Ives: "...this is a reasonable..."

Dunkin: "...at the Bilandic Building."

Ives: "And it's... it's wonderful that..."

Dunkin: "Rep..."

Ives: So, we're finding out about this now. I was... nobody told me about this..."

Dunkin: "We talked about this the last time, Representative."

Ives: "Representative Dunkin, this..."

Dunkin: "We talked about this the last time."

Ives: "...this Bill... this Bill is exactly what Senator Cunningham support, which he was the lead on, which he..."

Dunkin: "Of course, he supports the Bill."

Ives: "...which he talked about it. This is... he voted in favor with me of it. He said he's in favor of this Bill."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "He... he wants this Bill."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Speaker Riley: "Members. Members, Members."

Ives: "It's right here in his..."

Speaker Riley: "Members."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Ives: "...address."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Dunkin, we're getting into a diatribe. I'd like for you to ask your question, get an answer. We have more people to speak. Otherwise, we're just going back and forth."

Dunkin: "Representative... To the Bill. You know, I don't care how long you've been here in this chamber. I don't care your district demographic, what your background is, the type of people that you represent, whether you're a Democrat, whether you're a Republican. I can care less. But what I care about, what I know is valuable here, is your integrity and your credibility here in this chamber. When you say you've done something or you're going to do something, damn it, you'd better do it because all you have is your word. All you have is your credibility. And if a Member misrepresents the facts as simple as holding the Bill because there's going to be further hearings... official... officially scheduled hearings by the Chief Sponsor of the legislation, we should adhere and honor that. Now, I'm not going to belabor the point that I made earlier, but be it this Bill or any other Bill we have to not only come correct but we have to come with the level of integrity and deference of this Body whether we are on the record or not and that deals with the truth. So, again, Representative, I am befuddled and surprised that you are

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

moving this legislation in spite of what you talked about and agreed several weeks ago and what you know now that July 20 at 10:30 a.m. in the Bilandic Building that we will hold official Senate hearings that all of us can come to and participate in, but yet you're running the Bill anyway. It's wrong. It's disingenuous. And it's something that I'm not going to stand for and I'm not going to allow anyone to lie to me on this floor or off the floor off of simple legislation when all of us are trying to be a part of the solution. Shame on you."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Tryon."

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

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Tryon: "To the... to the Bill. This is a very interesting debate I find especially when we bring up issues like local control. When you look at how our communities and units of government throughout the state operate, with the exception of Home Rule who get some powers through our Constitution, the rest of them operate under state statutes. The very statutes and laws that we debate here in this chamber. When we look at local control, we have decisions on that almost every Session. Last year we took away local control from the Village of Dolton and every other community in Cook County, when it came to landfill siting. Now, you can't have a landfill anywhere in Cook County in any community because that was the policy the majority of this chamber voted for. We're talking about an issue of severance agreements that are egregious to almost any taxpayer who would hear it. We had that situation with Metra a year ago and the ma... many of the Members in this

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

chamber were demanding the removal of those appointed officials from their seats because the ... it was a similar issue that's happened to the College of DuPage. I have an issue with my community college in my community on a severance agreement that we can't even find out what it is because part of it isn't subject to the FOIA law. So, I hope this never happens to your community. I hope it never happens to any community college in any other part of the state. So, the question on this Bill is, is this a reasonable policy to give somebody one year of severance? My community college president today makes \$220 thousand. One year of a severance package I think is way more than enough, if there is a severance agreement that's put in place due to a termination of my college president and I can easily support that. I'm a little concerned that the community colleges are that upset that maybe there are a lot of community colleges that have agreements and severance packages that would exceed one year. This is a reasonable solution to a problem and this is the process to do it. How much more does the Bill's Sponsor have to go through when she files a Bill and she works with people on it in committee and she comes to the chamber and it goes to the Senate and goes through their committee? It gets amended and it comes back. That's the process. We supported this Bill in this chamber. It's a Bill that serves a purpose and provides some limitations to units of government that I think are reasonable. That is no different than the many limitations we provide under state tax statutes or the many empowerments. So, I can't imagine not being down here and trying to protect taxpayers against these kinds of contracts,

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

when we're looking at \$700 thousand severance agreements. That's egregious to anybody. That part of their money is state money, part of their money is federal money. So, I would hope the vast majority of this chamber would support the Lady from DuPage's Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill has been debated now for quite a while. I just want to say that the Representative has done a lot of work on this Bill. She… it is a bipartisan Bill. She has worked both sides of the aisle in discussion about this Bill. It's what several of the other recent speakers have said. This Bill is a public policy to protect taxpayers, not just in DuPage County, but to address the issue that arose in DuPage County as it did in Metra. A fund to form public policy to protect taxpayers throughout the State of Illinois. It is a reasonable Bill. It is very transparent and it is very accountable to the taxpayers of the entire State of Illinois. And I hope that the majority of people in this chamber will support that Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Many have talked about the pros and cons of the Bill. Like my Leader, I don't know what the cons really are, where the merit of trying to defeat this bipartisan Bill really lies. There must be something else that underlines and... and makes up this debate because it's a very straight, simple Bill. And as a reminder, to some of the folks that are vociferously objecting now, they voted for a more restrictive Bill in the first instance.

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

This comes back on Concurrence, nearly unanimous Concurrence, from the Senate and now, all of a sudden there are these objections many of which go to process that I think are unfounded. My friend, the Gentleman from Chicago, I think has exercised a little bit of inflammatory language with respect to holding hearings. I just went on the Senate website. There are no ho... hearings publicly announced just yet, but I absolutely take the word of the Representative that hearings are coming on July 20 in Chicago. I think that's wonderful. Trying to perfect a Bill and/or hear from other concerned constituents makes perfect sense. But let's be clear. Hyperbole and you know, really inflammatory language aside, this is a good Bill. I ask that you look to your first vote which was more restrictive and then say, oh, we've reduced some of this Bill. It can't make it more oppressive. It makes it more reasonable. Let's do the reasonable thing and pass this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Ives moves to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3593. Because of the effective... immediate effective date... There's a way to address the Chair. I'm sorry. Representative Ives to close."

Ives: "Thank you. I'd like to hear from Representative Dunkin.

I'd like to hear from Leader Lang. I'd like to hear a commitment to higher education hearings. Is there a commitment to higher education hearings... hearings on higher education and the issues? Do I have a commitment from that side that we hold House hearings on higher education and its out-of-control costs? To the students and the hardworking

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

families of the State of Illinois, do I have a commitment from those Leaders? Do I have a commitment for hearings?"

Speaker Riley: "Representative Ives, you're closing so another Member really can't respond to you as you're closing so."

Ives: "It's a rhetorical question to some degree 'cause obviously there's not a commitment on that side. I applaud the Senate Democrats, again. I applaud them for supporting this Bill. I did not lie about the Senator Cunningham and his support of this legislation. It's obvious from his vote. As far as I know, I have not been invited to any hearings about higher education costs. To me, this is a very reasonable taxpayer protection. I'd like to remind some people of their votes on... on freezing property taxes at the local level. That's certainly an intrusion on local control. So, as far as I'm concerned, this is a reasonable Bill. And I'd appreciate a sincere 'yes' vote for something that unanimously passed this House prior to this. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Ives moves to concur with Senate Amendment #3... I'm sorry. It's #2 to House Bill 3593. All those in favor vote 'aye'... Excuse me. This takes 71 votes, 71 votes. All those in favor state by voting 'aye'; all those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davis, Sims. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this measure with 73 voting 'yea', 34 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present', House Bill 3593 has reached its concurrence. And having reached the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared Representative Golar, for what reason do you rise."

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

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Speaker Riley: "Make your point."

Golar: "First of all, I just want to welcome Representative Davis back. But I'm here speaking today on one of our other colleagues that have had some issues in regards to his health and that's Representative Mautino. On tougher days a friend or colleague would... would get him there, other times he tried to make it, but by the time his chemotherapy treatment had ended, he'd be too late for the day's Session. Over the last roughly six months, State Representative Frank Mautino, Democrat of Spring Valley, has battled esophageal cancer. He missed at most three days of Legislative Session. He says this week in the midst of preparing for surgery later this month related to his illness, Representative Mautino said Democrats could again count on him. Driving the 150 miles to the State Capitol to cast what's likely to be a critical vote. We would like to give a hand of applause to Representative Mautino in his... as he goes ... Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Riley: "Thank you. And thank you to our courageous colleague. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "I have five minutes for a rebuttal. Hey, God bless you all. Thank you very much. Esther, that's wonderful. It's been a very interesting six months. And I want to thank you all for the... so, thought this would be easier. But thanks. So, I want to welcome back also Monique and say welcome also to Raymond Poe. The chamber has had a lot of... a lot of very difficult things to deal with this year. And to welcome back to all of my friends. Thank you for the prayer list. I have a Mezuzah, which I did not even know what it was. But it's a yep... yep from Rabbi Kalish. I've got copies of the Torah, the

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Koran. I've got prayer lists. You guys are amazing. You are wonderful and great friends. And thank you."

Speaker Riley: "Thank you."

Mautino: "Prognosis is good. Surgery's the 23rd. And so, I'll be out for a couple of weeks and a few weeks recovery after that. They expect to get it all, which is wonderful. So, I'll get to come back and join with you and hopefully, by the time that five or six weeks is done, you guys won't be here. Though you may, but I have a lot of... I've been in this chamber for 40 years, since my dad was here. It's an amazing chamber filled with people who are the greatest people of Illinois. And so, excuse me, thought I'd get through that a little better, but anyway. Thank you for everything. Thank you for your prayers. And you guys can get through this. We all can. Thanks."

Speaker Riley: "Thank you very much. The Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you. I rise for a point of personal privilege." Speaker Riley: "State your point."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One, I want to just make a very brief comment and thank the gentle Lady who moved the Concurrence that we just passed. It's important that we acknowledge something on that Concurrence is that there has been an effort to review the salaries of the Governor's administrative staff and it has been denied. And that is a good example as to why we must build transparency in the process. And secondly, I ask my colleagues to stand with us to send condolences to Senator Mattie Hunter and her family for her two nephews who were killed over the July 4th weekend

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

visiting the City of Chicago. An issue that none of us want to experience and certainly, as a mother, sending my child to visit relatives, heartbroken over the loss of those two young men. So, we want to send our condolences to Senator Mattie Hunter and her family."

Speaker Riley: "Thank you very much. The Chair recognizes Representative Monique Davis."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise to commend my colleague Representative Mautino for his effort to continue to be a part of the Democratic team in getting the work of the people done. I want to say to each and every one of you who sent cards, flowers, letters, texts and ask that God look upon me with healing. And I want to say I thank you so very much. I think many times people don't know the wear and tear that occurs on our body as we drive back and forth two and three and four hours one way or the other and we're also eating improperly through no fault of our own. And we... we do a great deal to serve the public and re... it really disturbs me when I read in the paper about how many people have been absent and how many days. I have been here 29 years and of those 29 years, I've been absent three times. Once because of the death of my sister and the other two I don't remember what they were about. But I think people should realize that the dedication that is given to this state by the people like Mautino, my colleague and many others who sit in this Body. And we just want to say to the public, we're here for you. We come to serve you many times when it's to our own disadvantage. And again, I thank you to you for your prayers

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

and your concern and I ask God to look upon each one of you with His special, special blessing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Riley: "Thank you, colleague. We're still on the Order of Concurrence. House Bill 3765, Representative Scherer."

- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's rather unusual to bring up a Bill after all of that, but we will try to just shift gears and do the peoples' work. I ask that the House concur on Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3765. The Senate Sponsor and I have continued working with the City of Springfield. And the Bill was amended in the Senate to alleviate concerns violating State and Federal Law. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. I appreciate your consideration."
- Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes... I'm sorry. The Chair recognizes Representative Butler."
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I would thank... like to thank Representative Scherer for her leadership on this. I'd like to thank Senator Manar especially in the Senate for his leadership. There's been a great deal of discussion about this Bill when it's come up on the floor before. The version that's before us on Concurrence I fully support. I've signed on today as a cosponsor of this Bill. It will be good for the City of Springfield and our 10th Street rail project to provide an avenue of transparency and a way for folks to talk about this project that's... that currently is not there. And I would certainly urge an 'aye' vote from all my colleagues. Thank you."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Scherer moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 of House Bill 3765. This Bill needs 71 votes.

 All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'.

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this measure, with 113 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 3765. House Bill 3765, having received the requisite amount of votes, is hereby adopted. House Bill 4006. House Bill 4006, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4006, I ask that we concur on Amendments #1, 2, 4 and 5. I believe that the Senate actually did us a favor by actually clarifying the Bill. What this would be is it creates the Burn Victims Relief Act (aka) the George Bailey Memorial Program. And it provides that the funding would come from a... a portion of the fund that goes to the State Fire Marshal's Office. They have agreed to use that. And we will pay it as the individuals receive their Social Security disability insurance payments. I ask for a Concurrence."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

Sandack: "Jay, I remember this discussion in committee and on the floor. What's the difference between the original source of revenue and the new source? And as a reminder, this is for discreet people who have suffered catastrophic injuries and have a verifiably short, unfortunately, lifetime ahead of them. Isn't that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes. It is for burn victims who have become disabled and have been told by two independent physicians that his or her prognosis is that they will have less than 18 months left

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

to live. They'll immediately receive the five month's pay that he or she would have received from Social Security had there not been a mandatory five-month waiting period. It's my understanding that the average amount is \$1100 a month. So, very few individuals probably in the state will be eligible for this. The Fire Marshal's Office actually came up with this funding mechanism. And it's better than what we were going to use, which I... was the foreign... the foreign exch... the Foreign Fire Insurance Fund which would have caused some problems with reciprocity with other states so. They're in favor of it. I know of no known opposition. I think it's a good Bill."

Sandack: "Thank you for the clarification. I believe it was a good Bill originally. I think it's certainly a better Bill now because I think the source of funds is more reliable. And I would encourage all... because this is a very discreet group of people that really need help and otherwise would not get help because of their short lifetimes. I think this is a good humanitarian Bill and I... I support the Sponsor and the Bill. Thank you."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Hoffman moves to concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 4 and 5 to House Bill 4006. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed... this requires 71 votes, requires 71 votes. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, with 114 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 4 and 5 of House Bill 4006. House Bill 4006, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of your Calendar, we have Senate Bills on Third Reading. Senate Bill 1564, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, return this Bill to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1564, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Gabel, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment just changes the effective date of the Bill to... there's... to have no effective date of all on the Bill."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Gabel moves to adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1564. All in favor... The Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Sir. Will the Sponsor... a question of the Sponsor, real quickly?"
- Speaker Riley: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Sandack: "Representative Gabel, why are you changing the effective date of this Bill?"
- Gabel: "So, the Bill would then only require 60 votes."
- Sandack: "So, you're... and when would it become effective, if it were a dead..."
- Gabel: "It would become effective Jul... June 1, 2016."
- Sandack: "All right. So, you're deliberating changing the effective date in order to get a lower threshold of vote

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

- count. And thereby, pushing the effective date of the Bill to one year later?"
- Gabel: "Correct."
- Sandack: "All right. Is there any reason why you just can't bring this Bill next year when we're in regular Session or in the fall?"
- Gabel: "This Bill's ready to go now. We... we were trying to call it at the end of Session in May. And there just wasn't an opportunity to do it then."
- Sandack: "All right. To the Amendment. I would... I appreciate the candor of the Sponsor. The... obviously, the change of effective date is meaningful, but it also basically demonstrates that we shouldn't be addressing this right now. I would suggest a 'no' vote on this Amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the conclusion of debate, I would ask for a Roll Call vote on this Amendment, please. Thank you."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Gabel moves do adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1564. This is a Roll Call vote. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. This question, with 56 voting 'yea', 52 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', Floor #1 to Senate Bill 1564 is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. But a fiscal note, state mandates note, balanced budget note, judicial note and state

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

- debt impact note, as amended by Amendment #1, has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Riley: "Keep this Bill on Second Reading. Representative Leitch, for what reason do you rise?"
- Leitch: "Thank you. My switch wasn't working. I intended to vote 'no' on that Amendment. Thank you."
- Speaker Riley: "It'll be duly recorded. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 639, offered by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 640, offered by Representative Bellock."
- Speaker Riley: "Leader Currie moves to adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor state by saying 'aye'; all those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions have been adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Brown."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 118 for one hour."
- Speaker Riley: "Republicans will caucus in Room 118 for one hour.

 The Democrats will caucus immediately in Room 114. House will now stand in recess until the call of the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on June... correction... July 09, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2040."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Sandack: "Just wondering if you'd been advised of any schedule
 with respect to when the House will be in Session next week?"
Speaker Turner: "I don't know yet, Sir, but I'll let you know."

Speaker Turner: "I'll be sure to let you know as soon as I find out."

Sandack: "Thank you, Sir."

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

Davidsmeyer: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Pursuant to House Rules I move to suspend the House Rule 37(d) and House Rule 18(a) to allow for the First Reading of House Bill 4245 without automatic referral to House Rules Committee. Under House Rule 54(a)(2), all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of debate, I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to suspend. Under Rule 49 and Article IV Section 8(c) of Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be recorded whenever 5 Representatives shall so request. There are at least 5 Members on my side that wish to have a recorded vote on the Motion to suspend House Rules 37(d) and 18(a). Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's very important that while state workers are working hard to make sure that they continue to perform their duties, it's important that we make sure to pay them for their duties. Their paychecks should not be in limbo. This is a clean Bill

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

that would continue to pay our state employees for the important work that they provide to the State of Illinois."

- Speaker Turner: "Just a moment, Representative. Representative Davidsmeyer, at the request of the Chair, would you please put your Motion in writing and submit it to the Clerk? Thank you. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4243, offered by Representative Leitch, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4244, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4245, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4246, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 4247, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 4248, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 4249, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act Bill 4250, offered concerning regulation. House Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 4251, offered by Representative Anthony, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4252, offered by Representative Stewart, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4253, offered by Representative McSweeney, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. First Reading of these House Bills."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Sandack: "Sir, I understanded that Representative Davidsmeyer made a Motion and there was, I don't know, a 15 minute break and huddling occurred. But I understand it was made in writing and that that writing was given to your very learned exceptional counsel because she needed another explanation and understanding of the Motion. I... I don't understand what's going on here."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, I requested the... that Representative Davidsmeyer submit the Motion in writing to the Clerk and that was not submitted in writing to the Clerk."

Sandack: "I understand it was given to the parliamentarian. So, maybe it needed to be handed to..."

Speaker Turner: "Parliamentarian is..."

Sandack: "...one person to the left or right?"

Speaker Turner: "Parliamentarian is not the Clerk."

Sandack: "Maybe he'll hand it to him right now and then we'll be...
we'll satisfy the Chair's inquiry, which I understand is
legitimate. But it seems to me that that is kind of a very
perfunctory and very... I'm going to use a word that the Leader
from the Democrats said... persnickety interpretation of a
Rule. The folks in that well are all well acquainted with
procedures and process, so I suspect that the delivery had
been made and had been constructively made and now is
physically being made as I speak. So, we had constructive
service and now we have physical service. So I would ask the
Chair that the Motion made by my colleague, Representative
Davidsmeyer be addressed per the Rules. Thank you, Mr.
Speaker."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Speaker Turner: "Representative, that Motion is out of order.

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

Davidsmeyer: "Mr. Speaker, as a courtesy we gave a copy of that letter to your parliamentarian. That was our copy that we were going to turn in and it is now, we printed out a new copy of that since you took our old... other copy. We have turned it into the Clerk. And I rise on a point of order. We specifically requested a Roll Call vote on my Motion pursuant to the rights granted in the House Rules and the Illinois Constitution. This breach of Rules should be corrected immediately with a Roll Call vote on my Motion to suspend and ensure that state workers continue to get paid for their hard work. Mr. Speaker, under House Rule 57(a) I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair that there be a... that there be no recorded vote to suspend House Rules 37(d) and 18(a)."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your Motion is out of order.

Representative Bill Mitchell, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mitchell, B.: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Mitchell, B.: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't quite understand. Representative Davidsmeyer's Bill all it says was that state workers will be on a continuing appropriation just like Members of the General Assembly, the General Assembly staff, judges. It's not a Bill in the extreme. It's moderate Bill. It's something that I think Republicans and Democrats can join together, pass this Bill and then we can talk about

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

other issues. Again, not in the extreme, moderate. Let's do it."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Lang."

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Lang: "Thank you. Now, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of noise coming from that side of the aisle. It just sounds like noise to me. All I hear is... that's all I hear. We have Rules. Mr. Speaker, you're well within your rights to uphold the Rules of the House. There's a process by which a person can make a certain Motion. The Rule specifies how the person needs to make that Motion. The Rule also specifies whether it's suspendable or not. So, to do... so, to propose that we have a Roll Call vote on something that isn't appealable or isn't changeable, is a moot point. I would recommend, Mr. Speaker, that we move on to the business of the House."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the previous speaker's comments. I believe we're still on the clock, 20 minutes waiting for an Amendment before it can be... additional business can be undertaken. So, we have plenty of time to address Representative Davidsmeyer's Motion. In fact, we spent more time talking about technicalities, which frankly have been inappropriately used. For those listening at home and/or wondering what it is Representative Davidsmeyer... Davidsmeyer wishes to do, it's real simple. It's extremely simple. House Bill 4245, the body of it holds as follows: beginning July 1, 2015 and continuing through June 30, 2016, there is hereby

appropriated to each state agency from the applicable state

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

funds on a continuing basis the amount necessary for personal expense... personnel expenditures of the state agency as jointly certified by the state agency and the Governor's Office of Management and Budget for each payroll period, during which appropriations for personnel expenditures have not been made available to the state agency for fiscal year 2016. In sum, this is the Appropriations Bill, a continuing Appropriations Bill, to pay state workers. Why wouldn't my Democratic friends want to put a vote on that? Why not vote on that? It ought to come out of Rules. It ought to be debated on the floor. And each of us ought to be held accountable for this simple, straightforward, continuing appropriation to make sure workers get paid for their work. Who is going to argue against that? Who is going to argue against that, seriously? How about we put a vote on this and let's stand with our colleagues and state agencies that are doing the peoples' work. Let's get them paid the right way, not under some silly Bill, not under cover of darkness. Let's put votes on it. Come on, friends, it's time."

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

Nekritz: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find this a fascinating discussion. By... over the last couple weeks when we've been debating... debating some budgets around here, we hear continually how our bud... the budgets that the Democratic... Democrats are passing are out of balance. No matter how much we're appropriating in those budgets, they're out of balance

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

because if we extrapolate from what we're doing now, the budget we would be passing out, we extrapolate that then the entire budget is out of balance. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we are going to pass a continuing appropriation with no cap, no time frame, no limit for state employees, then the budget is out of balance. The budget is out of balance because we're going to get... if we're going to pay them everything we paid them last year that by extrapolation we're going to pay everybody everything we paid last year and the budget is out of balance. That's the argument I've been hearing for days. I'm a little amazed that the other side of the aisle would... would make that argument right now. Not that we don't want to see state workers paid, we want to see people compensated for what... for the work that they do. And I think that our side of the aisle has been very clear about our desire and our willingness to do that. In fact, it's an argument over whether workers are to be paid for what they're worth and the work that they do that's holding up the state budget and keeping us from focusing on the budget and getting it done. And it ... and if we can put aside those issues about... about labor unions, collective bargaining, prevailing wage, all those things, we can put those aside and focus on a budget, folks, I guarantee we could get it done."

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

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

Guzzardi: "Remarkable to me as well to hear our colleagues from the opposite side of the aisle say, who would vote against

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

state workers getting paid for their work? Who would vote against that? I couldn't agree more. And I think in about 20 minutes we're going to see a lot of folks from the opposite side of the aisle vote against state workers getting paid for their work. And if you're shaking your head saying, no, I'm not going to vote against that, I welcome the bipartisan cooperation. I cannot wait to see every Member in this chamber vote for state workers getting paid for their work. I can't wait for it."

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

Davidsmeyer: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Pursuant to House Rules, I move for the discharge of House Bill 4245 from the House Rules Committee. Under House Rule 40... or 54(a)2 all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of debate, I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Rule 49 and Article IV Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be a recorded vote when 5 Representatives shall so request. There are at least 5 Members on my side that wish for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge House Bill 4245 from the House Rules Committee to ensure that a clean Bill to pay our state workers comes out. Not a Bill that's lumped with a bunch of other stuff that doesn't help the State of Illinois, but a Bill that pays the state employees for what they are doing for the work they continue to do for us." Speaker Turner: "Representative, your Motion is out of order.

Rule 18(g) provides the method for discharging a Bill from the Rules Committee. Your Motion does not comply with that

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Rule and therefore is out of order. Representative Kay, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege, please?"

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Kay: "I'm curious. Representative Davidsmeyer has asked for a number of Motions to be acted on pursuant to the Rules. And it was just now that you mentioned 18(g). Would you please articulate the reasons that his Motions can't move forward beside 18(g)?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, have you taken a look at Rule 18(g)? Rule 18(g) provides..."

Kay: "Yeah. I got... right here."

Speaker Turner: "...the method for discharging a Bill from the Rules Committee. Your Motion or Representative Davidsmeyer's Motion does not comply with that Rule and therefore is out of order."

Kay: "I don't know that that's where Representative Davidsmeyer started though and that's my point. I'd like it on the record as to why you began to say that everything is out of order. Is it 18(g) that makes everything out of order?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, the Motion is out of order. You have any further questions?"

Kay: "Yeah. I'd like to... is it 18(g) that you're..."

Speaker Turner: "Take a look at your Rule book, 18(q)."

Kay: "Well, I've got the Rule book right here, and I've read 18(g), but that's not where Representative Davidsmeyer started out. And I'm wondering if you have a response to his original comments when he started."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Speaker Turner: "Representative, I'm... I'm addressing the Motion that is on the table right now. And... and that's where we're going for with and that Motion is out of order."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "You're welcome. Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Davidsmeyer: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The last... the original Motion that I made was deemed out of order because of for some odd reason you took our copy of that and decided to read it into the Rules Committee, so you could rule my Motion out of order. So, you went around the system to... to rule me out of order. We were ... we specifically requested a Roll Call vote on my Motion pursuant to rights granted in the House Rules and the Illinois Constitution. This breach of the Rules should be corrected immediately with a Roll Call vote on my Motion to Discharge to ensure that state employees are paid for the work that they're done and not lumped in with some other political battle that we're trying to do here on the floor. We need to make sure that state employees continue to get paid for exactly what they're doing, the work of the people. Mr. Speaker, under House Rule 57(a) I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair that there be no recorded vote to discharge House Bill 4245 from the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, in accordance with House Rule 57, a Motion to appeal is not in order if the House has conducted intervening business since the ruling at issue was made. Representative Kay, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Kay: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Kay: "Yeah. Without trying to be cute or funny, but very seriously, it appears to me like what we're doing here is applying Rule 71 with no logic or reason in saying the Rules really don't mean anything. It's just that you have the number of votes. Is that correct?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, do you have some business that you'd like to address? Otherwise..."

Kay: "I... I just did."

Speaker Turner: "...we... we're going to ... we're going to go forward..."

Kay: "Sure."

Speaker Turner: "...with the business of the day."

Kay: "I think I made my point. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Okay. Thank you. On page 8 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 2040. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, can you please bring Senate Bill 2040 back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2040, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker and Members of the House.

This is the opportunity you have been waiting for. This

Amendment... this Amendment would provide pay for state

workers. But unlike the proposal in House Bill 4245, it would

limit the pay... limit the pay for one month, so that we can

continue to discuss and debate a full 12-month budget. And it

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

would cap the amount that we spend so it's not unlike House Bill 4245 raise the specter that we are breaking the bank, breaking the budget and providing no controls on state moneys that are spent on workers that we are ignoring the collective bargaining contract that we are making sure, in this measure, that our workers get paid in a timely fashion. And I hope that I will have support from every Member of this chamber to adopt Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2040. Happy to answer your questions. And I look forward to your unanimous 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the Leader yield for a few questions? Leader..."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In your eloquent opening remarks, you talked about this being the moment. Is there a repeal date on your Bill?"

Currie: "This... this lasts one month. This would provide for funding..."

Sandack: "Ma'am, I asked you if there's a repeal date. Is there
 a repeal date on it?"

Currie: "There doesn't need to be a repeal date. It is a one-month spending plan."

Sandack: "I take issue with that. I think maybe you want to read your Bill. Perhaps, you'll read the very last page of your Bill, Ma'am, because under the title 'repeal' it says as follows. This Act is repealed on August 1, 2015."

Currie: "That... the un..."

Sandack: "Have I misread that?"

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Currie: "The underlying Bill says that. And this Amendment would be an Amendment to the Bill that says that the repeal happens on August 1."

Sandack: "I don't even know what that means. Is there a repeal date yes or no, Ma'am?"

Currie: "In the Amendment, no. In the Bill to which the Amendment will be attached with your help, the answer is yes."

Sandack: "So, the Amendment goes into the Bill, which is why we call it an Amendment. It amends the actual Bill. And because your Amendment doesn't change the repeal date, the repeal date of August 1 stands whether you're Bill is amended or not. Isn't that correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Sandack: "Okay. So, you don't have a one-month Appropriation Bill, Ma'am. You have a two-week Appropriations Bill and you know the Rules, maybe better than anybody here. It... it goes... it's got to go to the Senate next. Does it not? This is..."

Currie: "It..."

Sandack: "It has to go to the Senate?"

Currie: "Yes. And the Senate will be in and the..."

Sandack: "Okay. And then, assuming you have your Supermajority there, it goes to the Governor."

Currie: "That's right."

Sandack: "And how much time does the Governor get to... to rule on your..."

Currie: "The Governor..."

Sandack: "...two-week appropriation?"

Currie: "...the Governor has 60 days."

Sandack: "Right."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Currie: "...but I know... I know this Governor cares about the workers of the State of Illinois. And I know that when he gets a Bill that will provide one-month funding, personal services for all of our state employees, he will do the right thing and he will affix his signature..."

Sandack: "The right thing would have taken..."

Currie: "...to it as quickly as he gets the Bill."

Sandack: "...taken Representative Davidsmeyer Bill. Because Representative Davidsmeyer's Bill is a real Appropriation Bill for workers. Yours is a faux one because you know it's going nowhere. And it only appropriates for two weeks by its own terms."

Currie: "And that would be effective for the full month of July.

And I would also point out that the Governor could hardly sign the Bill that you were proposing since it breaks the budget."

Sandack: "Right. It breaks the budget."

Currie: "We're talking billions of dollars out of whack."

Sandack: "Right."

Currie: "Billions."

Sandack: "To... to the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, there was a young man who gave a very eloquent impassioned speech, but like... probably the author and Sponsor of the Bill hadn't bothered to read it. It expires. It goes away on August 1. So, let's be careful what we're asking for. Mr... Mr. Speaker, I noticed that we called this Bill before the expiration of one hour. So, I would inquire whether the Rules have been uniformly applied in this instance. Because by my instance

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Rule 15 has not been adequately addressed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I find the rhetoric coming from the other side of the aisle interesting. Not only from the previous speaker and not only about their desperate concern about this Amendment, but the prior Motion of Mr. Davidsmeyer. I've been listening carefully over the last weeks to rhetoric coming out of the other side of the aisle and the Governor's Office relative to the budget, relative to paying state employees, relative to what we're going to do for Fiscal Year '16. Let me start by saying, we didn't have to be here at all. Pretty... it's pretty ludicrous for the people on the Minority side of the aisle and for the Governor to be jumping up and down over these issues when there was a Bill on the Governor's desk that would have funded State Government that would have paid state employees and yes, you can argue that it was out of balance. Of course, the Governor's proposal was out of balance as well. We indicated on our side of the aisle that we had an interest in both cuts, which we did, I think about \$800 million and revenue as well. The Governor, himself, admits we need new revenue but will only discuss that revenue if we take care of the political issues that happen to be on his plate at the moment. So, the Governor could have taken the spending plan that was passed out of the General Assembly that was on his desk and done a reduction Veto or simply just not spent the money. To send these Bills back here or to send the whole issue of the budget back here at all, was an irresponsible act. And those that

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

support it are supporting an irresponsible act and thereby become irresponsible themselves. So, the only reason that we need to be here and discuss this is that the Governor of the State of Illinois took it upon himself to hold the people of the State of Illinois and the budget of the State of Illinois hostage over nonbudgetary items that have nothing whatsoever to do with the budget. Someone over there, when I'm finished, is going to say that's nonsense. It's about the economic climate and it would improve the economic climate, bunch of nonsense. Those are issues that can and should be debated on the House Floor and on the Senate Floor. And those are issues, some of which, we have debated. We have debated property taxes. We have debated workers' comp. We've debated quite a few of these issues and some even passed out of this chamber. So, the insistence by the Governor on these nonbudgetary issues that has willing enablers and those in compliance because they're told to be, on the other side of the aisle, is what's getting in the way of the health of sick children in Rockford, and seniors in serious need of services in Effingham. It threatens the gentleman we saw here last week during the Committee of the Whole whose DON score is at 36. These actions by the Governor are appalling. Those that would support the notion that the entire budgetary discussion ought to be back on the House Floor at all are playing in some fantasyland that I don't understand. The Governor has the ... all the power he needed to make changes in the do... in the budget documents or the spending documents that were on his desk and instead chose for his own purposes to put us back in this situation, threatening the ill, threatening seniors,

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

threatening those with autism, threatening those with epilepsy, threatening those who need adult day care, threatening those who have serious needs. You all, even on that side of the aisle, recognize these serious needs, but you've become enablers. You've taken irresponsible acts and taken them upon yourself as your irresponsible acts. Now, the Governor and you have decided you want to pay state employees. That's great. But let's look at the facts. The facts are we all want to pay state employees. The facts are we all want State Government to stay open, not lose the services of the people of our state need. Of course, some of you enablers were bailed out by a court order whereby many people are going to get paid through that court order, certainly not all state employees. Many grantees will get paid. DCFS will get paid. Many will, many won't. But for some of you, that's good enough. So, what do we have instead of all that? We have campaign ads. We have mailers. We have all kinds of things ... Oh, robocalls. Let me not forget the robocalls. ...coming out of the Governor's Office and his minions. All of that has failed. The Governor's political rating continues to sink. Those robocalls were failures. The people that called my office had no idea why they were calling. And you know, Ladies and Gentlemen, if the Governor had \$40 million to spend on campaigns, maybe he could have helped an autistic child with that money. Maybe he could have built a school with that money. Maybe he could have taken care of somebody with a DON score of 36.9 with that money. I find it incredibly interesting that the Governor now is so desperate to pay state employees, in light of his campaign and in light of what he's

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

been saying all spring, where he's reviled state employees. He's referred to those trying to negotiate fair wages for employees as corrupt. He referred to Governor... discussions between Governor Quinn and AFSCME as corrupt. Why? Because AFSCME may have dared to make a campaign donation to the Governor while they might be negotiating their contract. Apparently it's okay though that he writes four hund... that Governor Rauner writes \$400 thousand in checks to Republicans in the House and Senate the night before the right-to-work vote. Apparently, that's okay. And apparently, it's okay, just before the union negotiations are now about to begin that the Governor is now with them. He went to court to make sure they could get paid, failed. Now he wants, through his minions and enablers, to come to the floor through them and try to get them paid and this is the same Governor who said the following things over the last several months. In October of 2012, the Governor called AFSCME AFScammy and said they are out there for their own interests. On shutting out employees during a campaign event last year, the Governor said, 'We may have to go through rough times. We may have to do what Ronald Reagan did with the air traffic controllers. Sort of have to do a do-over and shut things down for a little while. That's what we're going to do'. In January, the Governor said, 'The government union bosses are at the core of our spending problem in Illinois'. Rauner said in a Primary debate arguing that public unions create a conflict of interest for taxpayers and public unions have made a mess of the state's finances. These are the people the Governor now wants to help. Rauner said that public employees average

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

salaries are among the highest of any state in this country and share... and the state's share of health care premiums is too high. In a lawsuit filed against the Governor's attempt to withhold fair share fees, the Rauner administration said the lawsuit demonstrates that unions 'will do anything to keep the broken status quo'. This was stated by one of the Governor's minions in the Chicago Tribune in March. Members, on your side of the aisle, you enablers are not immune from this. One of your Members said, 'There's only 38 thousand members in AFSCME, you'd think there're 38 million. They're mobilized like ants'. That same Member said, 'Trust me. It's like spanking a child sometimes. The child doesn't want to be spanked, but in the end, it's going to make them a better person'. The Governor, after he was elected, in the early spring was running around the state doing a PowerPoint presentation. During this PowerPoint presentation, he said, 'The average public sector employee in Illinois makes almost 22 percent more, over \$11,300 per year, than the average private sector employee.' A 2013 University of Illinois study found that the opposite is true. The opposite is true. It was a total fabrication. The Governor's PowerPoint attempts to make a comparison between State Government pay versus working family pay, as if state workers aren't part of the working family scenario in Illinois themselves. In a February 2 memo to us, the Governor directs us to slides on state workers' salaries. The Governor writes that 'these levels are unsustainable and unfair to working families.' Again, making it clear that he believes state workers are overpaid and he doesn't consider state workers to part of the larger group of

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

working families in the State of Illinois. This problem, Ladies and Gentlemen, could have been alleviated with a simple stroke of the pen. I think the Governor must have some lawyers up there somewhere. If the lawyers had talked to the Governor and had not been bullied by him, as he attempts to do with us on a regular basis, they could have told him the Constitution provides to fix, if he thought it needed to be fixed or changed, the spending plan we sent to him. A simple stroke of the pen. We would all be in our districts. We would all be able to attend our events. We would all be able to be with our families. The people of Illinois would have whatever budget the Governor decided we should have. We don't have to be here. He, in the end, could have created any budget he wanted to, but yet, we're here. We're here because the Governor has a political agenda. And we're here because that political agenda is going to be foisted on us come hell or high water no matter what's right or what's wrong. Let's remember that the budget introduced by the Governor in February was out of balance. The difference is that when we filed and passed our spending plan we said we don't have enough money for this, but this plan reflects the values of the citizens of the State of Illinois. The Governor tried to play a hoax. The Governor tried to convince us and the people of the State of Illinois that his budget balanced, his budget would fix Illinois, his budget reflected our values and his budget was going to take care of all the world's problems and get us on the right course. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, it was a hoax. I've heard the word 'sham' 10 thousand times this year from that side of the aisle, from those enablers over

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

there. And those enablers think it's okay for the Governor to play a hoax on us and the people of the State of Illinois, but it is not. A simple stroke of the pen, Ladies and Gentlemen, would have fixed all of this. We wouldn't have to be here. The gentleman with the 36 DON score would be taken care of. The child in Effingham would be taken care of. The people of the State of Illinois would be taken care of. Instead, here we are debating whose Bill to fund the payment for the next month for state employee workers is a better Bill. We're going to get to the end of the vote Representative Currie's Amendment and you're not going to vote for it. You will not vote to pay state employees on Representative Currie's Amendment. You only wanted to do it on your Bill. Just like you were for property tax relief, but not for the property tax relief written in exactly the same language of the Governor's Bill proposed by Representative Bradley several times, which you may get a chance to see again sometime. This is wrong. We shouldn't be here. But one thing is sure, state employees are hard working. State employees deserve to be paid. State employees don't deserve to be vilified like Governor Rauner has done and now he pretends to put his arms around them and say, gee, guys, you're really important to me. Gee, I really want to help you. Ladies and Gentlemen, they aren't fooled. We aren't fooled. And the enablers over there know the truth as well, but they're not going to tell it to you. But they're going to tell you how you've... they really feel about the workers, the hardworking men and women, that work for State Government every day that work at our prisons that work in those offices that do all

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

the work that needs to be done for the State of Illinois in just a few minutes, when we see red and yellow votes up on the board. I challenge you to do the right thing. Stop being enablers. Start doing your jobs. Join us in taking the lead to run this General Assembly. The Constitution gives us power to do what we need to do as a coequal branch of government. Don't give away that power. Through the last two Governors who were Democrats, this side of the aisle told them both when they were wrong. We fought with Governor Quinn when it was appropriate. And we sure as hell fought with Governor Blagojevich when it was appropriate. When will you step up to the plate and reflect the values that your constituents sent you here to reflect. We're prepared to do that. Join us to do the right thing today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had a beautiful moment just a second ago of bipartisan consensus. We finally agreed state workers do valuable work and deserve to be paid. In Chicago, we have the Hubbard Street Dance Company. Man, they're fantastic. Don't know if you all haven't gone to see them. What the folks in the gallery are about to witness is a modern dance performance the likes of which Hubbard Street has never seen. You're going to see tap dancing and side stepping and shuffling away from that position that you just heard. Just a moment ago, we heard how valuable it was to pay our state employees, but now, I'm not quite sure what it's going to be. Maybe it's going to be that we're... only paying them for one month instead of for 12 months. Well, you guys had the opportunity to vote for 12 months of paying state employees.

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

It was called a budget. And everyone over there voted against it, if I recall. Well... or perhaps the concern is going to be that this is wrapped up with all sorts of other measures. Well, God forbid, we should vote on spending a little money on human services here, while we're down here. God forbid, we should vote on 30 days of funding for people with disabilities and people with mental illness and children who are sick. Is that the concern? Is the concern that we're also paying for those services? I don't know; we're about to find out. For my part, I'm going to sit down and watch the show. And when it's done, I'm going to vote 'yes' for this Bill because it provides pay for those state employees who deserve it and it provides funding for the basic services that our families need. It's an important Bill and everyone in this chamber should vote 'yes'. I thought we just agreed we would?"

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will."

Davidsmeyer: "Following the prior two speakers, I actually forgot what Amendment 1 was about. Could you please explain what Amendment 1 is?"

Currie: "I would be happy to. Amendment 1 provides that state workers will get their salaries paid from the beginning of July... July 1, 2016 through the end of July... July 31, 2016. So, what this does is makes sure our workers, all of whom deserve to be paid, make sure they get that pay, but we do it in a way that preserves the Governor's authority collectively

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

to bargain with state workers. We do not say this is an opencommitment. don't call it ended We a appropriation, so that every time the workers and the Governor bargain over salary, the workers can cheerfully say, Governor, you can spend whatever you like. And we hope you'll spend the bank. So, we're giving the Governor something that preserves his control, his authority collectively to bargain with the workforce, but we're making sure that our workers get paid for one month while cooler heads, grownups prevail and we figure out spending for the rest of the fiscal year."

Davidsmeyer: "Can you explain the recent decision that decided why we need this... this Amendment?"

Currie: "I think that we're concerned now that the court has said that the state workers can't be paid, not even the minimum required by the Federal Labor Standards Act, and we think it's important that they do get paid. So, we're responding in part to what happened yesterday in the Appellate Court in Cook County. We want to make sure the workers do get paid. They should not have to go month after month without... without pay. This is a one-month deal. And we are a continuing Body and we have been in continuous Session and we are prepared to come back. If we haven't done a full budget by the end of July, we can come back and renew this Motion."

Davidsmeyer: "Why... why did the court intervene?"

Currie: "Well, I believe there had been a lawsuit filed asking whether all the salaries might be paid. And the answer is, while there was some court orders that the court sustained, continuing appropriations that the court sustained, the court said that in response to the question about state workers

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

about whom there was neither a continuing appropriation nor a consent decree nor a court order, the court said you can't pay."

Davidsmeyer: "So, was this a..."

Currie: "Now, the court might have said you can pay, if we could have separated out those workers who were subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act and those who were not, but our State Comptroller said she was not able to make that distinction."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so, was this brought by a private individual to the courts or how did this come about?"

Currie: "The Attorney General brought the suit. And the Attorney General defended some spending, but not full spending."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Where... where was the... where was the Attorney General on the \$4 billion out of balance budget that you passed?"

Currie: "I don't think that was before the court."

Davidsmeyer: "Why... why is it not before the court? And if... and re... the previous... one of the previous speakers spoke to the Constitution and in the Constitution it says, the General Assembly by law shall make appropriations for all expenditures of public funds by the state. Appropriations for a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during that year, which means we passed... you passed an unconstitutional budget. Why did the Attorney General not step in and say this is unconstitutional? Let's come together, based on the revenue and get to where we need to be."

Currie: "First, of course, there is no budget because the Governor vetoed the budget Bills and until... until there is, if there

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

is an override, there is no budget for a court to rule upon. Second, we took our estimates... our estimates based on what we projected would be the appropriate level of revenue. I don't understand why you're talking about that. Before us in an Amendment to make sure our workers get paid this month. You said, just a few minutes ago, you were for that. Let's talk about how important it is to make sure these deserving workers get the day's pay that they are worthy of."

Davidsmeyer: "And people in the gallery, anyone listening, I think we're seeing a song and dance right over there right now. Here's why I'm talking about the Constitution. We saw earlier how you sidestepped your own Rules. Right now, you're picking and choosing what parts of the Constitution you want to uphold. I think it's ridiculous. The reality is, if you vote for this Amendment, it's going to land on a Bill that the Governor is going to veto, which means you're keeping state employee pay in limbo. You are voting for a Bill that the Governor will veto and state employee pay will be in limbo. My Bill, House Bill 4245 will actually pay state workers. If you really care about them, you won't leave them in limbo, playing these games, loading this on top of a Bill that we already voted down in this Body. And you will come together with me and vote for House Bill 4245, if you really care. This is not a song and dance. I'll come together with you, Representative and we'll... we'll come to a compromise. But right now, we are talking about state employee pay. If this lands on the Bill that you're amending, it will be vetoed by the Governor leaving state employees in limbo because of all the other stuff, not because of state employee pay but because

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

of all the other stuff, the unbalanced budget, the ... all that stuff. Okay? So, if you care about state employees, let's actually come together and do something that actually helps them. Quit playing games, quit doing that same song and dance. We've played... we've played games here on the House Floor and I should... I guess I should say to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. One of the prior... one of the... one of the prior speakers talked about political mailers. I remember back in May we voted on a Bill on a Friday afternoon and there were political mailers that landed in mailboxes on Monday. That means you had to print them on Friday, get them in the mail Saturday morning and have them in mailboxes on Monday. You can't tell me you're not playing political games, doing a song and dance. You can talk about all this stuff. Go for it. Keep telling the media what's going on. But what's really going on has been a song and dance for a month and a half to two months right here on the House Floor. The ... we we talked about simple, you know, scratch of the pen or whatever you want to talk about, but the reality is a simple pushing of the button on House Bill 4245 would accomplish exactly what we're trying to do, pay state employees so we can continue... they continue to do the work of the state or we continue to work on a budget that's constitutional. However that comes about, I'm happy to be part of that discussion, but state employees should not be in limbo. This Bill will be vetoed. You're keeping state employees in limbo. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Mautino."

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

I rise in support of the Lady's Amendment. And we've heard

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

and... and seen a lot of different things, but the courts have stepped forward and they've actually ruled. And so, what does that mean? If we take a look at what the court has said and who will and who will not be paid, about 97 percent of the state's employees, your constituents who send you here to do a job which is to get an operating budget for the State of Illinois, to those who put in their time and their hard work in DCFS in the agencies, the social service agencies, Corrections, all of our institutions, they will not receive a paycheck, period. That is what the court has said. And as we look to that, we do have a definitive answer. No one is in limbo. Will the check come? The answer without this Amendment is no. Through the past four Governors, we have hit budget stalemates. We have put together short-term budgets that keep the essential basic operations of State Government moving so that reasonable people can get together and come up with the only thing that is truly our job here which is to set and structure a budget which keeps State Government functioning. That means it pays our people and without this, that doesn't happen, 97 percent of the people who work in your facilities, who work for the State of Illinois. In LaSalle County, there's \$50 million worth of payroll. There is \$14 million in Bureau County. There is \$3 million in Putnam County. These are people who go to work. They work hard every day. And they deserve to be paid and without this... and I know numbers. I know numbers. I know budgets. I have known them for years. I know and respect the appropriations people on both sides. They know and they can tell you that this is the only option. It leaves the Governor with a choice, a very difficult choice. Do you

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

let the institutions in the State of Illinois fail in pursuit of something that may be important but not the fundamental responsibility of this Body, which is to ensure that state operations for the neediest continue, that the schools continue, that our people get paid what they should be paid. This is 30 days. It takes out all the arguments from the courts. It is a personal services budget. The Governor could have done this by zeroing everything else in all of the lines except for personal services. He didn't choose to do that. This is all about choices. The choice that we will provide him today and that he will have to make is, will our state services continue for the most needy and will we pay our people? And we're going to give him that opportunity very shortly. I would urge you to vote 'yes'. We're asking 30 days for the Leaders of these chambers to get together and do what we are supposed to do, what we are sent here to do and what we take an oath to do. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill or to the Amendment. Last week I rose and asked a series of questions after repeated comments had been made about how we were looking out for the most vulnerable people in the State of Illinois. And we pointed out several instances in which programs that deliver services, even from the individuals who we heard from directly here in the Committee of the Whole, those programs were left out. So, I thought surely when Floor Amendment #1 was filed that many of those vulnerable people would have been addressed in that Amendment. However, programs like the Autism Project, Early Intervention, domestic violence

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

shelters, breast and cervical cancer programs, AIDS drug assistance programs, domestic violence grants, violent crime victims, I mean, this list goes on and on and on. So, instead of focusing this time and spending time drafting Amendments that still exclude those groups, instead of having these votes week after week that still leave out a vast majority of the issues that... that face people in the State of Illinois, we need to return to have a discussion about a comprehensive budget. A budget that from all intents and purposes appears to require bipartisan collaboration. We need support on both sides of the aisle. We need support in the House, in the Senate. We need the Governor's signature for anything concrete to happen. For any kind of stability to come to the State of Illinois, we need all of those factors at play. So, we can continue to take partisan line votes each week and try to put somebody on the political spot week after week, but it hasn't gotten us anywhere this year and it will not get us anywhere this month or over the next several weeks. The focus has to come back to the glaring reality we have that a spending plan was passed on partisan basis earlier this year that spent \$4 billion more than we're projected to bring in. We have to begin to reconcile that. Programs that simply say we'll pay for maybe a month or a twelfth of the year or put some kind of patch appro... appropriation for 15 days don't get us closer to that actual compromise we need for a year-long budget that really provides the kind of stability we need. So, if we're really in this to protect the most vulnerable in the State of Illinois, we can't continue to look six inches in front of our heads. We've got to look to the future. These

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

tactics have tried... have been tried before and they failed before. What we must have... what we must have for a budget to pass in this state today is bipartisan cooperation. So far that has not been part of the budget process and it needs to be."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Tryon."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

"You know, Representative Currie, we started this conversation actually a little bit yesterday because in the 12 years that I've been here, I have never seen this chamber divided like it is today. And I have enjoyed 11 years of working in a bipartisan manner with you and most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. And while I could never compete with your experience here in the ... in the General Assembly since I've only been here 11 years or the Speaker who's been here 35 years, I do have more experience as serving in the Minority. I do know what it's like to be on this side of the aisle when you hold all the votes for State Government to do whatever you want in your hands. But this year what I see is... is not the spirit of bipartisanism. It's actually not bringing us close... closer together. What's happening now, it's dividing us further apart. And you know, to be here... and so, let me give you an example. Today we're going to look at a temporary spending plan for essential state services. And my question is, did you reach out to the Governor on the Bill that's before us today? Did we talk to the Governor about what essential state services are needed in his plan? Did we have that conversation..."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Currie: "My... my..."

Tryon: "...on this Bill?"

Currie: "We are talking about Amendment 1. Amendment 1 would provide one-month's pay for state workers. My understanding is that the Governor vowed to appeal the ruling of the Appellate Court yesterday that said there can be no pay for state workers. So, I heard the Governor loud and clear. I heard the Governor say yes in spite of all those remarks that Lou Lang read to us, in spite of all of that, this Governor does want to make sure the state workforce gets its salary checks at the end of the week."

Tryon: "In all due respect..."

Currie: "So, that's all this Amendment does. And I..."

Tryon: "Okay."

Currie: "...as I would say, I think that it's very responsive to the Governor's public statements of late. Although, obviously, he's entitled to change his mind..."

Tryon: "My..."

Currie: "...20 times between today and the time that this Bill gets to his desk."

Tryon: "My... in all due respect, Ma'am... Leader, my question to you, when I work on a Bill with you, we sit down and we discuss it and we work together on it. And that's what's not happening here. You're not working with the Governor. We're running Governor's Bills for property tax freezes and things that are in his agenda without even having a conversation with him. How does that bring us closer together? And it's very... it's getting very frustrating to sit here and be lectured about the Minority is being financially

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

irresponsible. We are in the position we are today with a \$5 billion unpaid bills, a \$4 billion underfunded budget, not by the votes made by the Minority, but by the 12 years of financial irresponsibility of budgets that have been passed by this General Assembly. We want to work with you so that we can look out next year, the year after and somebody can finally see a vision for Illinois five years away. And that's what we're going to do if we're going to have a conversation about revenue, but that hasn't happened yet. And so, I'm being criticized because I'm not going to vote to fund a temporary budget. That temporary budget, when you make this vote, is going to cut funding for autism. It is not going to fund domestic violence. It's going to leave a lot of things that are in last year's budget unfunded for the next 30 days. All right. So, by... by me not voting to fund it, a temporary budget, how is that different than you not voting to fund the real budget, the \$36 billion budget that you funded? So, this is now getting to be more of a political statement from your side of the aisle to our side of the aisle and vice versa. But unless we're going to sit down and have a conversation in a bipartisan way, unless somebody that's going to run a Governor's Bill is going to talk to the Governor about his own Bill, that's not bipartisan."

Currie: "It would help if the Governor were here to talk about the budget. The Governor seems not interested in talking about the budget, but about items that are extraneous to the budget. And I appreciate your new-found enthusiasm for all the health and human service programs that we care about too, but my recollection is that you and all of your colleagues voted

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

'no' to a full-year budget that did include the autism project..."

Tryon: "Yeah. Well, it didn't have the money."

Currie: "...not just general services to the disabled. So, I'm pleased..."

Tryon: "Show us the money."

Currie: "...I'm pleased with..."

Tryon: "Show us the revenue."

Currie: "...this new commitment and we have many more weeks that we may end up spending together and maybe more of those programs will find their way rising to the fore as these programs have."

Tryon: "How can you call \$36 billion budget that's missing 4 billion..."

Currie: "This is not..."

Tryon: "...funding the social service programs?"

Currie: "Yes, we call it the Rauner budget."

Tryon: "Okay. You know what? I hope this works for you, but it's not working for the people in Illinois. I have people being laid off in my district because we can't have a conversation. And maybe if the Speaker can't work with the Governor and the Governor can't work with the Speaker, maybe we're going to have to do it ourselves. But this isn't the way to go about doing it. And you know what? Unless you're going to work in a bipartisan manner, unless you're going to reach out to our staff and work with us, then you're going to have to do it on your own. You have 71 votes. If you had 71 votes to make an expenditure side of the budget and you're not willing to work in a bipartisan basis, then get 71 votes to do a revenue side

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

to have a balanced budget. So, I'm... I'm not voting 'yes' on this because this isn't the right way to go about it. And if we're not going to work in a bipartisan vote manner you'll have to do this on yourself. Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Christian Mitchell."
- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A couple questions of the Sponsor?"
- Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
- Mitchell, C.: "Leader Currie, just a couple quick questions. I want to make sure I understand a couple points. All of the programs included in this essential services budget were fully funded in the budget that we sent to the Governor's desk, were they not?"
- Currie: "Actually, we're on Amendment 1, which is the proposal that will provide funding for our workers for the month of July."
- Mitchell, C.: "I understand, Leader. I just know these questions have been raised, so I'm just attempting to address them as well. And a couple speakers mentioned some services that they wanted to see funded either through this Amendment or through the underlying Bill. Are you aware of any separate 30-day Appropriations Bill that would fund domestic violence, breast cancer from our friends on the other side of the aisle?"
- Currie: "I haven't see one, but as they say, I think it's a discussion we can continue to have."
- Mitchell, C.: "And I think I..."
- Currie: "And I hope that we will."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Mitchell, C.: "...I think I would agree with that. And just one final question. It may seem extraneous; it'll make sense in my close. When we talk about this \$4 billion out of balance budget, did that also include the Appropriations Bills for education?"

Currie: "Of course."

Mitchell, C.: "So, to the Amendment and I think to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would take this Governor as being a man of his word. One of the things that the Governor talked about during his campaign was the need to fully fund, in fact, increase funding to our public schools, our K-12 education programs. And despite the fact that everyone on one side of the aisle, in fact, voted against that education Appropriations Bill, I do believe that the Governor signed that Bill. The Governor has now said that he is very serious about paying our public employees. So, what I might be worried about is I encourage all of you to support this Amendment that we're voting on is will you again find yourself strung out by the fact that the Governor signs the Bill that, in fact, funds critical services based on his own word. He's done it once before and I would caution my colleagues it may happen again. This is a good Bill that doesn't overstep our bounds, but in fact, makes sure that our state employees will be paid. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, I think we probably need to take a deep breath for just a second and realize that words do mean something. I don't think anyone on this side of the aisle is a minion. I don't think we're

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

morons. I wouldn't say that about that side of the aisle, never have, never would. Words have meaning. And it's unfortunate that we have stepped down to the point where we are degrading each other to that extent. As a matter of fact, I would say when comments like that are made on a one to one conversation or a man to man conversation, we're one man short. You don't do that. You don't do that. Especially when you had 12 years of an unbalanced budget. You know what, Speaker, that was done with the swipe of a pen. Twelve years and this Governor has said enough is enough. The simple truth is we're not going to live with a budget that's unbalanced. Now, I've heard the conversation and I understand the conversation and I understand the politics of both sides of the aisle. But I understand that this Governor wants a balanced budget, no more no less. I find it unfortunate that we have forgotten that this state has no money. That we are, to some extent, falling into the category of penniless. Now, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that we have revenues that come in every day and we're able to sustain some things, but we're not able to sustain everything. And we're not able to sustain the Bill or the Amendment to the Bill that we're discussing this afternoon. We are able to sustain Representative Davidsmeyer's Bill which he brought forward and I quess we're not going to take up. But it's a fatal deceit, Mr. Speaker, a fatal deceit to stand here and tell us that we can pass this Amendment to this Bill and survive normally with a balanced budget. Not going to happen today, not going to happen tomorrow, not going to happen next year unless the Democrats want to raise taxes and that's a distinct

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

possibility. I would simply... I would simply end by saying this. I would simply end by saying this. We are trying to do things differently. This Governor is trying to do things differently. And if it means some hard decisions, I think he's prepared to make them. If it means we step away from a bad Amendment to a Bill that we have today, I'm prepared to do that. But to use people as foils in this debate, it's wrong. Previous speakers have called you folks out and presented to you the areas where you didn't fund needed services. So, let's be honest with one another. Let's... let's not sit here and say that we're minions, that we're morons, that we're whatever ... enablers. We're State Representatives. we're here to balance the budget. We're Representatives that represent 108 thousand people just like everybody else does. But the derogatory tone today is not a good sign and as for those people who say we shouldn't be here this summer, I'm not sure we shouldn't be here all summer. This is a fatal deceit, make no mistake about it. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Keith Wheeler." Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Wheeler, K.: "Leader Currie, you know I'm a freshman. It's my first time through this budget process."

Currie: "Congratulations."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. I appreciate that. When I sat down in my first Appropriations Committee meeting, the veteran Members were kind enough to go through a little outline of the process that we should expect. I'm going to read it very briefly. I

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

was hoping it would start with a revenue estimate then we'd move on to things like expenditures and things that are above the line and below the line. And it sounded like an interesting and actually a pretty thoughtful appropriate process. But where I'm from, we talk about budgets. A budget has two sides. It has a revenue side, an expenditure side and we still don't, to my knowledge, have ever adopted a revenue estimate. Leader Currie, do you anticipate that we will at some point adopt a revenue estimate as a Body?"

Currie: "At what point?"

Wheeler, K.: "Do you anticipate that we will at any point actually adopt a revenue estimate?"

Currie: "I don't know whether that's going to happen or not."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I'm just going to go to the Bill then. On the first day, the first thing that we did here as a Body, when inaugurated and we stood up and we swore to uphold a Constitution of the State of Illinois. And part of that Constitution says that we are going to pass or we're not going to budget... appropriate any more funds than we actually have a revenue estimate for, we haven't had a revenue estimate yet. That's why I voted 'no' on everything we've done so far because we can't justify what we're doing as far as expenditures are concerned. I have a hard time looking at my kids and telling them that I'm doing my job voting to spend money that we haven't authorized that we actually have yet. So, I will continue to vote 'no' until we get the process right and we understand what we're really doing. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Verschoore."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Personal privilege. I very seldom get up, but I feel compelled to get up today. And I heard the other side of the aisle talk about how they're so concerned about our workers and having... having to be getting paid. I got a call from a maintenance worker today. And he said, you know, what's going to happen? I've got a couple little daughters and I don't know how I'm going to pay for it. And then, as your... the Republican side of the aisle said, we're concerned about our workers and the Governor's concerned about our workers. Well, I'm going to read something that was in the Capitol Fax today. Bruce Rauner's pension Bill. Public employers and labor organizations may not bargain over or no collective bargaining agreement enter into, renew or extend or after the effective date of the 99th General Assembly, that includes provisions related to the following prohibitive subject of bargaining. That means they can't even talk about it. Sounds just like Wisconsin, folks. A public employer and a labor organization may not bargain over these following issues: employees' pensions including the impact of implementation of changes to employees' pensions including the employees consideration pension program as set forth in Section 30 of the Personal Code; wages including any form of confers... compensation including salaries, overtime compensation, vacations, holidays, any fringe benefits including the impact of implementation of changes to the same except nothing in this Section 7.6 will prohibit the employer from electing to bargain collective or employer provided health insurance; hours of work including work, schedules, shift schedules, overtime hours,

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

compensa... compensatory time and lunch periods including the impact of implementation of change the same; matters of the employees tenure including the impact of employees tenure or time in service on the employers exercise of authority including but not limited to any consideration the employer may... or must give to the tenure of employees adversely affected by the employer exercise of management's right to conduct a layoff. Now, I ask you, does that sound like someone that's really interested in the ploy... the employees of the State of Illinois? Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Straightforward proposition: do you want to make sure that workers get their paychecks or July paycheck... paychecks? We are responsible for funding. Please vote 'yes' on Amendment 1."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves that the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2040. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 71 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', and 21 voting 'present', the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2040.

Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2040, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. To separate parts of the Bill: one would pay state workers for the month of July. And the second would see to it that community providers of critical services to fragile, vulnerable populations would not be lost in the mix. It seems to me that these are both very important goals. We all are workers, a day's wage for a day's work. And we also want to make sure that people who depend upon child care in order to get to the job on time, people with mental illness and developmental... developmental disabilities need to be able to get services provided in the community. Nutrition programs for low-income elderly, for women, infants and children. These are all at stake in this... in Senate Bill 2040. And while some would suggest the Governor would veto these critical services for a vulnerable populations, I've known this Governor to change his mind. And I can't believe that given a choice he would say no to children in need. He would say no to foster care. He would just say yes to workers. So, I think that this gives the Governor first, of course, the opportunity to fund only what he wants to fund for the coming month, but it gives him the opportunity to stand not only with the state workforce, but also with fragile populations who need our support if they're going to be able to make it through the day, make it through the week. A one-month funding plan gives us time to put our heads together, to behave like grownups, to be responsible for the budget for the full fiscal year. Nothing in Senate Bill 2040 would break the bank. Nothing would take us over a twelve-month spending plan that we cannot afford. So, there is no excuse, I would say, not to vote anything but

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

'yes' on the provisions of this measure. I would be happy to answer your questions. This Bill needs your support."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. There's been plenty of debate. There'll probably be more with respect to this spending plan... this 12-month spending plan. The language the Lady used to identify this is consistent with what was used by the Speaker and folks that passed the \$36 billion out of balance budget that spends 4 billion more than what we afford. My colleague in the front row here asked the Lady is there going to be a projection of state revenue. Well, COGFA did it. The Governor's budget... Office of Management and Budget did it, give or take, we're talking 32 billion will be expected in revenue now. And yet, we're going to continue to pretend that we've got 36 billion to spend. And what's slightly offensive is, the Gentleman from Skokie was commenting that the Governor could just wave an Amendatory Veto and fix all the problems we didn't properly address. That's not the Governor's real job. That's the Legislature's domain. We're supposed to appropriate. We're supposed to be responsible in the first instance and legitimately so with respect to spending the people's money. So, while the Lady talks about us coming together and getting the month to put out heads together, I would suggest we ought to be doing that now. I think the Gentleman from Homewood mentioned that. I think we ought to just stay here and start working on a budget one that spends 32 billion unless the folks that put votes on a \$36 billion budget want to fund that budget and actually put a tax ri... tax hike vote before the people. If you want to

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

vote... if you want everything in your budget, then fund it. Please fund it. Be responsible and fund it and quit asking the Governor to do your dirty work, our collective dirty work. We're either going to get to a budget or we're not. This does not do anything than provide for some at the expense of others. There will be fragile populations that do not get a nickel from this appropriation. There will be people in need, community service providers that get nothing from this. So, if this is some, hey, we're going to fund everybody. Let's be clear and let's be honest. It will not take care of everyone that's vulnerable. It just won't. Last comment, Mr. Speaker. There's been a lot of people saying let's get the adults in the room. Well, we're in the room. And so, let's be adults and let's start working on a legitimate budget that funds State Government. You want to pay employees; I want to pay employees. Everyone wants to pay employees. Well, we got to do it with real dollars, not imaginary dollars. We've been down that path for 12 consecutive years of overspending, overtaxing, borrowing, kicking the can down the road and the reckoning day is here and now. So, let's be adults. Let's put our heads together. Let's be responsible. Vote 'no' or vote 'present' on this irresponsible spending because it's a spending plan. It's not a budget. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates that she will."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

- Wheeler, B.: "Thank you. Leader, I know sincerely that you mean to fund the state workers and their pay. Am I... am I correct in that?"
- Currie: "Absolutely."
- Wheeler, B.: "I also know that this Bill is complicated with other spending that you recognize that we're not going to be voting for or will be voting 'present' on."
- Currie: "I find it impossible to believe that each and every one of you thinks that these fragile vul... vulnerable population should go without help during the month of July."
- Wheeler, B.: "I..."
- Currie: "I don't believe it and I think if you look at what we're talking about here developmentally disabled children, seniors who need nutrition support in order to survive, families that need child care in order to get to work. I find it very difficult to believe that in your heart you believe that state workers deserve pay, but these populations deserve nothing from the state."
- Wheeler, B.: "I think that's not correct to say that we think they deserve nothing is incorrect."
- Currie: "Well, I'm... I'm glad to hear that, Representative."
- Wheeler, B.: "And I think there's a lot of work that we need to do with these populations you... in the budget for the populations you just described. However, I'm listening to this debate especially through the Amendment. The one thing I know both Houses can... or both sides can agree on is the state workers need to be paid and not just for that month or 20 days or two and a half weeks or whatever the math becomes,

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

but continually. And I believe sincerely you agree with that.

Am I correct?"

Currie: "I believe that there ought to be limits on how much we pay state workers. I believe in the collective bargaining pro... program. And I believe that the Governor, the Executive, ought to have control over the size of the employee payroll. I believe that we should not say, by a virtue of a continuing uncapped appropriation, that the employee pay is whatever... whatever they're able to get someone to agree to because there are no limits under an approach that says we'll do a continuing appropriation without any kind of cap whatsoever. So, I think this... this Bill is a far more reasonable approach than what has been offered under other Bills that have been introduced in this Assembly."

Wheeler, B.: "So, I'm assuming you're referring to House Bill 4245?"

Currie: "I am."

Wheeler, B.: "Okay. So, that was going to be my next question. I'm not interested in calling it... the other side names. I'm not interested in doing a song and/or dance. Believe me, you don't want me to do either one of those. I'm not interested in making YouTube videos. I'm trying to find common ground and this is not going to be one of them. You're interested in your Bill and paying the state workers for approximately 16 days..."

Currie: "No, I'm sorry, 30 days. Let's be clear. It's oaky to say
I don't want to do your approach, but don't give me a reason
that is no reason whatsoever. It's a 30-day pay program..."

Wheeler, B.: "I get it."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

- Currie: "...and anybody who says it isn't is just throwing around red herrings..."
- Wheeler, B.: "Okay."
- Currie: "...smokescreens, it's not true. Thirty-day budget, 30 days."
- Wheeler, B.: "So... so, it's not repealed on August 1?"
- Currie: "It's a... it's backdated to July 1, so it's July 1 through July 31."
- Wheeler, B.: "Okay. All right."
- Currie: "And it doesn't matter whether the Governor gets it next week or..."
- Wheeler, B.: "My next question to you Leader was and you won't support 4245. You are basically the Rules Committee, so you will not let that... that House Bill out because you disagree with the way the state workers will be paid on a continual basis for 12 months."
- Currie: "Representative, the Rules Committee just got jurisdiction over House Bill 4245, lately filed as it was.

 The Rules Committee has not yet considered House Bill 4245.

 Before us is Senate Bill 2040..."
- Wheeler, B.: "Right. And I think everybody..."
- Currie: "...and I would encourage you..."
- Wheeler, B.: "...I think there were plenty of people that have correctly predicted what's going to happen. We're going to vote 'no' or we'll vote 'present' or we won't 'no vote' and it doesn't matter. It'll pass 71 votes... possibly with 71 votes and we're pretty sure the Governor is not going to like this Bill either."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Currie: "Well, remember the Governor has options with an Appropriation Bill. The Governor can like part of it and not like other parts. The Governor can say I'm standing with these but not with those. He's got a line item. He's got a reduction item Veto in his gubernatorial tool kit. So, when this Bill reaches the Governor's desk, should you be helpful in making sure that happens, the Governor has many options available to him."

Wheeler, B.: "Well..."

Currie: "It is not an all or nothing proposition."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you for that reminder. I was hoping to get a commitment from you if this Bill were to pass and go to the Governor's Office and it'd be vetoed. I was asking... was going to ask you to release 4245 out of Rules so we can also vote on that. And I'm going to assume I can't get your commitment on that?"

Currie: "certainly not."

Wheeler, B.: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. One of the earlier Representatives said he looked forward to the song and dance. I'm not going to give him a song and dance and in fact, I'm going to try to be as candid as I can in this. And I'll tell you, it's hard. This is a hard vote for me to take because the temptation is absolutely to say 'yes'. It is to say 'yes'. But the question I have to ask myself on that is isn't that the right que... the right vote. And I'll tell you what, in determining that, I have to look at will this move the ball forward? Will this get us to a full budget? And in

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

looking at the history of the last five or six months, 'cause that's all I have, I have seen that where we don't have budget pressures, where we don't have deadlines, nothing gets done. Nothing gets done and so, quite frankly, I think that the idea if you look at the history of that is that we won't make any progress, if we create a 30-day budget. I'm not going to argue about whether it's balanced or unbalanced. The point is, does that move us forward to a real full-year's budget? And I think the answer is no. It delays us. It delay us from that ... that full-year's budget. And in fact, I think by doing that what we're sending the message to the people, to the workers, that we all say we care about, is we are being cruel. We're being cruel to them because what we're saying is that there's hope. And the reality is we're just kicking the can down 30 days maybe only two weeks, as we heard earlier. And that's not right; that's cruel. Just like it's cruel to say that if the Governor had just exercised his Amendatory Veto then the gentleman in Effingham would be able to sleep at night. The gentleman with the 36 DON score could sleep at night. The truth is, is that they both can't. Maybe one of them can, maybe both of them can, but then other people can't because, you know what, we overpromised... rather overpromised by \$4 billion. You overpromised. And so, to tell people, go ahead sleep at night because we passed a budget that addresses your particular concern, legitimate concerns, when we're \$4 billion out of balance, that's cruel. So, instead what I would suggest is instead of trying to meet down here weekly and pass these short-term fixes that just kick the can down the road, how about we do some real

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

negotiations? I... and in those negotiations, you have a lot of power. You have a supermajority. You have a veto-proof Majority. So... but there's one power you don't have and that power is to tell us what we're supposed to negotiate around. You may or may not agree with us, but our belief is that the nonbudgetary items have an impact on the budget. Virtually all actions we take have an impact on the budget. And so, part of the negotiations with our side needs to include those items. Now, if you don't want to, that's fine. That's okay. You've got your supermajority. So, vote your budget, vote your tax increase and then prepare to override a Veto and then own that. But if you do want to negotiate with us, then let's sit down and if the Leadership can't do that, then, like some of the other speakers said, then let's do it here. Let's restart the... the working groups. Let's actually dig down into the weeds and let's resolve it on a line item by line item basis, where we prioritize... where we prioritize our budget 'cause we can't have it all. We know that. So, with that, as much as the temptation is to vote 'yes', I must vote 'no'. And I hope that if it passes or if it doesn't that we can get to the real negotiation and not this level. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to request a verification if this receives the requisite number of votes."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Demmer. Chair recognizes Representative Martwick."

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

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Martwick: "Leader, I have a... just a couple of questions for you.

I... I sat and listened to the debate on the Amendment and I've been listening here. There have been a number of things that have been said. And there was something that was said by one of our colleagues that words mean something. And I... I agree words mean something. And so, I want to talk about some words with you, if that's okay."

Currie: "How about persnickety?"

Martwick: "Yeah. I'm not going to start with that one. I'm going to start with one that's been used a lot lately, constitutional. Constitutional. Now, you've been here a little bit longer than I have and I certainly don't presume to be a constitutional expert, but I have a couple of ideas and I'm wondering if you could maybe help me. My understanding of constitutionality is that it's sort of a threshold question. Meaning things either are constitutional or they're not constitutional. Would you agree with that?"

Currie: "Yes."

Martwick: "So, the idea that something could be kind of constitutional that doesn't really fly or sort of constitutional. That really doesn't work, does it?"

Currie: "Right."

Martwick: "So, we heard so much about how we passed this unconstitutional and irresponsible budget, but the Governor signed a portion of it. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Martwick: "So, did he... did he then sign an unconstitutional portion of our budget or I could see they're all

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

constitutional. Or does he... does the power that's granted to the Governor and you spoke that you knew a little bit about his tool box, does he have the power to unilaterally decide what is constitutional and what is not?"

Currie: "No."

Martwick: "Okay. 'Cause it would appear that that's what he's done and it would appear that that's what many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have done. They've said we've decided what is and what is not constitutional and yet it doesn't match up. And I'm a little perplexed by that. So, another thing that was said was we... you can't spend money you don't have. And that's a pretty basic precept. But they talk about a Bill that another Representative filed that would create a continuing appropriation for workers' salaries. Would that be... if your Bill here is spending money that we don't have, is their Bill somehow different or is that also spending money that we don't have?"

Currie: "Well, I would say unlike my Bill, their Bill would spend money that we do not have."

Martwick: "Because your Bill leaves open the possibility... the possibility that there may actually be some resolution while their Bill, on its face, presumes that there never will be?"

Currie: "And even if you extrapolated this Bill, Senate Bill 2040, by 12 months, you would not be beyond appropriate revenues. This Bill does not fund all State Government for one month. It funds workers' salaries and it fund... it funds emergency critical essential services for some, but not all state populations."

Martwick: "Thank you."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Currie: "So, it's not one-twelfth of state funding in the la... spending in the last fiscal year nor the year before."

Martwick: "In... in fact that's been pointed out by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that there are many sensitive programs that I would prefer to fund that are not in here. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

"So, to the Bill. Words do mean something. And there's Martwick: been much talk and... and I'm encouraged by some of my colleagues who have chosen to ... some of the recent speakers who stood up and really chosen to speak frankly and honestly because that is clearly something that I think all of us can agree has been lacking. So, to those of you who have spoken frankly and honestly and without all of the political double talk on both sides of the aisle, I commend you for it because I think that's a step in the right direction. I'm going to do a little bit of that myself right now because I want to talk about some of the words that have been mentioned. What's been mentioned is, is that a word that keeps popping up and I heard this... if you care. If you care. Now, these are three words that I find fascinating because what do they mean? If you care. We have seen a parade of witnesses come here and testify. People with disabilities, people who are in need of services and we have constantly heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we care about you. We want to provide services to you, but we can't because the Democrats passed an unconstitutional, irresponsible, unbalanced budget. See, it's not rocket science, folks. This isn't the Federal Government. We don't get to print money, manipulate interest

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

rates, do creative bond back... buyback programs. It's really money in, money out. And it's been mentioned many times, we don't have the revenue unless Democrats raise taxes. That's not right, folks. We don't have the revenue unless this Body raises taxes. Unless this Body chooses to do the revenue. See, if you refuse the revenue, if you refuse the revenue, if you put that on us and we all know you can talk about the 71 votes, but the reality of the situation is, there's not a Republican on that side of the aisle that'll vote for a tax increase and we all know there isn't a Republican on this side of the aisle that will vote for it either. So, if you care, if you care about people with disabilities, if you care about people who have disabilities that need paratransit services, you cannot fund them at zero and say you care about them. We have a simple issue, folks. We either raise the revenue to spend for the services we care about, the services that we need or we don't. But all I ask is this, in the spirit of being honest, which is what we're doing ... see, I'm doing something that is honest. Okay? I'm doing something that ... that I think is probably not very wise politically. I'm saying as much as I'd not like to do it, I will not vote to get rid of those services. So, yes, I will vote to raise revenue. You can put it on the mailers. Not smart politically, but I'll be honest about it. If you won't vote to raise revenue, then be honest about it. Don't tell these people that you care about them. Tell them you feel bad, tell them you're sorry, but tell them that you'll refuse to raise the money to fund their services. Be honest."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
- Davidsmeyer: "Could you give me a little time line on the Amendment that was added to this Bill, please?"
- Currie: "Yes. This is a one-month funding for personnel services throughout State Government."
- Davidsmeyer: "Not... not a definition. The time line of the filing of this Amendment."
- Currie: "This Amendment was filed this afternoon, a few hours ago."
- Davidsmeyer: "About two hours ago this was filed. And when we... somebody mentioned my Bill, House Bill 4245, you made it a point to say, well, it hadn't been to Rules yet and it hadn't done this or done that. It's amazing how quickly this can come through to land on a Bill that is ultimately going to be vetoed. And the reality is, the Governor doesn't even have to veto it. It if makes it past August 1, it's repealed anyway. Right? Am I correct in that statement?"
- Currie: "Wait, say that again."
- Davidsmeyer: "If the Governor does not sign this before August 1, it is automatically repealed anyway, if he signs it after the first of August because of the repeal date?"
- Currie: "No, I think that's incorrect. But let me just doublecheck with staff. Yeah. Well, so he better hurry."
- Davidsmeyer: "Yes. So... so, it will be repealed on August 1, if he doesn't sign it. And he said he will not sign it."
- Currie: "Well, wait a minute..."
- Davidsmeyer: "In fact, he said he'll veto it."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Currie: "...if the Governor... Sorry, sorry. First of all... first of all, although the Governor's been quoted in the press, we know he's been quoted on six ways to Sunday, three sides of the same issue depending on whether it's Monday, Wednesday, or Friday. The Governor has said he wanted to appeal the court ruling that said that we can't pay state workers. Well, if that's what he'd like to do, why not give him the opportunity simply to sign a Bill that will pay the state workers during the month of July. If he doesn't care about vulnerable populations like the developmentally disabled, the mentally ill, children in need of nutritional services, child care programs, if doesn't care about that, he can veto that out of this Bill. So, there are options that the Governor has, if this Bill should arrive on his desk. And it seems to be fair for us to give him these options. I care about state workers. And I care about those vulnerable populations and I'm hopeful that by the time the Governor gets this Bill, he will care enough about both sides of the equation, the people that depend upon state services as well as those who are providing state services to make sure that he signs the Bill. That's not a very tough request and it is certainly fair to say that even if this were the budget 12 times, if this were the budget and times it by 12, that you're not out of whack the way the Rauner proposed budget was when we heard about it in the early part of the spring. So, I don't see why the Governor wouldn't welcome the opportunity to sign this Bill and in terms of our experience in the past, short-term funding has often been the way to start a serious adult conversation about a full budget for a full fiscal year."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

- Davidsmeyer: "Well, the Governor has stated that he will veto this Bill. I know that you haven't had those conversations, but that's the way negotiations generally work. You have those conversations with the other side to make sure it has a chance to survive. Do you know what negotiations and compromise are?"
- Currie: "Yeah, I do and just to remind you, the Governor said he wasn't going to sign the Education Bill, the Elementary and Secondary funding Bill, which the Governor then signed. So, as I say, I don't know that you can assume that what he said on Tuesday is the way he will behave the following Tuesday when the measure is actually on his desk."
- Davidsmeyer: "We've... we've clarified. He will veto this Bill, so if you think that you're going to pay state workers with this Bill, it's not. It's going to be in limbo. We have an opportunity with House Bill 4245... You know, I'm just saying. Let's... let's pass them both. If you really care about state workers getting paid, let's... let's do it."
- Currie: "And I want to protect the Governor from a budget proposal that is so out of whack that it takes away his authority collectively to bargain with state employees. So, I think that the other proposal..."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you..."

- Currie: "...you reference is fatally flawed in terms of both the Governor's willingness to sign something that he believes is out of whack, out of balance and it curtails the Executive Authority in ways that I can't believe that people like you would generally support."
- Davidsmeyer: "So... so, am I correct to say that earlier you were concerned that this... the Governor wanted to cut so much and

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

do all this stuff and now you're concerned that the Governor's going to overspend this line item?"

Currie: "I think the Governor doesn't understand what your Bill would mean to his position in collective bargaining negotiations."

Davidsmeyer: "You're saying he doesn't understand?"

Currie: "I think it's scary."

Davidsmeyer: "You're saying he doesn't understand. Okay. Do you know when my Bill, House Bill 4245 was filed?"

Currie: "No."

Davidsmeyer: "It was filed over 24 hours ago and I can't get heard. I can't get it heard. So, I ask you to join me in bringing that Bill up because this Bill will die. This Bill is going to be vetoed, so you're pretending like you're going to help fund state employee services, but you're not. You're not. We need to come together and compromise. And to some of the prior speakers, when you talk about compromise, compromise is you give a little, I give a little and we come together. It's not tax increase or cut everything. It's somewhere in the middle. And I think... I think people are willing to discuss that. People are showing their willingness to discuss that, but you guys aren't willing to do that. So, we're going to come out of this today without a budget. We're going to come out with a short-term budget that actually is probably going to expire before the Governor has a chance to act on it and we're going to be no better off. We're going to leave everybody, all of these people, in limbo because you're going to pretend like we passed something that's going to go into law. It is not going to go into law. So, I urge a 'no'

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

vote on this, so we can talk about a real budget, about really funding the programs that we care about, funding the state employees that we care about that do all the work, because they are my friends and they are my neighbors. So, people that are talking about these state employees like they're just people out there, they're my friends and my neighbors. They are my friends and my neighbors. So, we are talking about real people. All these… all these services. We're talking about real people. So, the sooner we get to a real budget, the sooner we can actually get something accomplished and provide services for the people that are in need, provide state employee pay checks. So, the reality is, this is just going to delay our budget. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. And with all respect to everybody that has spoken today, I just want to briefly touch on the taxpayers of Illinois, who are sick and tired of the status quo in the State of Illinois and especially, tired of the partisan tug of war that we've been seeing in the last couple of months. What they're really concerned about is the fiscal crisis in Illinois and all facts point to that. We've been downgraded 22 times over the last several years. We have the second highest outward migration of any state in the United States. We've had hundreds of thousands of jobs that have left Illinois including 11 thousand manufacturing just last year. They saw an income tax increase a couple of years ago and mention of reform of what was going to happen in the State of Illinois. In that last four years, there has been no reform and now we're at an

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

impasse on a budget again. No real reforms and still we had the Pew Foundation come out and say that Illinois had the second highest revenue of any state in the United States outside of North Dakota, but still we had the Mercatus Policy Institute just last week say Illinois was No. 50... No. 50, dead last in financial outlook of any state in the United States. This is a problem that the taxpayers are sick and tired of. Okay so, now we have a monthly budget in front of us but still no talk of a real balanced budget in a bipartisan way. So, how does that look to the taxpayers of Illinois? Six billion dollars still of unpaid bills and we have no balanced budget to pay those. We talk about the providers, \$6 billion for the providers and we have no way to pay them yet. And yet we're still talking about a one-month Bill. Most of all, we're talking about the most important, most fragile population in Illinois and a no balanced budget to pay those providers for more than just talk of one month for those people. And in this budget that does not even take care of a lot of groups that we care about: autism, domestic violence, Intervention, child care. There are a lot of things that are not in this budget that got left out. So, you know a balanced budget is what we have to accomplish in a partisan way. And this is the most important discussion that needs to follow the vote on this Bill because that's what the real taxpayers care about and staying in Illinois to stop that outward migration to respect the state that we know as one of the finest states in the United States and the people that live in it. And I ask all of you to work together that we go forward with a balanced budget, not a spending plan that's \$4

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

billion over. We need to come together, discuss this, and move on so our state can be proud of what we're doing down here."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I was referred to before I'm not sure it could have been somebody else. But listen, I pride myself on being independent, being fiscally conservative. I can also see the validity, I think, as a result of my friends on the other side of the aisle feeling though they're not getting anything more than lip service. But I also can tell you that many of my friends on this side of the aisle feel the same way because their core beliefs are very different than some on the other side. The stand-off that we're having today I think is a natural result of the unavoidable contradiction between those that believe the state needs more revenue than the current law provides and unfortunately, the state has proven to be a terrible manager of the tax dollars. I mean, that's where we find ourselves. And many of us have been fighting unnecessary spending. And so, I think we need to do some of this. I'm against the tax hike, very clear on that. That's one of the reasons why I like this Bill. I voted for it last week and I explained at that time that I stand with the people with the faintest voices. I'm not going to get into those reasons again today. But what this Bill is simply is a 30-day breather. That's all. This will not require a tax hike. This Bill will not require more revenue than we already have. Let's be very clear on that. Now, yesterday, the courts required that Medicaid must be paid, which if you look at the underlying Bill, that's

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

about two-thirds of this Bill. So, we're really talking about funding only about \$700 million at a time when we have approximately \$32 billion in revenue. Let's also acknowledge that the Bill... that the budget that was passed here was out of balance, that it was about \$4 billion underfunded. Well, let's also acknowledge that the Governor's budget was also out of balance and would have required more revenue for it to work. So, let's just... it's stating the fact; let's be honest about where we are. So, the fairest way to resolve this, I believe, is to open up some breathing room for caller... for cooler heads to prevail. And we ought to be talking about shared sacrifice. We ought to be talking about compromise. And we also ought to be talking about priorities. Now, the Democrats, my friends on this side of the aisle are going to need to accept that there's going to be some spending cuts and acknowledge that beyond doing so rhetorically. And my friends on the other side of the aisle we're going to have buck their base too and agree to revenue. Now, unlike some, I do not think that a tax hike is necessary to increase revenue. And I've identified... we worked last... many of us worked together bipartisanly last year talking about tax policies in this state. We had working groups and we came forward with a bunch of ideas and I pulled those out this morning. So, I've identified one and a half billion dollars in tax loopholes which benefit a small subset of corporations that could be eliminated in a budget package with spending reductions. I'd like to share some of those with you, but also, I want to call on my friends on the other side of the aisle to also identify specific line items to cut. Understand

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

that 'cause I know you don't want to have a tax increase; I don't want to have a tax increase. So, it falls on us to find revenue and also cuts. So, I want to discuss these things. talk about corporate loopholes some approximately \$320 million right off the top. We also have streamlining... we look at the vendor discount system. Right now, Illinois has a vendor collection allowance of 1.75 percent for companies that remit their sale taxes on time. If we did it like Indiana does, like what many people hold often to be the paragon of virtue when it comes to State Government... if we did the same remittance rate as Indiana, the state would save \$90 million annually and local governments would gain \$57 million annually. All right. So, that's one thing we ought to be doing. We also give discounts for other collections on taxes and instead of doing those discounts, perhaps we ought to look at penalties if they're late. Because right now we're paying the state... right now, if we eliminated this, we'd save \$47.75 million on collection on motor fuel tax, cigarette tax, telecommunication tax, liquor tax, hotel occupation use tax, underground storage tax, gas use tax. That's a lot of money. You look at the E10 exemption right now that we're giving. That is \$500 million over five years. It'd be a hundred million dollars annualized. Also, can somebody please explain to me why we're giving newspapers \$32 million a year in tax breaks so they can buy ink? This is a... this is not a nascent industry. This has been around for hundreds of years and you don't think that they would need to continued propping up in tax breaks to keep in business. That's \$32 million a year. We have offshore continental shelf. We're giving tax

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

breaks for those that are offshore drilling and that costs almost \$25 million a year to the state. You look at DCEO, a Bill that the Governor's probably going to veto that we passed a couple weeks ago, I think we ought to zero them out. That's \$45.4 million just in GRF and \$717 million in Other State Funds. Adding those very easy solutions together approximately \$1.5 billion. Now, last year, we also talked about getting rid of the private lottery manager. We were successful in doing that. If we ran the Lottery like other successful states do, such as Georgia and Massachusetts, we'd increase our revenues by approximately \$1 billion. So, these solutions that I'm bringing forward to you today will account for about \$2 and a half billion. Think about that, folks. I'm putting onus on the other side as well. We need to take this back. We need to come up with a solution, get past the rhetoric, work together to make the solution. The Governor said today... or yesterday that the budget is not dependent on advancing his pension proposal. Now, the pension proposal is the 800 pound gorilla in the room. Our pension deficit is extraordinary and one that needs to be addressed. But if the Governor doesn't think that the pension needs to be addressed before we go to the budget, then perhaps he's willing to give on a few other things. But having said that, I think that we ought to bring forward some of his ideas and I think we should have those up and down votes and I agree with him. This Bill will pass today, folks. And there's been a lot of machinations trying to explain why it shouldn't like not everything's in the budget there and you know, certain folks aren't going to get their money. Well, that's because the other budget wasn't

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

amendatorily vetoed. All right. Let's understand that. Let's not make the perfect the enemy of the good. I'm going to call on the Governor not to veto this Bill. Show good faith. Show that you're willing to work with us. That you will listen to some of these ideas. Let's get some breathing room. Let's have some shared sacrifices, let's have some compromise. Let's go forward on our priorities. Let's not have a default position necessarily of a tax hike. It's not something I think we need, something I don't think we need. But I think we can get the additional revenue if we work together. So, Governor, please, I understand you said that you want to veto this. I'd ask for you to look into your heart so that people with the faintest voices, those that can least afford it will not be harmed. I'm encouraging all my... I'm encouraging everyone to vote 'yes'. And those on the other side of the aisle, think about this. This is going to pass. Do the right thing. Please encourage the Governor not to veto this and I think it'll give us the time that we need to work together on compromise."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill and to the previous speaker. Thank you for defining yourself as a true fiscal hawk. It's always good to hear that and I'm sure that your vote in the next few minutes will be consistent with it. Thank you, Sir. I'm not going to mention your name 'cause I think I've heard enough of you today so. But let me just start here. I do care. My colleagues care. And I believe to truly care about our citizens is by being truthful and being honest about how we conduct our business and also telling them what Illinois can provide for them through our revenues. Last May

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

when we passed ... you passed that budget, the one which will go down in history and for years to come that \$4 billion unbalanced budget. I saw the press releases. We had been able to pass this, my friends on the Democrat side of the oil... on the Democratic side of the aisle, we passed a budget which is going to provide and cover those basic services that you've relied upon for so many years. To me, that's dishonest. That's a cruel hoax that you've perpetrated upon Illinoisans by not delivering the other part of it. That's the revenue side of it. You can't do that, folks. It's unfair. I've been listening to this ... all of us for the last hour over this and to me it's just fascinating to believe and that for somehow for some people to think that you have the moral or intellectual high ground on this budget process. Good God, it's laughable. It's worse than that. It is unadulterated BS of what you've done to this state year in and year out for the past 12 years. Never mind that you ripped off from the pension funds... shortchanged the pension funds, used a lot of accounting gimmicks to try to say that we balanced the budget. That's why we have record deficits that we have people ... why we have people and families and businesses running from the state. It's not because of this side of the aisle. It's because of you and a Democratic Governor for the past 12 years. Well, folks, the jig is up. That's why we're not going to be able to... you know, today you'll pass your Bill. It will not be signed into law. And we'll be back at square one. But there's an old expression. It's called you can run, but you can't hide. Keep running, folks. You're not going to be able to

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

hide what you've done, not only over the last two months, but over the last 12 years."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. One of the previous speakers from that side indicated that the budget that we're talking about or the spending plan that we're talking about leaves a lot of things out. Okay. Let's go back to February of 2015 where we heard an address by the Governor, whose budget address left out the community care program. It left out DCFS services for youth age 18 to 21. It left out funding for the division of alcohol and substance abuse. It left out funding for the division of mental health. It left out funding for the division of developmental disabilities. It left out funding for division of family and community services. By doing that, programs like the Autism Project, homeless youth services, teen reach and supportive housing, all of those things would have been left out. So, I think we need to take this conversation back because if we focus on the Governor's budget and I can only assume that as bad as you've talked about the budget that the Democrats passed, that apparently you love the Governor's budget despite the things that his budget left out. So, this brings us to kind of where we are now, the FY16 budget that the Democrats passed that all of you have said a lot of things about. It's out of balance. Whatever the case may be. But we've also heard that the Governor's introduced budget was also out of balance. Essentially, both budgets call for the need for revenue, something that I often talk about, others on this side have talked about the need for revenue. And I think probably what

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

dismays me more about that conversation is that while we can't admit it here, but when we talk, walking through the halls, in each other's offices, places like that, guess what, we hear from your side that, yeah, we need some revenue. We can't do this without revenue. So, why don't we bring those conversations to the light? Why don't we take those conversations out of the dark places, out of just casual conversation in the hallway and bring it to the floor and have a conversation about the need for revenue? So, as the previous speaker said, this budget or spending plan leaves things out, so we don't leave things out. Let's talk about the need for money to fund vital services, whether it's a 30month... a 30-day budget or not, there is a need for us to have a conversation about revenue. So, for those of you who will quietly say, yeah, we need to have revenue. Let's stop being quiet about it. Let's stop being quiet about the need that we... the desire that we need money to fund vital services here in the State of Illinois. That's the conversation that we need to be having. One of the previous speakers talked about getting together, working together to put together a budget that involves both spending, that involves cuts where we can agree them, but it also has to include revenue, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let's not forget that part of the conversation. If we can have a conversation about revenue, then we can indeed determine the budaet that's necessary that bipartisanly put on the Governor's desk and dare him to veto it because we've worked together on it. Now, if he vetoes that budget, that means he doesn't care about this side of the aisle, which I can understand, but that also means he

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

doesn't even care about his side of the aisle. So, let's be real about what's necessary here. Yes, this is a temporary conversation that we're having to get us through the remainder of the month of July. I get that. I can also appreciate, as the previous speakers have talked about, the need to have a long-term conversation about where we go for the remainder of the fiscal year. Yes, we passed a budget that you've criticized for being \$4 billion overspending. That's fine. But recognize that it puts back in the budget the things that the Governor left out. And as the Leader said that he cares, well, if he really cares, then that's the conversation that he would agree that we all should be having so that we can put that bipartisan budget on the Governor's desk and stop trying to get through with short-term fixes. I'm with you. Let's get together, talk about revenue, talk about spending, put that budget together and put it on the Governor's desk. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, like many in this chamber, as we go around our districts, and we come back to Springfield week after week, constituents are frustrated. They're frustrated because when we come to the floor of this hallowed chamber progress towards an actual budget is not only not in the cards, it's not addressed in any way. It's this weekly clown show that is gotcha politics. And it's about mailers. I suggest when we come back next Tuesday or whenever it is we look the doorman square in the eye and we tell him to lock the door behind us. And we tell our families that we won't be home next week or the week after

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

that or on Labor Day or on Thanksqiving, if necessary, because this is ridiculous day after day after day after day. We're no closer to a budget today than we were when the regular Session adjourned. I think there are four or five of us in this chamber... maybe five or six that were mayors of our community and even from a public sector perspective of having the buck stop with us, personally. I've had the privilege of balancing eight budgets. It was not negotiable. Good people debated what the priorities were, but the notion that we were going to spend more money than we took in was off the table, from the beginning of the discussion until the end, simple as that. Because that's how adults act. That's how all of our constituents balance their own checkbook. That's how any organization, public or private, keeps its doors open. It's how any business, small or large, runs. So, I say starting next week, let's lock the doors and let's get to work."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. Simply rise in support of the legislation. And just wanted to come back to a couple of the basic facts that are out there. We do have a court decision. The court decision is very, very clear. Ninety-seven percent of the employees of the State of Illinois will not get paid. They will not have a paycheck. They will not have the money to make their rent, buy for their kids, put food on the table and it may continue on. We're talking about a one-month fix where the Governor had options with a lot of the budget Bills, the 27 budget Bills that went to him, he could have signed the budget Bills that are no GRF. All of those people would have been out of the way of collateral damage. He could have

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

zeroed out everything in there except personal services lines. That's another choice that when we have the hearings in the House we talked to Tim Nuding and he said they considered, but they chose not to do. Those are the words of the budget director. We considered those actions. We told him he could have proposed personal services budget. He chose not to do that. So, we're faced with people who are looking and from what I understand, the bills and the checks are being processed today. Today, tomorrow and the next day. Some of the employees are being paid for work done between the 15th and the 30th and the others are not in that time slot, they will not be receiving any money. This job and our chamber is responsible for creating budgets to keep State Government operating. This does not fund all portions, but it takes essential services... the Majority Leader laid out those programs. Are there others we would like to see? Yes. Are there others that the Governor could have signed, which dealt with federal money or nonappropriated items? Yes. He chose not to do that. What you have before you today is a one-month action which will allow our employees to be paid. Don't worry about the court's decisions, they have no impact. This is an actual personal services budget. It's essential services and it will allow us to go forward, as other Governors have done, when we have hit budget impasses. And this has happened over decades with every Governor and every the past two administration. This is a stopgap measure. It ensures the people get paid. They can put food on their table while we go ahead and try to figure out a budget that works for a 12month period. Our budget lacked revenue; the Governor's

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

budget lacked just as much revenue. A difference of a few hundred million dollars on the basis of a 34, 35 billion dollar budget. So, let's pass this. Next week the Senate can send it on to the Governor. I hope that he signs it. And therefore, those thousands of state employees, which were directly affected by a court opinion which you can read, it's out there and it is very clear, will get paid and they will not become collateral damage of a fight that we're having here. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I heard a lot coming from the enablers regarding... regarding the fact that the Governor won't sign this Bill. So, what. I mean, we want him to sign the Bill, but our responsibility's to do legislative work. The Governor's in the Executive Branch. He's not even on this floor. He's one floor below us with all those lawyers that haven't taught him how to do an Amendatory Veto or a reduction Veto. We have our own separate responsibility under the Constitution of the State of Illinois, our own separate responsibility. Do you check with the Governor every time you have a Bill to see if he's going to sign it before you run it? I doubt it. I don't. Even if he would talk to me, I don't. So, the ... the notion that we're going to give up our responsibilities to the Executive Branch of government violates our oath of office. The Constitution talks about the separation of powers, so be it. We are a separate branch of government and a separate chamber within the Legislative Branch. We have responsibilities. We should fulfill those responsibilities. So, to say you're not going

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

to vote for this because you think the Governor will veto it is an abdication of your responsibility. Especially, in light of recent history. Some weeks ago the Governor went to the enablers caucus and he said, don't want you to vote for any of the budget Bills especially the Education Bill. And so, in the House and in the Senate, everyone voted 'no' except one brave soul in the Senate who voted 'present'. And then, after he made you all vote 'no' because you abdicated your responsibilities to the Governor, he signed the Bill. And none of you felt like you were thrown under the bus and it was all okay with you and whatever he says is fine. Well, then, maybe we don't need you here. Why don't we fill those seats with 47 pictures of Bruce Rauner and let him decide for all of you how you're going to vote on every Bill. Of course you would not agree to that, but then why do you agree that we should not vote for something simply because the Governor's opposed to it. That's not reasonable. It's not rational. If you want to vote for or against this Bill on its merits, do so. If you don't think state pakers... state workers should be paid for this month, even though you have your own Bill to do that, then don't vote for it. If you don't think that the most vulnerable in Illinois should have a break for the next 30 days while we try to get a budget together and try to get reasonable people to a table... if there are... still are any reasonable people in this building. If you don't think we should do that, then vote 'no'. But don't use the Governor as an excuse. Don't use him as an excuse. Stand up, as Mr. Martwick said, stand up and be honest. Stand up and be counted. You want to be 'yes', be 'yes' because you think

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

it's the right thing to do. You want to be 'no', be 'no' because you think it's the right thing to do, not the guy on the second floor. Not the guy my friends the enablers who threw you all under the bus. He doesn't care what you think. You're going to be embarrassed. He vetoed a Bill that... he signed a Bill that he told you to vote against and you all like lemmings went ahead and voted against the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have our own responsibility. There's something called the Constitution of the State of Illinois. Live with it, breathe with it, follow it and then vote your conscience. That's what we're here for. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the Body for adding all of the information today and of course, Leader Currie doing the very best that she can as a champion to try to push us forward. So, we need a budget. Well, I thought I would say, budget, budget. We need a budget now. Madigan and Cullerton, Radogno and Durkin, we need a budget now. We need a budget now. Budget's on the table. Veto line item, hot issue for us. Veto line item, hot issue for us. Advocates on the sideline cheering us to victory. They are asking only for a compromise. Rauner we're asking only for a compromise."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is no possible way I'm going to follow that. So, I'd like to yield my time to Representative Sandack."

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

"Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to follow Representative Golar's wonderful singing voice. I'm not going to sing, but I am going to speak to the Gentleman from Skokie, who has become really very offensive with lemmings and enablers, minions. Those are really inappropriate terms for this process and it's beneath him and this chamber to continue to do that. Had I wished to engage in a name-calling debate with the Gentleman, I would be limitless in my ability to categorize his votes over the umpteen years that has brought this state to its state of fiscal nightmare? The Gentleman forgets why we're here. We sit with a \$4 billion unbalanced budget. A mere pittance compared to the \$111 billion unfunded pension liabilities. A mere pittance compared to the \$5 billion in unpaid vendor bills. A mere pittance compared to the out migration that we seem to want to continue to move. If we care about taxpayers, we would spend less time labeling colleagues as minions, enablers, and lemmings and spend more actually coming up constructive time with responsible solutions. I challenge the Gentleman to use his time constructively. I challenge the Gentleman to engage in legitimate collegiately and conciliatory language towards bipartisanship. It must be fun having the Majority and wagging your finger dismissibly and say, you're not with us, so you're bad people. That is hardly parliamentary procedure worthy of

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

this august chamber. Let's raise our game. Let's do better than call names. Let's act constructively. Mr. Representative, Leader from Skokie, I challenge you to actually work with us and this Governor. It's fun pointing fingers and yelling and screaming and calling us names, but it gives us no relief and does not move the needle one iota. We can and should expect better. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. We've had a forthright and a lengthy discussion. I think the issue is clear. You either are prepared today to make sure workers get their paychecks during the month of July or you're not. You're prepared today to say that vulnerable, fragile populations will continue to get community-based services or you're not. Whether or not the Governor signs the Bill, our job is to go ahead and give him the opportunity. We know that Governors sometimes say one thing and then they do another. I would hope that if we pass this Bill that we will all encourage the Governor to do the right thing and sign it in its entirety. But as you know, he has options available to him with an Appropriations Bill. If there's some portion of the Bill he wants to sign and not others, he has that option too. So, I urge your 'aye' vote. Let's keep the lights on for the next month. Let's keep state workers with paychecks in their hands and vulnerable people with the services they need to survive. I urge your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, Representative Demmer has requested a verification. All Members are asked to be at their seats and vote their switch. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2040

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 71 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no' and 13 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2040, having received the Constitutional Majority... Representative Demmer, would you like to proceed with your verification? Mr. Clerk, please read the names of the affirmative votes."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Representative Acevedo; Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Bradley; Representative Burke, D.; Representative Burke, K.; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Cloonen; Representative Conroy; Representative Costello; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis, M.; Representative Davis, Representative DeLuca; Representative Drury; Representative Dunkin; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Franks; Representative Gabel; Representative Golar; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Harris, Hoffman; Representative Hernandez; Representative Representative Hurley; Representative Jackson; Representative Jones; Representative Kifowit; Representative Representative Lilly; Representative Manley; Martwick; Representative Representative Mautino;

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Representative Mayfield; Representative McAsey; Mitchell, C.; Representative Representative Moeller; Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman; Nekritz; Representative Representative Phelps; Representative Reaves-Harris."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk. Representative Demmer, would you like to proceed?"

Demmer: "Withdraw my verification."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Please withdraw the verification. On a count of 71 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no', 13 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2040, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order. Pursuant to House Rules, I move the discharge of House Bill 4245 from the House Rules Committee. Under House Rule 54(a)(2), all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of the debate, I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Rule 49 and Article IV Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be a recorded vote whenever five Representatives shall so request. There are at least five Members on my side that wish for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge House Bill 4245 from the House Rules Committee that will continue to pay state workers unlike that Bill that was just passed that will not be signed by the Governor. And after your response, I request to be... have the opportunity to speak following your response."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

- Speaker Turner: "Representative, your Motion is out of order.

 Rule 18(g) provides the method for discharging a Bill from
 the Rules Committee. The Motion does not comply with the Rule
 and therefore, is out of order. Representative Davidsmeyer."
- Davidsmeyer: "Could... could you please explain why it does not comply?"
- Speaker Turner: "Rule 18(g) provides the method for discharging a Bill from the Rules Committee. Your Motion does not comply with the Rule and therefore, is out of order."
- Davidsmeyer: "What... what portion of the Rule does it not comply with?"
- Speaker Turner: "The entire Rule. Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."
- Sandack: "Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a point of order. Pursuant to House Rules, I move for discharge of House Bill 4225 from the House Rules Committee. And under Rule 54(a)((2), all Motions assigned... are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon conclusion of the debate, I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Rule 49 and Article IV Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be recorded ... shall be by recorded vote whenever there are 5 Representatives that so shall request. As you can see, there are 5 Members on my side who wish for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge 4225 from the House Rules. And as a reminder to my colleagues, 4225 is a rule to reject a COLA increase for us. Many are surprised to know, some of our residents... or constituents are surprised to know that state workers in some agencies and many will not be paid during our continual battle here, although calls for

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

bipartisanship and compromise at least were said on both sides today. Despite that, during the... during the last Session we had a continuing appropriation for Legislator pay including a COLA. Wouldn't it be nice if we could, on a bipartisan basis, work together to remove the COLA increase at a minimum, while others struggle to make ends meet during this shutdown. Mr. Speaker, I assume you're going to find my Motion out of order, so I'm going to ask right now that we get an appeal of that order and that there be a recorded vote on the discharge for House Bill 4225 from the Rules Committee, also known as purgatory for good Bills. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "In accordance with Rule 18(g), rulings of the Presiding Officer related to the subscription... subsection (g) may not be appealed. On page 5 of the Calendar, under House Bills on Second Reading, we have House Bill 697, Representative Bradley. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 697, 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 Turner: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "This is the property tax Bill. It's identical to the one last week. It's identical to the Governor's proposal. I'd ask for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack on the Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative, you concluded that it's identical to the Governor, but what's the Amendment do?"

Bradley: "This is the..."

Sandack: "What does the Amendment you wish to pass..."

Bradley: "It's identical..."

Sandack: "...actually do?"

Bradley: "It's the property tax Amendment, which would freeze property taxes 2016, payable in 2017, preempt Home Rule, would not apply to bonded indebtedness and you could raise property taxes by local referendum."

Sandack: "But wait a minute. I thought we've already moved this Amendment and there's actually a Bill on Third Reading. So, is there something different about the Amendment now on the board?"

Bradley: "It's the same as the one that we moved previously."

Sandack: "So, we're just voting on something we voted on before?"

Bradley: "Correct."

Sandack: "Is that what you're telling me?"

Bradley: "Correct."

Sandack: "How many times have we voted on this Amendment,

Representative Bradley?"

Bradley: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

Sandack: "How many times have we voted on the exact same Amendment?"

Bradley: "I think this is seven."

Sandack: "I'm sorry?"

Bradley: "I think this is seven."

Sandack: "And how many more times, assuming you pass it again, will we have the identical vote on the identical Amendment?"

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Bradley: "I don't know. I don't know."

Sandack: "Sir, why are you doing this?"

Bradley: "We're going to keep trying."

Sandack: "Keep trying for what? You passed it."

Bradley: "Well, we haven't..."

Sandack: "Put it on Third Reading."

Bradley: "We haven't passed the whole Bill out of the House."

Sandack: "What portion haven't we passed, Sir, that's..."

Bradley: "Any of it."

Sandack: "But you... you refuse to move it to Third Reading. Isn't that right? Which is why we're on the seventh..."

Bradley: "I don't know where... I don't know where it stands procedurally. We don't have the votes to pass it yet."

Sandack: "You don't have the votes to pass it?"

Bradley: "No."

Sandack: "Oh. So, you're just going to keep rolling with the same Amendment; it's identical, and go through the same process of wasting time and energy."

Bradley: "Well, I don't know about the second part of your statement, but..."

Sandack: "Have you worked a Roll Call, John, because you haven't come to see me."

Bradley: "Okay."

Sandack: "Have you come and talked to anybody?"

Bradley: "I'll come and see you after the vote."

Sandack: "Uh huh. To the Amendment. Talk about something that really is kind of the poster board example of uselessness and of futility and really kind of the height of what's all wrong about what we're doing in this continuing Session, this

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

continuing waste of time and energy. This Gentleman brings the Amendment for a seventh time. And you know, he has his hands on his hips. He's going to know the Roll Call, I'm certain because I know he's working it vigorously to win approval of his disingenuous Amendment. Boy, if people want to know... if we wonder why citizens are cynical. If we want to know they're skeptical and why they don't think there's a lot of open Illinois, especially in its governance and in its government, here's Exhibit A, this whole process. What an embarrassment."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tryon on Floor Amendment #1?"

Tryon: "Thank you..."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Tryon: "...Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Tryon: "Representative Bradley, you say this is, once again, the Amendment is the Bill that is the Governor's language, correct?"

Bradley: "It's identical."

Tryon: "Identical language to what the Governor has talked about. So, in your... I assume... and I asked this to Representative Currie... that some time before you filed this Amendment like this week, you reached out to the Governor and had a conversation with him, correct?"

Bradley: "No, that's not correct."

Tryon: "That's not correct. So, once again, in... in the... this side of the aisle because we have to work in a bipartisan manner, the only way we can even possibly hope to pass a Bill is to have your support. And for you to run a Bill that's the

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Governor's Bill and not have a... not have a conversation with him, not asking, Governor, I want to help you with this. I want to know where you're at. Is there some common ground maybe we can work on? That's makes a mockery of the entire process, John."

Bradley: "I've... I've said that before. I didn't happen..."

Tryon: "It makes a mockery of it."

Bradley: "I didn't happen to say that this week, but I've said that..."

Tryon: "You're going to get up later and say you don't support it."

Bradley: "...repeated times before. Okay. Go ahead."

Tryon: "And you're running a Bill you don't support. I mean, if I were an onlooker up here or on... on the TV, I'd be... I'd be... I would be insulted that my Representatives down here are making a mockery of the process and we're name-calling. I mean, that's not the way this process is supposed to work. And if you want to run the Governor's Bill, then let's work with the Governor. Somebody's got to break the logjam. We're... the Governor's taking stuff off the table. You came into the Governor's working groups... as Members in working groups and told us you have no appetite for the Governor's Turnaround Agenda. All right. So, the Governor's the one that's mak... has taken a lot of things off the table here. A lot of things have been taken off the table, but nobody wants to have a conversation about some of the reforms. We don't ... we just want... I'm... I'm going to answer Mar... Rob Martwick's question right now today. I am ready to vote for a revenue package, okay? Are you ready to vote for a reform package? That's the

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

question. Because I'll tell you this right now... I'll tell you this. To pass a tax increase and do what we've been doing like we did the last time we passed a tax increase with no budget reforms, no reforms to put our state in a better position, it's the wrong thing to do. So, I'm willing to make that vote on revenue. And... and I'm willing to have those conversations in a bipartisan manner. So, I'm hoping that when we come back next week we're not going to have a Bill that's being ran on behalf of the Governor that the Sponsor doesn't support, but he's never talked to the Governor about the Bill, about how we might be able to come together."

Bradley: "Now... now, Representative, that's not what I said."

Tryon: "That's what?"

Bradley: "I said I talked to him this week."

Tryon: "About this Bill..."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Tryon: "...about this Amendment?"

Bradley: "I didn't say I've never talked to him about it. I was on his work groups. I mean, this has been out there for a long time. This was adequate..."

Tryon: "No, I mean this week... this week."

Bradley: "...as was adequately pointed out."

Tryon: "Well..."

Bradley: "And this is reform."

Tryon: "Once again, John, I... when I work in a Bill in a bipartisan manner, I'm constantly talking to the person I'm working with."

Bradley: "This is no surprise, Mike."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Tryon: "Well, it is a surprise that... that you would run a Bill and haven't reached out or that anybody, Representative Currie, or any other... any other person would run a Bill on behalf of the Governor and not sit down and talk to him. It makes a mockery of the process. And we are ready to talk about fixing the budget and talking about revenue. So, let's get those conversations going. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor." Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, in previous attempts there has been also a Floor Amendment #2. Are you going to offer a Floor Amendment #2 to this Bill as well?"

Bradley: "That's my intention."

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

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Martwick."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Martwick: "So, Representative Bradley, you mentioned that you had not spoken to the Governor about this Bill this week?"

Bradley: "Correct."

Martwick: "You have in the past spoken to him about this?"

Bradley: "Well, there's been discussions ongoing, yes, Representative."

Martwick: "Okay. Very good. And you know, much has been made of the mockery of the process. And I think there's... there's... there's some truth to what's being said, but I think we have

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

to look at the whole picture. I'm curious, Leader, did you... did you hold a hearing yesterday in your Revenue Committee?"

Bradley: "I did."

Martwick: "What was the subject matter of that hearing?"

Bradley: "It was a third attempt to get some questions answered about the costs of the Governor's Office."

Martwick: "And did you invite anyone from the Governor's Office to appear?"

Bradley: "We did."

Martwick: "Did any of those people appear?"

Bradley: "They did not."

Martwick: "So, they... and these are the salaries that he pays his employees are a subject of our budget, right? Is that not correct? Do we not have to..."

Bradlev: "Part of it."

Martwick: "...incorporate the money from the... spend it in that way?"

Bradley: "Part of it. The amount in question would be enough in all likelihood to pay for some of these services we care about."

Martwick: "And... and yet, no one showed up to... to answer any questions or to speak you about the process?"

Bradley: "Correct."

Martwick: "Would you suggest then that perhaps they were making a mockery of your Revenue hearing by not... refusing to show up?"

Bradley: "I had..."

Martwick: "Had you invited them before?"

Bradley: "I tried to avoid the... the charged terminology. And I don't mind a fight, but I try to stay away from those kinds

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

of charged words. I... I respect the process. I respect the fact that Abraham Lincoln's on that wall and Stephen Douglas is on that wall. And they served in this chamber. And I felt it was disrespectful to ignore the Revenue & Finance Committee."

Martwick: "As it is the job of this Body to oversee and provide checks and balances to the spending of the Executive. That is our duty. Is it not?"

Bradley: "That's one of our duties."

Martwick: "It's interesting, Representative, because even though I don't sit on the Labor Committee, I saw that the Labor Committee meeting was... was meeting in advance of our regular Session yesterday. And so, I left home early... I skipped work. And I came down here because my understanding was we were going to have a subject matter meeting on the issues of workers' comp. And to me, my understanding is that's a seminal issue of the reforms that this Governor wants to make and yet, no one from the Governor's Office appeared to talk to us about workers' compensation. And for the life of me, I don't understand how I'm supposed to agree to reforms if no one from the Governor's Office will come and answer questions about what he wants done."

Bradley: "I'd rather just focus on this Bill, but I appreciate your point."

Martwick: "I agree. And you know, I... I know things are charged here today. I want to just take a moment since my name has been used. I know I get a little emotional at times and perhaps I got a little too emotional when I spoke the first time, so I apologize. And to Representative Tryon, I

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

appreciate your offer. I think these are the things that we need to work on. And when you ask am I ready to enact reforms, the answer is yes. Yes, I am. What I would tell you is, is that there has to be some compromise. And you know, I think that there's been a lack of understanding that because the Governor's proposed reforms, that they must be right. There are many of us who disagree with those reforms, but perhaps if we talked, obviously as you just did, we will find some middle ground. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is now the seventh time we're voting on this language. Language that's reported to be the Governor's language, but obviously it's not... it's not working here. We're not getting anywhere voting time and time and time again on the same Bill. Now, we've heard from several Republicans as to why this process isn't working. I thought we might have a little spirit of bipartisanship and hear from a Democrat as to why this isn't working. Here's a quote yesterday from the spokesperson for Senate President Cullerton saying 'you can't simply co-op language and pay lip service to someone's Leadership and call that a negotiation'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley: "I'd ask for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 697. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 45 voting 'yes',

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

- 24 voting 'no' and 34 voting 'present', Floor Amendment #1 is adopted to House Bill 697. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Bradley and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "This is Amendment #2. This is opportunity to vote for reforms. This is the collective bargaining prevailing wage portion of the Governor's proposal. It's identical to the language that was put forth by the Governor. And I do not support this, but I think it's worthy and that we should have a vote."
- Speaker Turner: "On the Amendment, we have Representative David Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor?"

 Speaker Turner: "The Spontner... Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
- Harris, D.: "Normally, when someone… when a Legislator puts forth a proposal, be it a Bill or Amendment, they tend to vote for their own Amendment. Are you saying you are not going to vote for this?"
- Bradley: "Correct."
- Harris, D.: "Why are you again putting it forward?"
- Bradley: "To allow the other Members that may not feel the way that I do to vote for it."
- Harris, D.: "In the past, how many positive votes has this Amendment gotten?"
- Bradley: "I don't think it's gotten any."
- Harris, D.: "But it is the exact same language of what the Governor wants."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Bradley: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Franks."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. I think the prior speaker just made a very important point. The Governor has said that he wishes to have reforms before he will sign the budget. And I get that. And I ... and I be ... and I agree with him on property tax relief. The Amendment that we just voted on, the prior Amendment, had 47 votes. Certainly not enough to get the 60 votes that we would need to start next year. I think there's been a new proposal by the Governor. There'd be a two-year freeze and I'd like to see that Bill come up on to the... on to the board 'cause I think that might get more votes. So, I'd like to see that Bill come up because I think that would happen and I think that would help move the ball forward. But the previous speaker had indicated that this had gotten no votes, this House Amendment #2, because it deals with things that I... that don't go to the heart of the problem with property taxes. Right now, the biggest driver of property taxes, when you flip over your bill, is the school funding. So, instead of dealing with the peripheral issue, if the Governor wishes to have something tied to property tax relief, my respectful suggestion would be to change how we fund schools and make a more fair funding of schools. So, instead of those in the collar counties paying some of the highest property taxes in the entire nation, that we fix a broken school funding formula that needs to be blown up. So, my suggestion would be to bring another property tax Bill with the Governor's two-year freeze. Then, I'd also like to see an

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Amendment to see where people are on the prop... on the school funding because I think we've beat this one to death, Amendment #2. No one on the other side of the aisle has stepped forward to file this Amendment or to carry this Amendment. I wish you would 'cause that way we could have an honest vote on it. And then when it fails, we can say it failed because we all know that Amendment #2, no matter who carries it, will fail. So, let's quit pretending that this is somehow tied to ... so we can go forward and move a budget. So, I'd ask if anyone on that side of the aisle today is prepared to carry this Amendment and argue it, if they really believe that this Amendment ought to be passed and there are some that do, please step forward and I'm sure John will sign it over to you so we can have a real debate on it. So, we can have the vote right now. Because I'm really tired of it getting zero votes every time and then the other side saying, well, this isn't real because we didn't carry it. Blah, blah, blah. Enough. Let's have the vote on this. Let's work forward on the property tax stuff, but let's quit playing these games. So, if anyone has the ability on that side to step up and carry it, now is your time. Let's at least move this forward today. We get it off the table at least we're moving forward. So, please, if anyone wants to do it stand up. Otherwise, we know it's going to get zero votes again and we're going to be doing the same thing next week. It's insane. So, let's talk. Let's get together. Let's put together a Bill that will pass. Let's do a two-year freeze. Let's talk about changing how we fund education. And let's move forward."

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. Mr. Kay is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "John, is this your strategy to bring this Bill to the floor
again?"

Bradley: "We're going to have a vote on this Amendment and see what happens."

Kay: "No, that's not my question."

Bradley: "Well, I gave you the best answer I could."

Kay: "Is that... is this your strategy or somebody else's?"

Bradley: "This is... we're going to have a vote on this Amendment."

Kay: "Well, you're in Leadership. Is that not correct?"

Bradley: "Yes."

Kay: "Is this your strategy or is it somebody else's?"

Bradley: "I'm the one on the floor here calling the Bill, calling these Amendments, answering your questions."

Kay: "Well, here's my point. We have been... and it's been a tortuous afternoon as far as I'm concerned... but there's been name-calling which has, I think, gone way above the normal decorum that we would expect in here. You wouldn't for one minute be a lemming. You wouldn't be any of those names we heard before, would you?"

Bradley: "I don't use those words."

Kay: "With all... okay."

Bradley: "I don't reflect those words."

Kay: "But your... but I guess my point is and I'm not calling you one either nor am I... am I suggesting that you're anything less than a Representative who tries to do his best for his

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

district. But somehow this has come to the floor and my simple question is, whether it's a good or bad Amendment, is this your strategy or is it someone you report to?"

Bradley: "I... I report to the people of the district that I represent and their support... they're in su..."

Kay: "Well, you report to the Speaker though, John."

Bradley: "No, that's not true, Dwight."

Kay: "Yeah, you do. Is it your strategy..."

Bradley: "I report..."

Kay: "...or the Speaker's strategy?"

Bradley: "I report to the 110 thousand people that I represent in southern Illinois just like the 110 thousand people. They want property tax reform. They're not for prevailing wage and collective bargaining, but they also want a budget. These have been put out as conditions of getting the budget done. We're going to keep voting on it. That's my decision."

Kay: "Okay. Well, the sad thing about this process is that we have free speech here, but sometimes we have foolish speech. And I think that's kind of what this is about. It's sort of foolish. I think we all know where your direction's coming from. And so, the simple truth is, this isn't going to go anywhere and why you continue to do this, but for the fact that you're told to, makes no sense to me whatsoever. And you're a better Representative than that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. The Gentleman from McHenry has again made a trade for the Sponsor's Bill, which I don't think the Sponsor's willing to give up because

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

this is a weekly endeavor, a weekly exercise in futility, a weekly show trial, et cetera. There is a real Bill out there. That's the good news. There is a real Bill which offers real property tax relief which should come out again of the dungeon known as the Rules Committee and it ought to get a real floor vote. No disrespect to the Sponsor. He's not carrying the Governor's Bill. He can say it's identical. He can put Amendment after Amendment on it, but it's just not the Governor's Bill. The Governor's Bill is in the form of House Bill 4247. And I will remind my friends that the Turnaround Agenda has been amended on a couple of occasions. This Bill 4247 is the Governor's property tax relief Bill. The Bill on the board is not. This continuing game of charade and timewasting endeavors is, again, beneath us as a chamber. It is time consuming and puts the peoples' problems, the issues that are ahead that face our taxpayers, our citizens, it continues to waste their time and makes them grow all the more cynical. And I, for one, understand why. Let's stop the games. And let's really address the problems of the state. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley to close."

Bradley: "I'm not going to respond to some of the things that were said because they're not worthy of this chamber and they're not worthy of response. We answer to the people that elect us. We answer for our votes. You could try to explain these votes away however you want to and you could make statements that the passing of a budget is conditioned upon doing things and get the opportunity to do those things and then choose not to. You can talk about reform and then when

71st Legislative Day

7/9/2015

you had the opportunity to get the reform that you asked for even though some of us don't personally support it, you can make reasons why you did it. But the truth of the matter is, is that we keep voting on this because this was made a condition of doing a budget and we don't have a budget. This was made a condition of doing the budget and we don't have a budget. So, you vote your conscience and you answer to the 110 thousand people that vote for you and we'll see what the voters think about the decisions that are being made here today. I'd vote this down, but you vote your conscience."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will vote 'yes'; opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? One more time. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there's 1 voting 'yes', 78 voting 'no', 26 voting 'present'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, pursuant to House Joint Resolution 85, the House will adjourn until Wednesday, July 15 at the hour of 12 noon or until the call of the Speaker. The House is adjourned."