74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on July 28, 2015: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 576, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4144; approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 800, House Bill 1054."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. We should be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and most sovereign God, we are forever thankful to You for all the blessings that You have bestowed upon us. Father, we thank You for this august Assembly, Your governing Body in this Earth realm. We ask today, God, Your blessings of strength and wisdom upon it. Father, I pray that as they deliberate today, that they would govern in a way that brings glory and honor to Your name, and hope to Your people, and strength to this great state. Father, we thank You for the beauty of this glorious day that You have bestowed upon us, and for all the hopes that strengthens the human heart. Father, help us as we pray to see all that goes on in this world from Your point of view, and not ours. Empower us today, God, with Your spirit that we may respond not only in our hearts and in our minds, but also

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- in our words and in our actions. This we pray in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge by Representative Manley."
- Manley et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Brown."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Durkin, Fortner, Leitch, McDermed, Sullivan, and Barb Wheeler are excused this afternoon."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

 There are 106 Members present and we do have a quorum. Mr.

 Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Golar, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on July 28, 2015: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 641. Introduction of House Resolutions. House Resolution 657, offered by Representative Brown. House Resolution 658, offered by Representative Barbara Wheeler. House Resolution 659, offered by Representative Sullivan. House Resolution 667, offered by Representative Anthony. House Resolution 668, offered by Representative Turner. House Resolution 670, offered by Representative Ford. These are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Martwick: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today I am privileged to have not one, but two Pages helping serve me today. Would you please all welcome Ms. Amber Bielunski and Ms. Elliana Given."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thanks for being with us today. Mr. Yingling."
- Yingling: "Pers... personal privilege. I also have a very special Page today, my son Max, who is sitting over there on the Page waiting for you to press your page button. So welcome, Max. Let's give him a big round of applause."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining us. Why is he on this side of the aisle, Sir? Have you forgotten your roots? Mr. Sandack."
- Sandack: "He's probably on this side of the aisle for a good reason. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

 Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."
- Sandack: "With the Minority Lead... Deputy Minority Leader, it's my privilege to introduce the DuPage County Auditor, Bob Grogan who's here with his son, Bobby. It's always Downers Grove day. And Mr. Grogan and Master Grogan are Downers Grove residents. Let's give them a warm welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Thank you for being here. When you started to introduce the person to your left, I thought you were going to introduce her as your Page for the day. No? Mr. Reis is recognized."
- Reis: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Reis: "It was brought to our attention, Members on both sides of the aisle, that very important school construction grants were put on hold because we do not have a solution to this year's budget. And I've introduced House Bill 4232 appropriate the moneys for those school construction projects. This isn't GRF money. This is money from the previous Capital Bill that's finally being built on these very important school projects. What we found out a week or so ago that some school projects are moving forward. Speaker has a school; the Majority Leader has a school; Representative Burke has a school, and the Mayor has money that he can spread out to schools. So I simply ask, and I'm not going to do a Motion to Discharge today, that the Speaker release that Bill from Rules so that it can go to the appropriate committee, so that these projects, some of which are almost a year into their project, can be completed. Some of them just started this year. There's nothing partisan about this. There's Members from both sides of the aisle on this list whose schools' projects are being affected. This isn't GRF money. This should not be held up because we don't have a budget Bill. More importantly, these projects shouldn't be held up when other projects are allowed to move forward because they knew people and that money was put somewhere else to be spent on those schools. So, I simply ask that the Speaker assign that Bill to committee next week, so that we can have an appropriate hearing on it. Thank you."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, moving to page 12 of the Calendar, the Order of Resolutions, House Resolution 548, Mr. Riley."

Rilev: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, House Resolution 548 in many ways is an economic development Bill, but basically... or Resolution, but basically what it does is it urges Governor Rauner and IDOT to move forward with work on the 2013 high speed rail plan and study that was commissioned by the University of Illinois. There is a plan or a project in the planning stages right now. Essentially they have high speed rail come from O'Hare airport down through Chicago, down through the south suburbs of Chicago, and then tailing over west going through Jolliet, Springfield and ending at East St. Louis. It's a great project. Really doesn't get in the way or supplant any other transportation projects that are going on, but we want him to at least study these great ideas. Planes, trains and automobiles make a lot of sense. In this case, we're talking about high speed rail. So, I'd like for everybody to be mindful of what this Resolution does and I'll answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, two things. One, my notes reflect that there was a hold that supposedly was supposed to be on this Resolution pending some type of Amendment. Do you know anything about that?"

Riley: "A hold on this?"

Sandack: "Yeah. It was supposed to be held on Second Reading."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- Riley: "No. I had not heard that. I mean, I testified before committee. There were a lot of questions, but we had a good conversation, and it passed out of the committee 12 to 0. There was some concern about the interpretation of what this Resolution does. I felt that I, you know, answered that during committee hearings, and so I don't really remember anyone saying to hold this."
- Sandack: "Well, Al, my notes reflect that you agreed to do that.

 So, that's either a mistake on the part of the analyst that wrote this or something else, right? I mean..."
- Riley: "Well, put it like this, Representative. Again, I think what I said was, I understood some of their concerns. Some of their concerns was whether or not this would supplant ongoing projects. First of all, this is a Resolution. Second of all, we're talking about doing a study. And I made it clear during that time that I wouldn't... it wouldn't really supplant anything. There were a lot of limited projects for rail going on in the state. And I made it clear that this would not supplant that. This is a Resolution and because it is, I mean, it's not like the kinds of things we might do with a Bill in terms of making major changes through it so."
- Sandack: "Representative, unfortunately, a Minority Spokesman for the committee that you're on and is Representative Fortner, who's not here. So because he's not here, and because frankly, my records reflect and it would... and I would usually confer with the, you know, the Minority Spokesman, what I'd ask, because we're going to be back again. Would you take this out of the record, just so I can confer with my colleague, clarify any questions? Because I don't want anything to get through,

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

whether it's a Resolution or not, without perfect, I guess, understanding of what's going on and what's had in the past. So, I'd like it if you'd just pull it back and we can do it again next week."

Riley: "Well, Representative Sandack, I understand your concern, but I am the Sponsor and again, I would have no problem with that. I'm just say... because Representative Fortner did ask a question, matter of fact, he harkened back to another Bill that I had passed for the Southeast service line and the work that he had done on the Starline. So I'm... I'm saying, I don't think that there's anything, there were members on my side, again, that's one of the good things about these kinds of Bills, is that typically they are very nonpartisan. There were Members on my side that had some concerns too, but again, I felt that I answered all of those concerns. People definitely could've voted the Resolution down; they did not. So, that's... that's how I... that's how I stand on it."

Sandack: "All right. Okay. To... to the Resolution. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to request a Roll Call vote now. I have a mark on my document that says that the Sponsor agreed to hold it on Second pending an Amendment. That may not have actually occurred. I don't know, I wasn't there. I requested the Sponsor withdraw it for simply one week so I could confer with the Minority Spokesman that isn't here. In the absence of that, frankly courtesy, I'm going to ask for a Roll Call vote because this may or may not be a big deal. I don't know. But I would expect, typically, given the continuing nature of this Session, given that there's no exigent circumstances, and given, frankly, common floor courtesy, that we would get

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

this withdrawn pending my request. I'm going to ask for a Roll Call vote and I'm going to reluctantly vote 'no'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley to close."

Riley: "Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the Chair. Again, this is a Res..."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Riley: "This is a Resolution. So to that extent, there's really no readings as such. So I know that a Roll Call vote can be called at any time on a measure, but would there be a procedure to do any sort of, I mean... During... during discussion we talked about Amendments and you know, is that usual and customary on... on Resolutions?"

Speaker Lang: "Members can say what they want to say on the floor, Sir."

Riley: "Well, in that case, I think everyone's heard my testimony.

And you've heard some of Representative Sandack's concerns.

Again, this is a Resolution. Clearly you can read it, again.

I mean, I think that those who know me, know that if I said

I was going to withhold something or withdraw something, I

would have done... done that. This is a good Resolution.

Everybody sees what, you know, what it is we're trying to do.

Again, I really look at things like this as economic

development Bills for the entire state. Those that know my

record know that I'm concerned about economic development,

not just up in my area, but in central and southern Illinois

too. And this is just one way to do it. So, I respectfully

ask you to join me and vote 'aye'."

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

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 561, Representative Gable. Please proceed."

- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just one second. Where are my notes? Thank you very much. This Resolution asks that Congress reauthorizes the Older Americans Act of 1965, with adequate funding to reflect the growing populations of Americans who benefit from its programs and services. 2015 marks the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and as my seatmate kindly told me, I am now an older American. So, I would... This... the Illinois Area Agencies on Aging serve an estimated 515 thousand persons 60 and over, and 22 percent of the 2.3 million seniors in Illinois. So I'm not alone being a senior; there's 2.3 million seniors in Illinois. This was an amazing Act of 1965 and it served as a model for the development of community-based services throughout the country. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 569, Mr. Ford. Please proceed, Sir."
- Ford: "Thanks for the action, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of Resolution 569. 569 is a measure that calls on the City of Chicago to take steps to assess the glaring disparities and the wait time for response to the 911 calls and urge the city to take steps to correct inequities across the city regarding the response time. Many of you know that we passed a measure to extend the 911 call text and it was my promise to the

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

community that I would do everything I can to make the 911 call, my vote, stand for something. And this was my promise to the community, and the promise to the people that I represent that we would do something to respond to the glaring disparity and the respond time in African-American communities. And I move for the adoption of House Resolution 569."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted.

 The Chair recognizes Leader Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to call a caucus for the House Republicans."
- Speaker Lang: "The House Republicans will caucus immediately in Room 118. The Democrats will caucus immediately in Room 114. That's immediately in Room 114. The House will be in recess 'til the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Page 3 of the Calendar, under the order of House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 576, Speaker Madigan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 576, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill is read second time on a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Rep...
 by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, is the Bill on the Order of Second or Third Reading?"

Speaker Lang: "Second Reading, Sir."

Madigan: "Second Reading. Is there an Amendment?"

Speaker Lang: "Floor Amendment."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- Madigan: "I would move for the adoption of the Amendment and propose that we discuss the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack, did you wish to speak to the Amendment, or can we move it to Third?"
- Sandack: "That's why my light's on. If I may inquire of the Speaker?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Sandack: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, would you explain what the Amendment is, briefly?
- Madigan: "The Amendment would provide that the anticipated COLA adjustment in the salary of Legislators, would be suspended for the current fiscal year. And in addition, it would hold level the level of reimbursement for the mileage allowance and for the per diem allowance, again, for the current fiscal year."
- Sandack: "Assuming the Bill goes to Third is passed, do you anticipate the Senate will take this up?"
- Madigan: "Well, I spoke with Senator Cullerton today, who seemed to be enthusiastic about the Bill."
- Sandack: "Okay. When are they next in, Sir, 'cause I really don't
 know."
- Madigan: "I believe they come into Session on August 4th."
- Sandack: "So, assuming the Bill passes this House, goes to the Senate, and assuming President Cullerton passes it there, when would the Bill become effective?"
- Madigan: "yeah, Mr. Sandack, I'm sor... I would presume it would become effective the day that the Governor signs the Bill."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Sandack: "Okay. And so, it would be... it wouldn't be effective for July, obviously, because we're going to get paid at the end of this month, in a few days. Isn't that correct?"

Madigan: "I... I'm not certain about that."

Sandack: "Well, Sir, I think you just said that the Senate wouldn't take it up until August. So, certainly, this most current pay period, this COLA suspension would not be effective for this current pay period."

Madigan: "I'm going to decline to answer the question because I want to consult with my attorney before I answer the question. She's normally at hand, but right now she, maybe she heard that you were going to participate in debate, and she wanted to vacate the floor."

Sandack: "I'll take that as a compliment. Thank you."

Madigan: "Yeah, you should."

Sandack: "Thanks. Well, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, and obviously maybe we'll wait 'til Heather comes. You... you have to be aware that the House Republicans have tried to remove from the Rules Committee House Bill 4225. My colleague Representative Batinick introduced that in early May, before the conclusion of regular Session and we're now deep into continuing Session. And it was the intent of that Bill, Representative Batinick's Bill, and my umpteen requests to get that Bill out of Rules, to actually put the suspension of COLA raises into play as soon as possible. And actually, before they would actually be administered, which is frankly, this month. Is there any reason why we couldn't have acted earlier upon House Bill 4225?"

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- Madigan: "All right, Mr. Sandack, back to your question. I... I presume that the Comptroller will issue checks for the month of July that would reflect the COLA adjustment. Each Member's in a position to decline that increase."
- Sandack: "Okay. So and then ultimately whenever the Senate's next in Session they take up the Bill, it goes to the Governor, the Governor signs it, and then your Bill will be effective in mid-August I'm assuming, correct?"
- Madigan: "It sounds... As I suggested, there's an immediate effective date."
- Sandack: "Ok. Thank you for answering the questions, Mr. Speaker.

 Obviously, to the Amendment. Better late than never, I guess,
 is what I would suggest to my colleagues. Better late than
 never. And obviously, if there's other questions on Third,
 I'll reserve to that time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Harris: "Spea... Sir, did I just understand you to say that the Comptroller would issue the paychecks for July, which would include the COLA and each Member could decline that COLA? Did... maybe I misunderstood."
- Madigan: "Well, they could decline it in terms of returning the money to the Treasury."
- Harris: "Is that... is that indeed... so, what you're saying is I can... any Member could return whatever that COLA is, return that to the Treasury?"
- Madigan: "You could write a check to the Treasury of the State of Illinois that would represent the increase."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Harris: "After... after I paid my tax on that..."

Madigan: "Well, you'd be a good American paying that tax because many don't."

Harris: "Okay. But the... but the money itself, the funds themselves, will indeed be issued to each Member by the Comptroller, correct?"

Madigan: "The answer is the Comptroller, apparently, has publically stated that she plans to recognize the anticipated increase in the checks for July."

Harris: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields."

Kay: "Speaker, I'm curious about previous initiatives to do the very same thing that you are trying to do today. Why were they never moved to committee?"

Madigan: "Mr. Kay, let me make two points. Number one, when we adopted the budget for the current fiscal year and in the Section that relates to the Legislature, we did not appropriate for this COLA adjustment. The level of appropriation did not reflect this COLA adjustment. When we were advised that Comptroller Munger planned to recognize the anticipated COLA adjustment in the July check, we decided to offer this Bill today."

Kay: "Maybe I wasn't clear. Let me try this again. House Bill 2437 was a Bill almost identical to this Bill. And it was filed several years ago, and I filed it. My question to you, Sir, is, why now? Why wasn't a great idea put in place two years ago?"

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- Madigan: "Yeah. Let me repeat my two points. Number one... number one, when we adopted the budget for the current fiscal year, we did not reflect this anticipated COLA adjustment in the level of appropriation. Number two, when we were advised that Comptroller Munger planned to process the checks reflecting the COLA adjustment, we decided to offer this Bill."
- Kay: "Fair enough. I'd like to go back and... and talk a little bit more about some answers with respect to the deduction and the repayment of these moneys. I'm assuming that actually the COLA that takes effect the end of this month will also take effect the end of next month. Is that fair to say, based on the process here?"
- Madigan: "Well, that's why this Bill is being offered today."
- Kay: "Well, my question though to you, Sir, is this, that we're going to be two months into the COLA being paid. Is that not right, July and August?"
- Madigan: "I think I would disagree with you, Mr. Kay. I think we've discussed the COLA for July, the anticipated COLA for July. We haven't reached August yet. The Bill, in my expectation, will be considered by the Senate early in August. I'm sure the Comptroller will know about this action today. She'll know about the anticipated action in the Senate next week, and she'd be in a position to wait to see the outcome of whether the Governor would sign the Bill."
- Kay: "And I guess, again, while I'm complimentary, my understanding when I... I've been here, and it's not nearly as long as some, but once you get a salary increase, there's no way, no way, that you can take it away. Is that... is that not correct?"

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- Madigan: "Well, my position on that was that every Member of the Legislature would be in a position to write a check to the State Treasury reflecting this increase."
- Kay: "Well, I'm not sure we're tracking here, Speaker. But I... I guess my question is, how do you, once you're given something that is permanent, give it back and not have it be unconstitutional?"
- Madigan: "I'm not going to comment on the constitutionality. I'm simply saying that for this month of July, for those that wish to decline the increase, which would be reflected in the check, they can write a check for that amount of money to the State Treasury."
- Kay: "So, I guess my final question would be this, and I want to thank you, I guess, for bringing this to the floor. Im... I'm a little bit confused as to why we didn't do this two years ago, and I think there's been initiative to do it prior to that. But my real question would be, is it your opinion, Sir, that we should get a salary at all?"
- Madigan: "I believe that Members of the Legislature ought to be compensated for the work that they perform here in the Legislature and for the work they perform in terms of constituent services."
- Kay: "Okay. People in my district might disagree, but I appreciate your candid response. And I thank you for your answers."
- Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close on the Amendment."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, again, I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will vote 'yes'...

 Excuse me. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 576, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading on this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had a very good discussion of the Bill on Second Reading, I would move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I strongly support this legislation. It is absolutely outrageous that we could be in a position that Members of the General Assembly are getting a pay increase while social service agencies don't know how they're going to be funded. People are talking about raising taxes. What we should be doing is we should be in Session around the clock to adopt a budget, so that we can do our job. This is a good first step. I strongly support this. Stop the madness. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. To the Bill. I... I concur. It's about time, actually. So, I welcome the Speaker's Bill, and I encourage every Member of this General Assembly, Members of this House, to vote in the affirmative. Obviously, I'll remind some people, for three weeks straight those of us on this side of the aisle tried to do this very thing and were frankly sto... stopped because of procedural rules that the Majority has put into play. Not wanting to hear that, at that time, a pay raise

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

was the worst thing... the worst optics imaginable. So, I'm glad, late coming nonetheless, I'm glad the Democrats in charge of this House, of this Generally Assembly, and the Legislature now see the propriety of not taking a self-serving raise, amid a budget controversy... a budget crisis. Welcome, thank you for that. I'll remind some folks, also, that since 2010 COLA increases were verboten. It was only last year, in the throes of a partisan budget, was it imbedded on a partisan Roll Call. In fact, some Members of this Assembly didn't even know they got a pay raise that they voted on. Think about that. Boy, that's a contrast in... in times right now, right? Because now we're scurrying for cover to show people, our constituents and many people who aren't getting a paycheck, hey, we're going to ... we're going to work with you now. We're not going to take our self-serving raise. Well, that's wonderful. Congratulations. I still say, and I'll agree with my colleague who just spoke, we ought to be spending time working on the budget. But we've been coming down here working on things that have nothing to do with the budget. Albeit, this ki... kind of does, so I welcome it again. Folks, I am glad you get to take this vote; I'm glad the Republicans will stand with you in a bipartisan show. Of course we had a Bill in May that no one wanted to talk about then. So, welcome to the party, thank you for your cooperation. Let's work towards getting a budget done that makes sense. And that means, no tax increase, Ladies and Gentlemen. It means let's get a budget done. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

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

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields."

Sosnowski: "I agree with this proposal, obviously. Hopefully we have a unanimous support in getting rid of this COLA, but it begs the question. I guess I'd like to just like to ask you a simple one, is 'cause why are we not, or why are you not, supporting a permanent removal of this automatic COLA increase? Let's just get rid of this once and for all."

Madigan: "Mr. Sosnowski, I think you raise a good question. I think that it's something that we all should reflect on. I don't have an answer beyond that for you today. I do feel, contrary to others in this Body, that Members of the Legislature ought to be compensated for what they do, as Members of the Legislature. I think the compensation should be appropriate. And... and that's about what I would have to say."

Sosnowski: "To the Bill. I just would hope that we can work on a bipartisan basis, and take this to the next step. Get rid of these regular, permanent, automatic COLAs. Eliminate them once and for all. Let's stop doing this on a year by year basis, and I would encourage you, Mr. Speaker, and other Members of the... the chamber, please, let's get rid of these things, once and for all, so there are no more COLA increases at all. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Yes, he does."

Breen: "For the purposes of legislative intent, Mr. Speaker. What... we're paid on an annual basis. We have a COLA that has increased our pay. We're going to put our pay back to where

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

it was, but it looks like we... we have, under current law, the Comptroller has to pay us the increased amount. For the purposes of legislative intent, is it your intention that she reduce our other 11 payments, to make us each at the same level where we should be or what... Is there some other way to ensure that?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. This is a great Bill. We should have done this long ago. We should do this once and for all, so we don't continue to have an annual work on giving up our COLAs. There should not be a COLA. So, would urge everyone to support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will Speaker Madigan yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Martwick: "Speaker, I was, I read in one of the Governor's press releases that this COLA would be worth about \$1,350, per Legislator. Is that correct, Sir?"

Madigan: "It sounds correct."

Martwick: "So, I did a little bit of math to see what this would save us in this budget crisis, and for 177 Legislators, it would save us \$238,950."

Madigan: "Sounds correct."

Martwick: "Problem solved. Budget solved. Sorry, that was snarky.

I... I know it doesn't solve our problem. And I think it is good optics that we not give ourselves raises when we are working on it. But realistically speaking, this does nothing to solve our problems. I'm curious though, Speaker. I heard

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Representative Bradley, from the chairman of our Revenue Committee, speak about what the additional cost of salaries in the Governor's Office. The pay raises that he's handed out to his political patronage appointees. I'm wondering if you can tell me how much that's cost the state. I think Representative Bradley said an additional \$2 million a year. Does that sound correct to you, Speaker?"

Madigan: "Could I yield to Mr. Bradley? If he were here. Mr. Martwick, I think that if Mr. Bradley were here he would say that it's costing \$2 million a year above what Governor Quinn provided. But Mr. Bradley's very well equipped to speak."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you. The information we've been provided, or that we've obtained through public sources is, counter to what was said that it was \$500 thousand less, it's nearly \$2 million more."

Martwick: "Thank you. So, I'm just curious, is there… is there time to amend this Bill, Speaker, that we could add freezes? Since we're freezing politicians pay for the optics of it, because it's certainly not correcting our budget problem, but we want the people to believe that we would not increase our own salaries. Because we're the ones that are responsible for solving this budget crisis. And clearly, the Governor plays a… a crucial role in solving this problem. And his appointed patronage hires have a… a very important process in crafting that budget, which he refuses to give us in a balanced manner. Is there any chance that we can amend this Bill now to freeze all of their salaries as well? Because that would save us ten times as much money, and it would continue the optics. I mean,

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

really, I think if the Governor is so concerned about us freezing our salaries, he ought to make a good faith effort and show the people of Illinois that he really cares about things by freezing his own staff's salaries."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Martwick, did you direct that question to the other side of the aisle?"

Martwick: "I would like to. And I would invite any who's there to answer it. This is a good Bill. To the Bill. I think we should do this. But I think the Governor is time... it's time for him to stop playing politics, to step up and do what's right for this state. He can freeze or cut his own salaries, as he sees fit. And I know that everyone on that side aisle would support it. So, I hope that all the future speakers will get up and echo my sentiments."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan yields."

Demmer: "Mr. Speaker, in recent years, how had the Legislature dealt with automatic cost of living adjustment recommendations?"

Madigan: "Over the last few years, why there's been a suspension."

Demmer: "And how is that suspension achieved?"

Madigan: "Through legislation."

Demmer: "Through Budget Implementation Bills?"

Madigan: "Legislation."

Demmer: "Legislation. So, in the current year's budget proposal that was passed several months ago, why was the cost of living adjustment not addressed in those pieces of legislation, as it had been in recent years?"

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- Madigan: "That was a decision that was made, not unanimous, but a decision that was made, and that's why the action was taken."
- Demmer: "The failure to act to re... to reject the cost of living adjustment has brought us to this point today, correct? In... in which, as you described earlier, there's some level of confusion between the amount that the Legislators... Legislature appropriated or attempted to appropriate and what the Comptroller reads as the law."
- Madigan: "Well, I will simply restate what I said earlier. You've said it, I'd say the same thing again."
- Demmer: "So, I think it's important to note that the Comptroller's decision to process payroll in this way. She indicated she has regrettably making that decision because current law holds that the cost of living adjustment takes effect should there not be legislation to reduce it or reject that. So, the position we're in today is not because the Comptroller wants to pay the Legislature more or thinks the Legislature should of her own accord be paid more. But rather since the Legislature deviated from its practice over the past several years, did not reject the automatic cost of living adjustment; therefore, we're in this situation today. And regrettable in that many sentiments that my colleague, Representative Sandack, pointed out. We're already nearly a complete month into the new fiscal year. We may be presented with a situation in which we have a higher than appropriate salary in the first month, and then it have to be adjusted over the next 11 months. The appropriate practice here, seems to me, would have been to follow our practice over the past

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

several years include this in legislation earlier in the year, make it clear before the start of a new fiscal year that the Legislature intends to reject these cost of adjustments and avoid much of this confusion today. Instead, we locked Bills in the Rules Committee. And we bowed only now because of the immense public pressure that's been placed on the Legislature for this specific issue. And I... I think it's just important for us to look at that in the context of how the timing played out here and understand that we had an opportunity, we had many Bills filed well within the normal Legislative Session. We could have dealt with it then. I'm glad to see this Bill come up today. I will certainly be supporting it. But this is an avoidable problem and one that shouldn't have to had come to air because of public pressure. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. First, I would like to say thank you to the Speaker for bringing this forward. It's about time. Those of us on this side have been clamoring for this for weeks, and this is something that we absolutely need to do. The base salary for Illinois Legislators is \$67,836 per year. That's a lot of money, folks. That's a lot of money to all the people in all our districts. We're the highest paid in the Midwest. We're the fifth highest paid in the country for Legislators. The average… excuse me… the median household… household income in my district is less than \$55 thousand. We make good money here. We have a severe budget crisis in this state. Now is not the time for us to pat ourselves on the back and give us a pay raise. I fully

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

support this. I also intend to call my own State Senator, Bill Brady, as a constituent of his, and say, as soon as the Senate get back, I hope you guys take this up and vote on it. I would encourage each and every one of you, as a constituent of you own Senator, to do the same so we get this passed in the Senate. I hope this is unanimous vote. I urge everyone to support it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure if this is to the Bill, or if the Speaker will yield, but correct me once I begin."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields, just in case."

Andrade: "Ah ha. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, this is a great Bill. I believe it goes; it's a good start. But I... I believe we should go further, and I hope maybe later on the other side, some of my colleagues, might look at this. I think the Governor, I believe is at, I think he made last year, 55 million, and his current salary is a dollar. I thought, maybe... maybe we should create a maximum threshold for outside income. Maybe if you make 300 thousand out of here, if you make 500 thousand out of here, you should consider maybe getting paid a dollar, giving up your per diem, giving up your mileage. Just a thought. I just thought... I just thought say that hopefully, maybe, lot of people once you make over 500 thousand or something to make them, you may consider working for a dollar also. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "That's great timing."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Speaker Lang: "You know, it appears that Mr. Andrade's comments made your hair turn gray."

Franks: "Yeah, it did. Thank you. Well, I was going to respond to some of these things. First of all, I want to thank the Speaker for bringing this forward. I think... I think it is ... it's appropriate. One of the previous speakers had talked about the Comptroller being upset or something. Well, the Comptroller's job is not policy. The Comptroller wanted to have a policy job. She didn't win that election. She was appointed to this position to cut checks. And if we want to save money, perhaps we should combine the Comptroller's Office with the Treasurer's Office. But that would... that would be one way we ought to be going; and if she'd like to run for a policy office, she should do so. But let me tell you about a hearing we had today. We had a hearing today in State Government Administration where the State Board of Education superintendent is receiving a salary of \$225 thousand a year, 35 paid vacation days, 10 sick days, 500 dollars-a-month allowance for a vehicle, plus he's not paying any money into his pension. The state's picking all of that up, and to make things even sweeter, there's a provision in the contract that says we are going to pay you the difference between Tier II and Tier I. Since you came in as a Tier II, we're sort of going circumvent the law that we passed five years ago and make sure that you get as much as you would have gotten whether you were hired under Tier I. It's true. Then we also found out there was a severance package and that it's saying, should he be let go, even after the administration changes, he would still get severance. We found out today that the

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

last State Superintendent of Education, with the change in administration, was paid 89 thousand. That's crazy. We've asked them to change those things and hopefully they will, and they'll be back in our committee soon. But I want you to understand when we're talking about the money today, its \$250 thousand, it's certainly important, but there are a lot of other things we should be talking about. The state Board of Education for instance, has hired another person, some type of guru, I'm not sure what this person does. So, we have two people making approximately \$500 thousand. And I'm not sure exactly what their functions are. And I don't think anybody here does. Okay. And I hear that you've been clamoring for weeks to get this done really? Is that the best you got? Clamoring for weeks, we got to get this done, we got to save that 250 thousand, but the arguments I keep hearing are optics. They're not based on fixing the budget. Now we are a coequal branch of government. We are not a subsidiary of an Executive Branch or our Leadership. The game show is who wants to be a millionaire, not who wants to be owned by one. Now, the fact is we have to move forward. We have to move forward. And when I talked three weeks ago about closing loopholes, I've asked you to help get us there. This is what you've been clamoring for, for weeks, 250 thousand bucks? That's the best you got? I ask you to bring us some cuts, cause that's, I just heard your Floor Leader saying, we want a balanced budget without any tax increases. I have not heard one cut. I have not heard one loophole being closed. What I've heard is a lot of politics and a lot of nonsense. So, what I suggest is we take our House back, and that we go forward because it's our

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

job, because this crisis was created on our watch. It's not Speaker Madigan's fault. It is not Governor Rauner's fault. It is our fault. We have an obligation to pass balanced budgets. We have an obligation to come forward with the ideas and not to sit on the sidelines. Enough sitting on the sidelines, let's work together. Today we're all going to vote unanimously to pass this Bill. So let's keep that spirit alive. Why don't we speak to each other, come forward with our ideas, run around our Leadership if you have to. But let's get this done and let's quit sitting around playing games."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields."

Davidsmeyer: "We heard one of the prior speakers spoke to the optics of this. Many people here may be voting 'yes' because of the optics. I'm here voting 'yes' because we are not doing our job. What is... what you would say is probably the most important job that we provide here in the House."

Madigan: "Thank you for asking the question because I've said publically and privately, to anyone who would listen to me, the number one issue facing the State of Illinois today is the budget deficit. The budget deficit. Extraneous issues, nonbudget issues, are not the number one issue facing the State of Illinois. I've said repeatedly, I don't believe we can just cut our way out of the budget deficit. I think there has to be a balanced approach; some cuts, some new revenue. I stand on that proposition from now until all of this is settled. But thank you again for asking the question because my view is, the number one issue facing the State of Illinois

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

is the budget deficit, and to the extent that we let diversionary issues prevents us from working on solving the problem of the budget deficit, we're just impeding our progress. We ought to get about the business of recognizing that we have this huge budget deficit problem, can't be solved just by cutting our way out of it. It cannot. It needs a balanced approach. We ought to get about the business of working toward a balanced approach to solve that problem."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I agree with you on a balanced approach, and I'm very willing to work with you on that. But I would say, let me... let me just clarify. The most important... would you say the most important job that we have, here in the House, over in the Senate, is to pass a balanced budget?"

Madigan: "The most important job for us today, in the midst in the problem with the budget deficit, is to eliminate the budget deficit. Requires a balanced approach; some cuts, some new revenue. The longer we wait, the worse the problem gets. We ought to get about the business of excluding the diversionary issues, which are raised by certain people in this state to try and cloud the issue. We ought to have the courage to say, let's move forward. Let's recognize we've got a serious problem. Let's recognize there should be some cuts in spending as the legislature did when we passed the Bill that would reduce Medicaid spending by \$400 million and as we did... as we did cuts all through the budget. Let's recognize we have to cut. Let's do it. But let's recognize we need new money to provide for services in a state budget that helps and protects middle-class people in the State of Illinois."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Davidsmeyer: "Well, I would... I would say that was probably the long version of... of a yes answer. That our number one job is to pass a balanced budget. We have not done that, I would argue that we should not get paid at all, since we've gone overtime. We shouldn't get paid at all until we pass a balanced budget. The... that doesn't put any pressure on us to do it. We have to all be under the same pressure to make sure that we do the job of the people. Mr. Speaker, have you spoken with our Senate President? I know the Governor supports this Bill. But have you spoke with the Senate President to see if he's going to bring this up as soon as they come back?"

Madigan: "I stated earlier in debate that I spoke with him this morning, and he seemed to be enthusiastic about the Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Well, I'm excited for him to... to come forward and to pass this and to give up this COLA which should've never been passed to begin with. I obviously join the rest of my colleagues, not because of optics, but because we haven't done our job to get rid of this COLA."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And very briefly to the Bill. First of all I want to thank and commend the Speaker for bringing this forward. This is a vote that I've been wanting to take for a long time, appreciate the opportunity. This and many other things need to be done. This is leading by example. But another individual in the state that's really done that too, to a greater extent, believe that I've ever seen before, and that's Governor Rauner. He promised to not take a salary or a pension; he's made good on that. I'm not aware of any other... I'm not aware of any other Governor in the state, in

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

the nation, doing that. Maybe nev... probably not in our history. So I think that's leading by example too. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

Batinick: "I don't know if I can follow that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Two months ago today, I filed 4225, which this pretty much looks like a carbon copy of. I'm proud to have filed that Bill. I guess imitation is the greatest is the greatest form of flattery. It says HB576 up on the board and that is the Bill that'll pass, and I don't care if it's 4225, 576, or 777. I would plea with the whole Body. It's amazing what people can get done when we're not worried about who's taking credit. I am thrilled to vote on House Bill 576 'cause it accomplishes what we're here trying to accomplish. Thank you very much for bringing the Bill. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The reason this Bill is up here is partly because we recognize that the State of Illinois has a big budget problem. And while the Speaker would like to talk about all these other issues being diversionary, the truth is, is that almost everything we do on the budget there's... there's impact from policies that have forced us to make these budget decisions. And it's not just true at the state level, it dips down into every single unit of government, or social service agency that has to operate under the policies that this state, this Legislature, has imposed on them. For example, I was just with a homeless organization in my district, and she... and we brought up the topic of cutting costs and how can you save money, and what can you

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

do. And she says, well, prevailing wage rates cause me to have my roof replaced at 30 percent higher cost. I have other people willing to do the work, because of prevailing wage raise, because we do take some form of tax money in, we have to spend 30 percent more. We heard this same thing from our universities. We heard this from our school districts. So you cannot separate the two, when it's not just the state budget, but everybody else's individual budget that must operate under state rules. That's why the reforms are necessary. And only through those reforms are we going to get the budget... commonsense procedures in that we need in the State of Illinois to move forward. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

"Thank you. To the Bill. I support the Bill as it sits Ammons: before us. We know that there was a attempt to pass a Bill previous, from our colleagues that didn't go far enough, and so this Bill takes us further down the road and I'm in full support. I am interested though, in some of the comments that have been made around this issue, around legislative salaries, and we're giving ourselves raises. Certainly we are not giving ourselves raises. Today's action is to go back and correct a COLA that is automatic, so we want to make sure people are clear on that. But as we talk about salaries, in a newspaper article just a few months ago, we learned that the Governor's wife's assistant makes more than every Legislator in this room, just to assist the wife. The questions that are being raised by our colleagues just really, I think rise to the level of, thank you, hypocrisy. None of these have been questioned, and I believe our senior Member,

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

who has been attempting to get to the bottom of the exorbitant rates of pay for administrative staffs under the Governor still has not been able to have a committee meeting where they will come forward and talk about (a) who these people are, where there being paid for, and why they're being paid so much. And so I think if the, my Republican colleagues want to really have this discussion, they should stand with the Democratic colleagues in particular in Revenue & Finance to bring forth to public disclosure, the pay and salaries of the administration of this state. Thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I recommend the passage of the Bill, but let me add, I think it's fair to say that we are involved in what will be viewed as an historic struggle, between two branches of government, when the number one issue facing this state is a budget deficit. The Governor has staked out a position. He has said, I want my diversionary issues, I want my nonbudget issues, and then... and then, I'll talk about new money for a budget. That's the Governor's position. We, in the House, have attempted to meet the Governor half way. The Governor has talked about workers' compensation. The House has passed a Bill that would do changes in workers' compensation. That Bill is in the Senate, that Bill could be amended. There could be more changes done to the worker's compensation system, I acknowledge that. People on this side of the aisle acknowledge that, but... but we are not going to use the government to force injured workers to welfare or to the Emergency Room. Let me repeat that. We are not going to use the government to force

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

people, injured workers, to welfare or to the Emergency Room. The Governor requested a change in the method of operation of the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. The Governor wants to take the decision-making away from government people and give it to people in the private sector. The House, at the request of the Governor, passed that Bill. The Governor talks in terms of the absolute necessity to freeze property taxes. There have been 11 opportunities in the House of Representatives to pass a Bill that would freeze property taxes. You have declined to participate in the passage of the Bill. And today, again, at the Governor's request, in an effort to meet the Governor half way as we have in the three prior instances, we're going to call this Bill. This Bill is going to pass. At the request of the Governor, we're going to repeal, we're going to suspend the COLA adjustment and the salary for people in the Legislature for the current budget year. So, in four separate instances, we've made a good faith effort to meet the Governor half way. We ask the Governor, how do you respond? His response; I have to have my agenda as-is, no change, and if I get it, I'll talk. The best promise you get is, I'll talk. So, we are at in impasse. We are involved in an historic struggle. I repeat, again, this Bill is just another effort to meet the Governor half way. Mr. Speaker, I recommend its passage."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no', the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- declared passed. Chair recognizes the Majority Leader for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, so that we can discuss issues involving the budget under rules, the guidelines, that have been established by the Speaker."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted, and the House hereby resolves into a Committee of the Whole. Is there leave for the Attendance Roll Call to be accepted for purposes of establishing a quorum in the committee? Leave is granted and a quorum is established. Representative Lang is appointed at the Chair of the Committee of the Whole and is recognized to conduct the hearing in accordance with the schedule established by the Speaker."

DISSOLVE INTO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE DO NOW ARISE

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order in regular Session. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 4144. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4144, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I urge adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 4144. This is a one-month proposal that adds to work we have done earlier weeks during this overtime Session. It would... it would respond to the panels that we heard today. It would put 1.117, \$200 thousand into the budget, all federal funds, for purposes of workforce investment grants, and as well it would, from General Revenue fund a 166 million... sorry... \$166 thousand for grants for purposes of giving help and services to people who suffer from epilepsy and their families. I would appreciate your questions. And I certainly would urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown is recognized for an announcement."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Phillips and Batinick for the rest of the afternoon."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. The Clerk has the information. Mr. Sandack is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative Currie, you said that this Amendment would add to the previous one-month budget that we've already passed."

Currie: "It would be a separate Bill, but the idea is to do the same kind of work we have done recently. As you know, we sent the Governor a one-month budget. I think that was on July 15, 2015. And since then we have looked at some other issues that people have brought to our attention. Issues that certainly deserve funding during the coming... during the present fiscal year and a way to respond is to start funding them now."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Sandack: "Similar to the other efforts, is there a August 1 termination provision within this one-month budget?"

Currie: "No."

Sandack: "Why not?"

Currie: "Because since it is already July 28 and the Senate is not in Session until early next week, we decided the better course was to fund services beginning July 1, but not include a repealer, so that when the Governor signs this Bill in for example the end of the first week in August or the middle of August, the money would still be there."

Sandack: "You don't think the Governor's really going to sign this Bill, do you?"

Currie: "I certainly hope he would."

Sandack: "Have you talked to him?"

Currie: "You know what, I wish he had come this afternoon to hear the compelling testimony we heard from the workforce investment people. We are likely to lose federal funds..."

Sandack: "Leader that's..."

Currie: "...if we don't start spending the federal money and a reminder to the Members of this chamber, the workforce investment money is all, only federal funds. As well the testimony we heard from the second panel about the services that are required to keep people alive, I would think would have reached the Governor's heart. So I wish he'd been here. Maybe he's listening, maybe he's here in Springfield and maybe he's got his squawk box turned on, so maybe he did hear the testimony. If he had, I'm sure he certainly would sign a Bill with these provisions."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Sandack: "I appreciate the monologue and your pre... previewing of your closing, but with respect to the question I offered, have you spoken to anyone about the... from the Governor's office about your Bill today?"

Currie: "You know, they were... they... we invited them to come..."

Sandack: "That's really a yes or no answer, Ma'am."

Currie: "...to the Revenue & Finance Committee this morning, and instead of appearing before the committee, the Governor's minions sent a hostile, rude, totally inappropriate, disgraceful letter to the Committee Chair. So, I would've been happy to have asked them, had they appeared, this very question, but they weren't there, so I couldn't."

Sandack: "While I'm certain they appreciated your characterization of them and I understand that rude letter had nothing to do with the propriety of the Bill that you're introducing today. So I ask you, and I would really appreciate a specific answer. Have you talked to anyone at the Governor's Office about your one-month Bill?"

Currie: "No. Not this one. No."

Sandack: "Okay. So, while you suggest that he should sign it, you haven't even gone to him or his office and suggested that he should?"

Currie: "I'm not... I'm not even sure he's here today. I did say that if he'd listen to the... to the proceedings before the House..."

Sandack: "Ma'am, I think he's in Springfield far more... far more than you are. So you can take shots at him, but I think in the spirt of bipartisanship, if you're offering something that you think is a legitimate budget, wouldn't you work with

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

them and offer it to them, and get their opinion on it? Doesn't that seem collegial, professional, and a far better path?"

Currie: "So, we filed the Amendment this morning. I would have thought that..."

Sandack: "Oh, that's right. This morning."

Currie: "...the Governor's people would have..."

Sandack: "That's right. So you called them in the interim, I'm sure."

Currie: "...would've paid attention and if they were interested in talking to me they know how to find me."

"Right. To the ... to the Amendment and this continuing farce of a process. We... we hear the Lady talk about the propriety and the importance of this Bill. It's still out of budget. It still doesn't make sense when put into the context of a full 12-month fiscal year budget. But talking about, and... and really diminishing other people when saying they're minions and they're this, that, and the other thing. The Lady doesn't even go and introduce the Bill to the Governor's Office, doesn't call, doesn't ask to speak to them, and then says, well, I'm not even sure he's in town, on a Bill introduced this morning, hasn't even gotten a phone call to the Governor's Office. It just belies the entirety of this continuing, really bad process that just makes us all lesser. And it makes the people of Illinois really question the propriety of those governing. I would suggest maybe a real budget discussion would be in order and a conversation with everyone at the table, in real time, not these, you know, hey, we're going to run a budget this morning at 9:00 and

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

we'll have it on the floor in the afternoon. It's just... it isn't cynical to say that's bad process that's a fact. I'm going to ask my colleagues to vote 'no' or 'present' because none of this makes any sense. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Martwick: "Leader Currie, I was just looking at the... the analysis that... that our staff has prepared for us and I noticed that this temporary one-month funding for epilepsy grants would... would be at a cost of \$166 thousand. Is that correct for the one month?"

Currie: "That's correct."

Martwick: "Okay. And that's interesting because today we just saved the state \$240 thousand I think by suspending our COLAs and probably more if you add in fact that we froze our cost of living... excuse me... our expense reimbursements for travel and for our per diems. So, it would certainly seem that we today as a Legislature, all of us, 'cause we all joined in on this, we saved the state enough money to provide this one month funding. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Martwick: "And I also noticed that in our analysis, at least, it shows that the GRF proposal for the spending plan that we put forth, that they Governor vetoed, or did not act on, or whatever, about \$2 million. So, is that our whole GRF funding for the epilepsy program per year? Is that what we propose to spend?"

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Currie: "The 166 is one month. I think his question is 2 million.

Yes, yes, that would be right. That would've been in the plan."

Martwick: "So, the \$2 million would... the GR... the \$2 million in GRF funds would cover the epilepsy program, which we just heard about, covered for a whole year?"

Currie: "Correct."

Martwick: "Interesting, 'cause that's the same number that we just found out that the Governor has raised the salaries of his political appointees for his office. So, again, I'll go back to asking my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join me in, since... since we all know we don't deserve this, and we haven't got the job done. I would suggest that the Governor's staff bares as much to blame as anybody else, and that would allow us to fund the epilepsy program, which we just heard was so important, for an entire year. Just by simply doing what every Member in this Body was willing to do, freeze your salary back to the 2015 levels, and we've got the money for the program. Do you think that sounds like a good idea?"

Currie: "I think it sounds like a great idea."

Martwick: "I... I think it does too. And I think it's time that, again, if we're going to be fair about this, you know, we heard that we don't like characterizations of people, certainly I've heard many characterizations about this side of the aisle coming from the Governor's Office. I guess I'm just another politician that the Speaker controls; however, I... I don't seem to think I am. I think I've exercised my own dependent decision-making. But this would be a great

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

bipartisan thing, wouldn't it? I mean, we all got together and said, we're not worth the salary increase. Don't you think the same should be true for the Governor's staff? Would you join me in calling on the Governor to reduce the staff salaries of all his executive appointees, Leader?"

Currie: "I... unless he's got contracts, in which case there's a problem doing that."

Martwick: "Oh, I'm sure since they're all political appointees he can get them to willingly give up their salary, just as we just did. Don't you think that that's possible? We could ask them, I'm sure that'd be happy to give it up..."

Currie: "Certainly. We could certainly ask."

Martwick: "...for the betterment of the state, right?"

Currie: "We'd certainly ask."

Martwick: "Thank you. I hope all of my Republican colleagues will join me in that call because it would certainly be keeping with what we did today. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me address the Bill, if I may. How in the world, you may ask, how in the world could we vote against only \$166 thousand for epilepsy? That's such a small number. We ought to be able to do that, right? You know, about two or three weeks ago the Deputy Majority Leader stood on the House Floor and he berated us on this side of the aisle because we voted all in unison in the way that the Governor wanted us to vote. He called us minions of the Governor; he called us lemmings, and we kind of took it good naturedly, and the week after we had these little things that are popular for the... for the movie right now, The Minions.

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

And we're minions and lemmings. My friends on the other side of the aisle, isn't it equally appropriate to call you minions and lemmings because you vote the way the Speaker wants you to vote? Isn't it equally appropriate? Is there some moral superiority on your side of the aisle, because you can pass a budget Bill that funds certain items that you want funded? Are we morally inferior on this side of the aisle because we want a full budget passed, a responsible, full budget that funds the State of Illinois for the Fiscal Year '16. Not on a piecemeal basis, not one by one. We're not lemmings. We believe in funding a full-year budget. Just like you believe in funding it piecemeal, and oh, by the way, that happens to be what your Leader wants done. So, the lemmings and the minions appellation is just as appropriate for you as it is for us. But let me tell you something, a month-to-month piecemeal operation is not the way to run a railroad, and it's not the way to run the State of Illinois. Let's have a full-year budget. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you very much. To the Amendment. I want to just draw attention to the Body on a couple of quick things. Number one, it would be great if we had a full-year budget, but we seem to be at an impasse right now, so we need to come up with what's second best. Many of you saw during the testimony the young wo... the woman that was out here, actually had a seizure. She doesn't have time for us to play around, call each other names, waiting to get a full-year budget. We need to do something now, so I implore you to do now. What I'm also really want to speak further on, 'cause I think the

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

epilepsy budget stands on its own on the importance of what we need to do on that, the federal workforce dollar. I just got an e-mail at 3:24. And this e-mail, I'm going to read you the first part of it. It says, Dear, DuPage Legislators, so I'm going to call on all my fellow DuPage Legislators. One of the consequences of the state budget impasse is that our local workforce offices cannot access federal WIA funds to continue operations. The workNet DuPage Career Center, located in Lyle, helps thousands of our residents annually access job skills training, career and education counseling, and connects those seeking employment with local businesses in of skilled workers. I would appreciate consideration of the attached letter and any assistance you could help provide these offices. Many thanks for your continued leadership and support. Regards, Daniel J. Cronin, Chairman of the DuPage County Board. I call on my fellow DuPage Legislators to listen to Chairman Cronin. In his attached letter he states that if we don't do something now, these offices will be closed by the end of July or the first week in August. Please I urge you to support this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. Leader Currie, good to see you."

Currie: "Good to see you."

Wheeler, K.: "I've been reinquiring these past few weeks as we go through this process regarding how we appropriate money in the State of Illinois and what I view to be our constitutional

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

and our statute-based requirements which I don't feel as though we have met. I want to bring to your attention a little research that I had done, and I'm grateful for the staff who put this together. In Fiscal Year '12 this Body approved a revenue estimate on March 8, for '13 it was March 1, for Fiscal Year '14 it was March 5, and the initial one for Fiscal Year '15 was February 25. We're in the last week of July and I just wanted to inquire again, to my friends in the leadership, when can we expect to have a revenue estimate, as required by the COGFA statute for the State of Illinois budget year... Fiscal Year '16."

- Currie: "I think I'll give you the same answer I gave the last time you asked the very same question. And that is, it was not until recently that we did the revenue estimates. What happened in fiscal '11, fiscal '10, fiscal '08, fiscal '94, so the idea of doing the Resolutions is a relatively recent one and remember that the real Resolution, the budget Resolution, is the budget, the final budget we adopt. Those revenues reflect our best estimate of available revenues for the coming fiscal year."
- Wheeler, K.: "May I inquire then as to why we haven't done so this year with... The COGFA and GOMBI staff members have provided us with revenue estimates. Are we not willing to adopt those revenue estimates?"
- Currie: "We don't need to adopt revenue estimates. It's a separate proposition."
- Wheeler, K.: "I'm sorry. I read that in statute here that says we 'shall' adopt a revenue estimate."
- Currie: "And the budget is the Resolution."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- Wheeler, K.: "But we've already appropriated billions of dollars of spending without a single revenue estimate on file."
- Currie: "We do not have a final budget. We do not have a final bu... and we're not even talking about an overall budget today. I'm not quite sure I understand the import of your line of questioning. We are talking about short-term funding for two services. We're not talking a full budget. We're talking about a one-month program for epilepsy services and for workforce investment. So, if you'd like to confine your remarks to those two issues, I think that might be helpful."
- Wheeler, K.: "I appreciate your... your guidance, Leader Currie. But this is an appropriation situation, which would require revenue to cover that. And I'm going to go back to the... to the measure that we are required to do this. And I'm going to ask again, when can we expect a revenue estimate to be adopted?"
- Currie: "When we have a final budget, then your expectations will be met, and I hope they are well met, Sir."
- Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. To the... to the Amendment. Every person in this Body swore on oath to the Constitution of the State of Illinois. We aren't following that. We aren't following the state statute regarding COGFA. But back in my district and I know many of similar situations, people are asking, when are you going to get the budget done? When are you guys going to finish the Fiscal Year '16 budget? I answer them with, I don't know when we're going to finish it because we can't even adopt a revenue estimate which is required by State Law. We're at least four months behind previous years. Why can't we start at the beginning and adopt a fiscal... a fiscal

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

'16 revenue estimate? Until then, you'll continue to see me vote 'no' on these spending measures."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to Leader Currie for putting forth this small step toward really funding critical services that was demonstrated today in our two panels. Listen to our colleagues saying that, I would vote for that if it was a full budget. I do believe that we had a full budget that including the funding for these items, which is where we got to this discussion. Because a full budget, that my Republican colleagues want us to vote on, would exclude funding for safety net hospitals, LIHEAP services, MAP grants for students of higher education, child care services, cuts to Amtrak from \$42 million to \$26 million, higher education cuts to the universities in our state at some \$387 million of cuts. The fully funded budget that they want us to vote on includes eliminating essential services from throughout the state. I cannot imagine how and where we would come together on this issue. Because what I see is very difficult, is I can't sit as a Legislator and watch a young lady have a seizure in this chamber, and not find it a crucial moment, to pass the funding, so that her family can have services. However you try to chop it up, however you try to justify your 'no' vote, you are justifying eliminating that which we are already made room for, by not taking our per diems and our COLA. The money is there because we just gave it back. So, you can't justify voting 'no' based on, I really want a full budget 'cause you had one to vote on, and you voted 'no'. So, we will not support the elimination of these services.

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

And I really do encourage the colleagues to the right, a few of you just move a little bit to the left, so that you can vote for these families who are in real dire need. That is what this is about today. And I appreciate Leader Currie for making a way for us to attempt to do this for those families."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie... Excuse me. Representative Kifowit, who has changed her mind. Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of House. It's been suggested that I should have precleared this proposal with the Governor's Office. I've been here awhile, but I don't think I've ever felt the need to preclear any legislation with any Governor, of either political Party, and I don't think it given the constitutional provisions sense separation of powers. I don't think it makes sense that I should start now. I would this were full-year budget, a budget we could all agree upon; it isn't because there is no agreement. But it does seem to me that it is really important for us to take the federal dollars that we have been offered and enable local communities to spend them, to help meet workforce needs from DuPage County to Cairo, Illinois. To meet the needs of people who want the training, want the help they need to get themselves a respectable job. It is shameful, shameful, if we do not appropriate these federal funds. The only way they can be spent is if we provide spending authority. The idea that in... in my good friend Repub... former Republican State Senator Dan Cronin, now the chairman of the DuPage County Board, the idea that his workforce offices are going to close in the next couple of days without our help, I think it would be shameful for us not to support him. I

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

don't think either Party in this chamber has a lock on superior morality. I don't think that morality belongs to one Party or the other, but I do think that there are some moral imperatives that we as individuals ought to heed, some calls to appropriate, responsible behavior that it is up to us, individually, to answer. You heard the testimony from the people whose lives have been scarred by epilepsy. You saw the woman with a seizure, not uncommon. You know that people with epilepsy die if they do not have appropriate treatment and health. I think it would be unconscionable for the Members of this chamber to turn our backs on these families, these victims. And it would be shameful if we were not to use the federal money and fund workforce investment programs. I urge, individually, your 'aye' votes."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Last try. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 58 voting 'yes' and 27 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk... Excuse me. 58 'yes', 28 'present', Mr. Clerk. And the Amendment is adopted."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Joint Resolution 91. Leader Currie."

Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution..."

Speaker Lang: "...Members will rise."

Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution 91, offered by Speaker Madigan and Representative Currie.

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

- WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives were saddened to learn of the death of our esteemed colleague Henry Woods Bowman of Evanston, also known as H. Woods Bowman, and even more commonly known as Woody; and
- WHEREAS, With a strong desire to help solve challenges facing the State and its people, Woody won election to the Illinois General Assembly in 1976; he represented the 18th Representative District, serving Evanston and its environs, from 1977 to 1990; and
- WHEREAS, H. Woods Bowman will long be remembered for his generosity, his political independence, his willingness to help others, and his work to improve lives; therefore, be it RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that we mourn the passing of H. Woods Bowman and extend our sincere condolences to Michele and all his family, his friends, and all who knew and loved him."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Woody Bowman served in this chamber for a number of years. He was to me, a great friend, a mentor, and a wonderful colleague. Woody was an economist by trade and training. He served as chair of one of the Appropriations Committees in this House. Long before politicians were tossing around the word 'transparent', Woody was using transparency to make the budget process in the State of Illinois more accessible, not only to the public, but to the Members of this chamber and the one across the rotunda. Woody was a straight arrow; he

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

was a role model. He understood honesty; he was the very essence of integrity. He was killed in a horrific accident on I-94. Three weeks ago a trucker out of control caused him to lose his life instantly. He continued his good work in economics and progressive politics. We have lost a great friend, a great person from the State of Illinois in Woody Bowman. And I hope that the Members will join me as Sponsors of this Resolution, and in sending our heartfelt sympathies to Woody's widow Michele and to the rest of his family."

- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves that all Members be added as cosponsors. Is there Leave? Leave is granted. And all Members of the House will be added as cosponsors to the Resolution. The Body will take a moment of silence in memory of Woody Bowman. Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 660, offered by Representative Morrison. House Resolution 662, offered by Representative Evans. House Resolution 663, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 664, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 665, offered by Representative Sims. House Resolution 666, offered by Representative Hammond. House Resolution 669, offered by Representative Riley."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Wallace: "I just simply want to ask for a moment of silence for Sandra Bland an Illinois woman who was ki... whose death is questionable in a Texas case that is now being federally investigated. As she was a fellow Illinoisan, I think we should recognize the sadness of her untimely death with a moment of silence. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you, Representative. Mr. Sandack is recognized."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry."

Sandack: "I... I was hopeful that we'd be favored with more than just next week's schedule, and hopefully there's a schedule coming that we can, as we endeavor down the continuing Session path, have some planning abilities."

Speaker Lang: "Sir, I'll make that request, but as of now we're about to adjourn and all I have is next week for you. So you're about..."

Sandack: "Shocking."

Speaker Lang: "...to hear that. Are your comments completed, Sir?" Sandack: "They are. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. And now leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, pursuant to House Joint Resolution 85, the House is adjourned until Wednesday, August 5 at the hour of 12 noon or until the call of the Speaker. We are adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4256, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4257, offered

74th Legislative Day

7/28/2015

by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4258, offered by Representative Meier, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 4259, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4260, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."