123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will please be in their chairs. The House will be in order. We shall 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 Almighty God, the source of all wisdom, the source of all life, we pray today Your blessings upon this august Assembly, upon the Speaker of this House, upon all of its Members, upon all of its families. We pray, God, as we come before Your great throne, we humble ourselves before You that we may reverence You. We pray, we ask for Your gracious and Your loving guidance. Teach us in all things to seek first Your honor and to seek first Your glory and to seek first Your direction. We pray that You would guide us to perceive what is right. Grant us the courage to pursue it, grant us the grace to accomplish it, that we would perform that which is good, that which is perfect in Your sight. We pray this in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "Be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Wojcicki Jimenez."
- Jimenez 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. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absences of Representatives Acevedo, Chapa LaVia,

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Monique Davis, Dunkin, Feigenholtz, Riley, Scherer, and Soto."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

Brown: "Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Sheri Jesiel is excused this morning.

Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 108 Members answering the roll, we do have a quorum. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment 6 to House Bill 166. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 5684. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1182, offered by Representative Durkin; House Resolution 1183, offered by Representative Sims; and House Joint Resolution 145, offered by Representative Jones, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk. Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution 146, offered by Representative Currie.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, April 22, 2016, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 03, 2016 at 12 o'clock noon or until the

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 03, 2016, or until the call of the President."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. House Bill 6200, on the Order of Third Reading, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6200, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning to the General Assembly. House Bill 6200, the family connections Bill, will put a reasonable cap on rates for... of calls from prisons and eliminate commissions. These commissions are a kickback to the prisons for an exclusive monopoly contract to provide services to captive audiences. The family connection Bill is a consumer protection Bill. The consumers protected are the family members outside of the prison industrial complex who pay extremely high costs to stay in contact with their loved ones inside. For every dollar these poor families spend to stay in touch with their loved ones, 76 cents currently goes to commission kickbacks that Illinois receives. One of the highest rates in the country. This Bill eliminates the clear moral hazard of the commission system where prisoners have every... where prisons have every incentive to choose contracts that collect exorbitant commission amounts from families. We want this Bill to pass today because it's an anti-poverty Bill. Most of the people who are paying this exorbitant cost are women, grandmothers, aunts and family members who can

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

least afford the additional cost. This has happened in 10 other states in this country and we want Illinois to be the eleventh to end the kickbacks. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Yes."

Sandack: "Representative, yeah, you were good enough to give me and share with me a letter from the Illinois Commerce Commission on this, and I appreciate that very much. So can you give us an idea of what the FCC has done with respect to charges associated with prison telephone packages, if you will?"

Ammons: "So the FCC ruled, back in October, to cap the rates for interstate calls across the country, but that did not include the commissions. So the commissions are on top of the rate and each state has to deal with its own commission to lower that cost, regardless to what the FCC does."

Sandack: "But what did the FCC set as a rate with respect to interstate calls?"

Ammons: "What they set was an 11 cents rate."

Sandack: "I'm sorry?"

Ammons: "Eleven cents."

Sandack: "Okay. So they said 11 cents made sense, right? And that is what the expense is if calls are made state to state or out of state. And then they said each state must make a decision in... with respect to intrastate calls."

Ammons: "Correct."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Sandack: "So what do you think... I mean, obviously, you have your Bill and you have a rate set. And we don't want to take away... do you want to take away full discretion from DOC on this?"
- Ammons: "So DOC actually... did not actually have the discretion on this issue until just 2016."

Sandack: "Right."

- Ammons: "This was decided by Central Management Services, had nothing to do with Department of Corrections, and so any revenue that may have been generated initially was being filtered to CMS, not DOC."
- Sandack: "Okay. I... but irrespective of the department, whether it's CMS or DOC, someone had discretion because someone has to set rates, and it was CMS before, it's DOC now. What rate do you... you want to do this legislatively for the first time."

Ammons: "Yes, we do."

Sandack: "And does... how did you come to your rate?"

- Ammons: "Actually, the rate came from the research that was done by the Federal Communications Commission. When they looked across the state, they saw that there was a patchwork of rates and that the companies actually reported that they made significant revenue in the billions of dollars at five cents a minute."
- Sandack: "All right. So you're essentially objecting to what profits come, but what does DOC say with respect to the rates you wish to set upon them?"
- Ammons: "DOC says, please the more the merrier, because we get a greater commission."
- Sandack: "Well, I don't think they say it quite like that, but they do take..."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Ammons: "Seventy-six percent..."

Sandack: "...umbrage..."

Ammons: "...is saying the more the merrier, we get the commission."

Sandack: "Look, I get what you're trying to do. You think there's price gouging going on and do you object..."

Ammons: "Well, that's been found factually by FCC that price gouging is going on."

Sandack: "Let me get this out first then you can go all you want..."

Ammons: "Okay."

Sandack: "...and... and I know you will. Do you think DOC is entitled to try and recapture any expense associated with their operations through telephone charges?"

Ammons: "No. DOC doesn't actually have expense that they demonstrated in relationship to telephone calls."

Sandack: "Oh, okay. So you're going to say..."

Ammons: "They have not demonstrated any expense in relationship to telephone calls."

Sandack: "So, you don't think they have infrastructure expense and/or any overhead with respect to telephone calls?"

Ammons: "Oh, I do... I do think we have overhead costs now, but the people of the State of Illinois already pay sales tax, property tax, taxes to fund the Department of Corrections through the General Fund. This is on top for only a certain segment of the population to pay this extra rate."

Sandack: "So, one more thing. Do you object..."

Ammons: "I'll just remind you that the vendor... all the costs are part of the vendor contracts. So they do already pay that."

Sandack: "Well, I... do you object to any expense recapture or overhead for DOC to pay for things like law books, for access

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

to television, to improvements of any kind or sort for the inmates within these institutions?"

Ammons: "I think that is a different discussion in some way, Mr. Sandack. This is why that's a different discussion. We have programs already, right, they don't actually use them for books. We provide that..."

Sandack: "How do you know that?"

Ammons: "Oh, I know that personally because there's a program called Books to Prisoners that provide all of the books in the prisons today..."

Sandack: "Well then, I guess I do have a follow up."

Ammons: "...in the State of Illinois."

Sandack: "So where is the money going? Because we know DOC is taxed, literally, with too many people to take care of. And we were..."

Ammons: "And that's a great point."

Sandack: "...in different hearings... we were in different hearings with respect to some real difficult things going on. Where's the money going?"

Ammons: "So, currently, all the services, if there are any, and you can talk to inmates and they would disagree, but whatever it is they... those things..."

Sandack: "Inmates disagreeing, I can't believe that."

Ammons: "They... there would be an example that all of these services are already paid for by inmates. Commissions, contracts, all of that."

Sandack: "Well, I don't... no offense, Representative, I don't care what inmates say about what the cost of incarcerating the inmates are. What does DOC say?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Ammons: "DOC have said many things and I can't pinpoint which one is true, nor can I provide that factually to you. What I do know is that the commission is being paid by poor families for no reason except that there's a kickback. So I'm telling you that if you and I..."

Sandack: "But where's... that's a term... that's a... that's a very charged term, Representative."

Ammons: "It is a charged term."

Sandack: "And where does the kickback, you know, proceeds go."

Ammons: "Let me tell you why I use the term kickback because that's in essence, the contract goes to the highest bidder.

And so you and I..."

Sandack: "Well, yeah, that's how it usually goes."

Ammons: "If you and I did that, actually, and get paid back we would actually go to jail for the very same thing that they're doing."

Sandack: "So you're saying that DOC gave a contract to the highest bidder, not the lowest, most responsible bidder."

Ammons: "That's correct."

Sandack: "Then you should be giving that information to the Attorney General, the State's Attorney..."

Ammons: "I actually did..."

Sandack: "...the U.S. Attorney, the FBI, Homeland Security, et al."

Ammons: "Well, there are a few people that have already gone to jail for kickbacks, I'm told."

Sandack: "You people?"

Ammons: "A few people..."

Sandack: "Oh."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Ammons: "...that have gone to jail in the past for kickbacks through DOC. A plumber's contracting."

Sandack: "Representative, you're in Illinois, a few people go to jail for an array of instances..."

Ammons: "It's a normal thing, right?"

Sandack: "...some of which graced our presence here."

Ammons: "And we're trying to end that practice; that's exactly why."

Sandack: "God bless you on that one. To the Bill. The Lady's Bill is a good Bill, in intent. Yet, I don't think it's soup; I don't think we really know. There was an array of questions I asked that she simply doesn't know the answers to. I was in committee when this Bill was brought and there's... and DOC has a different, you know, view of the world on this. I... I agree with the sentiment there shouldn't be price gouging, there shouldn't be anything hurtful to anyone, including inmates' families who wish to stay in contact with their loved ones, which is an important part of rehabilitation. However, I think we're just setting rates, kind of, from our hip here rather than deliberately and with good process. What I would like the Lady to do is take it out and I'll work with her, get DOC to the table and start figuring out the real numbers with some, just a little more plodding and a little more thoughtfulness. If she won't do that, I respect it; I just think it's not soup yet, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, I...

Representative Ammons knows certainly a lot more about the

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

ins and outs of what goes on in these contract than I do, but it just seems to me at that ... in this day what when, you know, can call all over the country for a... with no long distance charge, you know, for a very regular monthly fee that to have this kind of a system in place for prisoners just doesn't make sense. I mean, that's all we're doing is just... is making money off of them for a service that... that should not cost all that much money. And I don't argue that we shouldn't be reimbursing DOC for, you know, for... that they shouldn't be recovering their costs on that, but their costs cannot be what ... what is currently contemplated in ... in this contract. And from a... from a rehabilitative perspective, we... we want folks that remain connected to family and community have lower recidivism rates, do better when they get out and so this is the kind of behavior we should be encouraging, not discouraging by slapping an add... a huge fee on their ability to communicate with loved ones. I think this is a very important Bill; we should be voting 'aye'. This... this has been a problem in... in Illinois and across the country for decades and we have the ability to solve it today. I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons to close."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to address a couple things that was said by the great Gentleman on the other side. The interesting part of this discussion is that it's not a new one. I'm a new Member to the House of Representatives here, but many Members before me have been trying to work on this... what I would consider a very unfair practice in the State of Illinois. Representative Monique Davis worked on

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

this for years before I got here. Several Members of the Senate have worked on this for years. They've never been able to tie this process down, to end the exploitation, unfortunately, of people who are incarcerated. So this time, what we ask for you to do is to join the other states. There are 10 other states who have already done this, who've eliminated this commission, so that we can lower the rate in our state. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 53 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And the Lady asks for Postponed Consideration. Senate Bill 2... I'm sorry. Senate Bill 2059, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2059, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you. I'd like to defer to Representative Mayfield." Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield on 2059."

Mayfield: "Thank you, everyone. We had a very full debate yesterday when we were moving this Bill from... when we were moving the Amendment for this Bill. I think we are pretty much all on the same page. All of the questions ha... should've been addressed either during debate or last night. I know a lot of Members actually had an opportunity to talk to staff and to each other to get clarification on what this Bill does and does not do. This... I want to clarify that the intent of

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

this Bill is stopgap funding. It is not an FY16 fix; it is not the FY17 fix. This is just to get money to our universities, our students and our community colleges as well as MSA. I ask..."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we had a very, very thorough conversation on this yesterday, a very thorough debate. We're going to hear from Leader Durkin and then we're going to hear from one person on opposition. And then we're going to have a Roll Call. Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "Representative Mayfield, we're dealing with Amendment #3, correct? Nothing's changed from what we were debating last time."

Mayfield: "That is correct. Everything's the same."

Durkin: "All right, great. Thank you, again. This is not the end of our work for 2016. We know there's been a lot of discussions regarding human services. I've discussed with you my commitment to work with you and also Representative Bellock, as early as next week, to bring some resolution to this problem we have on the human service side. So, that's my commitment to you and your caucus. So, thank you for bringing this Bill up today. And I'm encouraging all of our Members to support it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, do you rise on opposition?"

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

Speaker Lang: "You are recognized."

Franks: "Thank you. I know I'm a... I know this Bill's going to pass. I understand that. We all want to see schools being funded and because of our terrible job that we've done here in Springfield, we've created hostage situations at every

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

level. We've ... because of our actions, our social service agencies are crumbling in this state; they're closing all around us. Because of our actions, poor people who want to go to college can't go to college because they can't get their MAP grants. Because of our actions, we are losing thousands of people moving out of Illinois. Because of our actions, our universities lost 16 thousand people last year. That's like ... that's the equivalent of losing an entire Northern Illinois University. We have created a political freak show and a financial Armageddon for our state. So when it comes to crises, we careen from crisis to crisis trying to put a stopgap measure and then saying, okay, aren't we great, we saved a school from closing temporarily. We haven't shot the hostages yet; we're giving them a temporary reprieve because the funds that are here may, may, not positive, may get them through to September 1 when they're supposed to open for their fall sessions, while at the same time, we're leaving hundreds of thousands of our citizens... just left ... just kicked aside. So instead of having half measures, instead of doing... doing it like we're doing, why don't we come together and actually pass a real budget. I've heard the Governor say he didn't want a piecemeal budget, but now, apparently, it's okay to do a piecemeal budget. Well, if that's okay, maybe that... that we should be sitting here and stay all weekend and let's work together now that we have a little bit of momentum. We've also heard the Governor say that he's not going to do anything unless it's tied, unless it's tied to his union-busting agenda, but now we've seen that that's not part of this. Well perhaps, that might be something very important going

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

forward, that perhaps he will no longer and you will no longer... on the other side of the aisle be very clear on this, that you will no longer have to be tied... no longer have to be tied to a union-busting ideology that most of you don't even agree with. Because that's what's got us here. Yesterday, courageously, many of you voted for a property tax relief Bill that an hour later the Governor criticized because, gee, it didn't bust unions, it can't be good enough. Now he's saying he's going to vote for this ... he wants us to pass this Bill, but it doesn't have the same union-busting language that he insisted on everywhere else. So perhaps, the one silver lining on this is perhaps, just perhaps, we can take our ideology and leave it somewhere else and work together to come forward to bring our state forward, to save our state. Folks, we are imploding. This is no different than ancient Rome; we are fiddling while Rome burns. Let's not pretend that this is somehow a victory because what this is, is only, is only, delaying the inevitable. So let's work together and get this done but don't be too proud after this passes because all we've done is delay unless we change how we go forward. I'm going to vote 'no' out of protest. I know it's going to pass, but we need to do much better."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ammons? Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr.

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Clerk, HJRCA36. Please read this Constitutional Amendment for a third time."

Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #36 read for a third time at... in full, as amended.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to add Section 11 to Article IX of the Illinois Constitution as follows:

ARTICLE IX

REVENUE

SECTION 11. TRANSPORTATION FUNDS

- (a) No moneys, including bond proceeds, derived from taxes, fees, excises, or license taxes relating to registration, title, or operation or use of vehicles, or related to the use of highways, roads, streets, bridges, mass transit, intercity passenger rail, ports, airports, or to fuels used for propelling vehicles, or derived from taxes, fees, excises, or license taxes relating to any other transportation infrastructure or transportation operation, shall be expended for purposes other than as provided in subsections (b) and (c).
- (b) Transportation funds may be expended for the following: the costs of administering laws related to vehicles and transportation, including statutory refunds and adjustments provided in those laws; payment of highway obligations; costs for construction, reconstruction, maintenance, repair, and

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

betterment of highways, roads, streets, bridges, mass transit, intercity passenger rail, ports, airports, or other forms of transportation; and other statutory highway purposes. Transportation funds may also be expended for the State or local share of highway funds to match federal aid highway funds, and expenses of grade separation of highways and railroad crossings, including protection of at-grade highways and railroad crossings, and, with respect to local governments, other transportation purposes as authorized by law.

(c) The costs of administering laws related to vehicles and transportation shall be limited to direct program expenses related to the following: the enforcement of traffic, railroad, and motor carrier laws; the safety of highways, roads, streets, bridges, mass transit, intercity passenger ports, or airports; and the construction, reconstruction, improvement, repair, maintenance, operation, and administration of highways, under any related provisions of law or any purpose related or incident to, including grade separation of highways and railroad crossings. limitations to the costs of administering laws related to vehicles and transportation under this subsection (c) shall also include direct program expenses related to workers' compensation claims for death or injury of employees of the State's transportation agency; the acquisition of land and the erection of buildings for highway purposes, including the acquisition of highway rights-of-way or for investigations to determine the reasonable anticipated future highway needs; and the making of surveys, plans, specifications, and

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

estimates for the construction and maintenance of flight strips and highways. The expenses related to the construction and maintenance of flight strips and highways under this subsection (c) are for the purpose of providing access to military and naval reservations, defense-industries, defense-industry sites, and sources of raw materials, including the replacement of existing highways and highway connections shut off from general use at military and naval reservations, defense-industries, and defense-industry sites, or the purchase of rights-of-way.

- (d) None of the revenues described in subsection (a) of this Section shall, by transfer, offset, or otherwise, be diverted to any purpose other than those described in subsections (b) and (c) of this Section.
- (e) If the General Assembly appropriates funds for a mode of transportation not described in this Section, the General Assembly must provide for a dedicated source of funding.
- (f) Federal funds may be spent for any purposes authorized by federal law.

SCHEDULE

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act. This was First Reading in... correction... Third Reading in full as amended of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #36."

- Speaker Lang: "On the Order of Third Reading, HJRCA36, Mr. Phelps is recognized."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 36. I

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

first want to say, I want to thank the road builders, the Chamber, IDOT, Representative Fortner, the Operators 150 and also I want to go back in time a little bit and thank our good friend, Bill Black. He brought this up many years ago and I think it's long overdue. This Constitutional Amendment will make sure that taxes collected from the motor fuel tax will only be used on transportation related projects only. Too many times we had funds that have been swept. This is undoubtedly going to make sure that that money is going to be used for projects in our transportation system. It's a jobs Bill and I just ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "A few questions of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, would this avoid any sweeps in the future if this question is approved by voters?"

Phelps: "That's exactly right."

Sandack: "And it would keep segregated sacrosanct tax dollars for improvements to the infrastructure... for infrastructure and infrastructure only?"

Phelps: "Absolutely."

Sandack: "Do you know of any opponents other than IDOT?"

Phelps: "I have none... and a matter of fact because we amended it the other day, Ron, they... they are totally fine."

Sandack: "So all opponents are off?"

Phelps: "All opponents are off."

Sandack: "Thank you for bringing this. Thank you for your diligence and hard work."

Phelps: "Thank you, Ron."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Sandack: "I stand in strong support."

Phelps: "Thanks, Ron."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to a possible conflict of interest, I will be voting 'present'."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Representative Flowers is recognized."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to congratulate the Gentleman on this very important Resolution because it is about creating jobs. And I think downstate has done itself a disservice for such a long time because they were so busy building prisons and keeping people locked up. And as a result of this, instead of having bodies locked up, we will have the money locked in a box to create jobs and make the roads and bridges safe for everyone in the State of Illinois. And I commend you, Representative, for bringing forth this Resolution."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, first of all, thank you so much for bringing this Amendment forward. For the purposes of legislative intent, I would like to ask some questions, if that would be appropriate?"

Phelps: "Sure. And Representative, thank you for... 'cause I know you were one of the main Sponsors on this before, so thank you for your hard work on this as well."

Fortner: "Okay. So, first of all, in your introductory remarks you stated the Constitutional Amendment would not apply to

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

moneys raised by state and local sales taxes on the sale of motor fuel. Is this correct?"

- Phelps: "Yeah. It does not apply... does not apply to state and local taxes on the sale of motor fuel. But you are correct, the Constitutional Amendment is not intended to apply to moneys raised by state and local sales taxes on the sale of motor fuel. State sales tax moneys raised on the sale of motor fuel, for example, are deposited into GRF and not indicated for transportation purposes. I have discussed this matter with the Senate Sponsor of the Amendment as well as the Amendment's House cosponsors. We are in agreement that the Amendment is not intended to apply to state and local sales tax moneys on the sale of motor fuel."
- Fortner: "Thank you very much for that. I read the language in the Constitutional Amendment, and I agree that the language used is ambiguous. Do you also view the language as ambiguous?"
- Phelps: "Yes, I do, as do my colleagues, cosponsors of the Constitutional Amendment. Thank you for your questions to clarify this matter for purposes of legislative intent, Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Next, you mentioned that motor fuels taxes in your introductory remarks and also in the answer to the previous question am I correct that the Constitutional Amendment also protects the current distribution of moneys raised from the State Motor Fuel Tax that are shared with local governments as well as transferred to the State Boating Fund Act, Grade Crossing Protection Fund, and Vehicle Inspection Fund?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Phelps: "Representative Fortner, yes, that is correct because the current distribution of moneys from the State Motor Fuel Tax are dedicated to transportation purposes only."
- Fortner: "That's great. Representative Phelps, this leads me to my next question. What about the Regional Transportation Authority Sales Tax that is imposed in Cook and the collar counties and the Real Estate Transfer Tax in the City of Chicago that are dedicated to the Public Transportation Fund? Are those moneys protected by this Constitutional Amendment?"
- Phelps: "Yes. Those moneys from the RTA sales tax and the City of Chicago's Real Estate tax... Transfer Tax are protected by the Constitutional Amendment that we have before us."
- Fortner: "What about federal transportation funds that state and local governments receive, are those federal funds subject to this Constitutional Amendment?"
- Phelps: "No. Federal funds are not covered by this Constitutional Amendment 'cause Federal Law controls what purposes those moneys may be spent on."
- Fortner: "What about moneys today that are raised from specialty license plates for firefighters or veterans that are shared with charitable organizations? Would those moneys be able to be shared with a charitable organization under this Constitutional Amendment?"
- Phelps: "Yes. Those moneys could continue to be shared with charitable organizations, so long as the full regular license plate fee is paid and used for transportation purposes only."
- Fortner: "Just a few more clarifications. Would you agree that the moneys covered by this Constitutional Amendment could be

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- spent on IDOT's operating expenses to administer public transportation programs?"
- Phelps: "Yes. Transportation moneys could be spent on those activities based on subsection (b) of the Amendment which states that moneys may be spent on maintenance, operation, and administration of highways as well as costs associated with the enforcement of traffic, railroad, and motor carrier laws."
- Fortner: "Okay. One last question. Would you also agree that moneys covered by this Constitutional Amendment could be spent on IDOT operating expenses relating to the administration of public transportation programs?"
- Phelps: "Yeah and this was very important. I agree with you. Subsection (b) of the Constitutional Amendment states that transportation moneys can be spent on costs for the betterment of mass transit, intercity passenger rail and other forms of transportation, Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Well, thank you, again, so much for those clarifications and making sure that we all understand what we're voting on. This Constitutional Amendment, I think, will be a welcome addition to our Illinois Constitution. For so long, people who have contributed moneys to the Road Fund in a way that had an expectation that their moneys were going to go to transportation purposes, whether it be maintaining our roads, building new infrastructure to promote transportation, and a variety of purposes related to keeping our transportation network strong. Illinois has its prominent place very much because of transportation. The connection between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River, railroads and the highway

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

system that bring so much of the nation's freight traveling through Illinois. I think this will only help our economy in the long run by getting the moneys directed to where they belong. Thank you. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the adoption of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves.

Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Phillips."

Phillips: "Mr. Speaker, personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Phillips: "Please welcome with me my Page today, Jordan Easton. You want to stand up for us, please? This young man is a junior at Charleston High School and recently he's got interested in politics and wanted to see how Springfield works first-hand. So I thought this would be the best thing for him to come and just sit right here, especially, during this time period so he can see how wonderful it is. So he can make that decision whether he wants to: a) be a firefighter or b) actually get into politics. I think he's already made up his mind after the last few days; he's going to be a firefighter. Also his dad, Jamie, is in the… is in the balcony up here. Stand up Jamie, and want to welcome all them from Charleston, Illinois. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir, and welcome both of you to the House chamber. Mr. Meier."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Meier: "Yes. I'd like to congratulate today two people from my home county, Chuck Melton of Hoyleton and Eric Newby of Nashville. They are members of the U.S.A. wheelchair rugby team and they won the gold medal in Paris, France, and now... they will now be going on to Rio."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. HJRC5, Mr. McSweeney. Proceed, Sir."
- McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, House Joint Reso..."
- Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, one second, Sir. Has this been read a third time, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #5 has been read a third time."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. You may proceed, Sir."
- McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 5 simply eliminates the office of the Lieutenant Governor here in the State of Illinois. This is long overdue. In 2013, I proposed the same Constitutional Amendment; it passed with 83 votes. And we need to show the people of this state that we're serious about actually eliminating unnecessary offices. I have the highest respect for the current Lieutenant Governor. She has done a great job in consolidation. My aim here is to save money for the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. Over the last five years, we've spent about \$1.6 million on the Lieutenant Governor's Office. It's an office with no constitutional responsibilities. I think it's time to show the voters that we're serious about cutting spending in this state. We also have an issue that has come up over the last couple weeks that I've had a number of discussions on, and that's on the issue of succession. I

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

am not changing the succession in my Constitutional Amendment that is currently in the Illinois Constitution. Let me repeat, I am not changing that succession. The succession in the Constitution is the ... if this goes into effect and is approved by the voters, is the Attorney General and the Secretary of State. That's how it works in the Constitution. There is a separate Bill that then would go to the Comptroller, Treasurer, President of the Senate and then the Speaker of the House. There are seven states without a Lieutenant Governor and it's working just fine. My view is, let's give voters the ability to make the choice of whether they want to eliminate the Lieutenant Governor's Office. That's what I'm asking for today. Give voters a chance to cut spending. Make sure that we're being honest that we're showing that we can eliminate an unnecessary office. Next election... this would not go into effect until January of 2019, the voters will know when they are electing Attorney General, they're electing a Secretary of State, they are also electing a potential Governor. I believe the way the Constitution was set up here in the State of Illinois... the Attorney General being the chief law enforcement officer, it is a very important office that voters will know what they're doing. I ask for your support of this Constitutional Amendment. Let's show that we're serious about cutting spending in this state."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Breen: "Representative, how long have the Governor and Lieutenant Governor been running as a team instead of running separately?"
- McSweeney: "They've actually been running as a team over the last few election cycles, Representative. It used to be that they were elected separately in Primaries. Now, they actually are running as a team. My view is that that is unnecessary because what we have is we have a Constitutional line of succession in order right now that I believe will..."
- Breen: "And that's wonderful and tha... that's an answer to my question. But next up, you... you mentioned cost. How much is the Lieutenant Governor paid?"
- McSweeney: "One hundred thirty-seven thousand two hundred and fifty dollars."
- Breen: "How much are our other top agency directors paid?"
- McSweeney: "Agency directors vary, Representative, as you know..."
- Breen: "Right. But... but more than 137 thousand."
- McSweeney: "My... was... Let me answer the question. Let me answer your question..."
- Breen: "Right. But your... that's... you just did. You don't know."
- McSweeney: "And the answer to the question is, not only are we paying \$137 thousand a year, we're paying \$1.6 million on average for salaries in the Lieutenant Governor's Office. So, I mean..."
- Breen: "And who made the appropriation for the \$1.6 million for salaries within the Lieutenant Governor's Office?"
- McSweeney: "You know what's really sad about that? While social services are getting decimated in this state, while we're not funding education, the Lieutenant Governor's employees are on

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

an automatic appropriation. They're getting paid without an appropriation. That's how they're getting paid."

Breen: "An appropriation by this General Assembly."

McSweeney: "No, that's not true. It's on a continuing appropriation. You are not correct. They're getting paid without the appropriation."

Breen: "We have to appropriate every year to the budget. You know, I..."

McSweeney: "They are getting paid without an appropriation."

Breen: "Representative, I'm not..."

McSweeney: "The social services in this state are being decimated."

Breen: "Representative, I'm not shouting at you."

McSweeney: "And the... the higher education is not being funded.

And they're being paid automatically. That's the answer to your question."

Breen: "Representative, you know, there's no need to shout."

McSweeney: "And... and I'm answering your questions."

Breen: "Well, okay."

McSweeney: "I'm answering your questions. Keep them coming."

Breen: "Its 137..."

McSweeney: "Keep them coming, Representative."

Breen: "...thousand. Wow."

McSweeney: "Keep them coming."

Breen: "All right. We'll have a little more lively debate this morning. I mean, great."

Speaker Lang: "Here's what we're going to do. Here's what we're going to do. We're going to quiet down in the chamber."

Breen: "Representative, under your proposal..."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Speaker Lang: "No. We're... we're going to quiet down in the chamber."

Breen: "Sorry. Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "I don't care how long it takes. I don't know about the rest of you, but I would like to get our work finished today. How about that? Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, under your proposal, who will take over the Governor's Office in the case of a temporary ailment or disability of the Governor?"

McSweeney: "It's the current succession order that's currently in the Constitution right now. Representative, all that we are doing is simply eliminating the office of Lieutenant Governor so it's the succession of order that's in the Constitution..."

Breen: "I didn't hear your answer."

McSweeney: "...which includes... which includes the Attorney General."

Breen: "The Attorney General. Okay."

McSweeney: "And... and the Attorney General. If there's no Attorney General, it goes to the Secretary of State. If there's no Secretary of State, it goes to the Comptroller. If there's no Comptroller there... it goes to the State Treasurer. If there's no State Treasurer, it goes to the President of the Senate. Then it goes to the Speaker of the House, to answer your question."

Breen: "To the Amendment or to the Resolution, as much fun as we're having with question and answer. Look, this General Assembly started on an experiment here in Illinois a few years ago, and we decided to have the Governor and Lieutenant Governor run as a team to present themselves to the people of

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

the state as a team the same way that our... our President and Vice President run as a team. And now, that we have finally got an example of running as a team, you have your first Latina Lieutenant Governor and you actually see her taking on independent responsibilities that are really the beginning of an exploration of what a Lieutenant Governor can actually do in this state. And whether you're a Republican or a Democrat, the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor now going forward are able to be more of a... of a team. And... and when we hear that roughly 45 states have Lieutenant Governors, you know, we're not a small state and we may have multiple places where we need to be represented. I had a... a colleague bring up the fact that foreign heads of state come to visit, who receives them? Just mundane things like that. Funerals of military service members, who's able to go there when there may be a ... you know, an emergency on the other side of the state or we may be stuck in budget negotiations? Who's going to be there to represent the State of Illinois? What about... I know that many people want to see our Governor go out and do some economic development in other states and countries. When he's away, who is here to help, you know, represent the state in his absence? And then more serious... more seriously the cost, \$137 thousand is lower than most of our agency directors get paid. It's lower than any of our school superintendent's pay. And if this is cost-based, then I'd say it's up to us to ... to tell them to cut back the office. 'Cause there are jobs being done by the Lieutenant Governor that are still going to have to get done. We, ourselves, could wrap it into the Governor's Office; we can do that through our power. And frankly, I think

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

that the Governor's Office would be glad to negotiate with us on a cost savings basis. The other issue is this temporary ailments issues. And... and it was raised to me that ... you know, look, I mean, the Attorney General has a job, and it's a very serious job that needs to be done. The Secretary of State has a job, a very serious job that needs to be done and... and they're not set up, necessarily, to ... to take over as acting Governor. You know, say if the Governor has a kidney transplant or has to go for chemotherapy or something like that as has happened in other states. Instead, the people of this state have chosen a Lieutenant Governor who they trust to step in. You know, nowadays I think it's... it would be shortsighted and really small of us to think that somehow we can just trade Parties back and forth. That, well, you may elect a conservative Republican Attorney General and you may elect a liberal Democrat as your Governor. If that Governor is unavailable, you don't ... the people don't necessarily want those folks to... the Attorney General to step in. We've set up a system. You know, there's another... another issue that we... we in the State of Illinois, unfortunately, have needed the Lieutenant Governor on a regular basis. I don't think anybody who knows Illinois politics or who's lived here for any length of time would see it as a legitimate concern that if the Attorney General is a member of the opposite Party and we were considering the impeachment of a Governor that impeachment might not move so quickly and it might, even if it... even assuming the best of intentions, politics could come into play on an impeachment consideration. Again, we... we've got the first Latina to ever hold the office of Lieutenant

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Governor and then we will immediately, thereafter, eliminate the Office of lieutenant Governor. You know, look, whether it's a Republican or a Democrat holding this office, there is a need for the office. I don't believe we will save any money eliminating the office, but instead we will reduce the number of Constitutional Officers available to our people to do the job here. And for that reason, I would respectfully urge a 'no' vote, even despite, you know, maybe the... the quick talking point, hey consolidation, because this is consolidation without savings. And in those instances, consolidation is not really worthwhile. So again, I would respectfully urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, before I address the Resolution, I'd like to make a ... an observation on what the previous speaker just said. He said that as an experiment we teamed the Governor and Lieutenant Governor together as a ticket. Well, to show you that I've been around here too long and to give you some sense of a little bit of history, it doesn't ... it wasn't an experiment. It actually goes back to the 1986 Gubernatorial Election when the Democrat Lieutenant Gubernatorial candidate happened to be a LaRouche, won the... the Democrat nomination for Lieutenant Governor and Adlai Stevenson won the Democratic nomination for Governor and Adlai Stevenson was not about to run with a LaRouche candidate as his Lieutenant Governor candidate. So he actually went out and formed a separate party called the Solidarity Party, which of course didn't help him win the election, which he didn't do and he

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

lost to... to Jim Thompson. So it wasn't an experiment, it was quite frankly, a very deliberate effort to make sure that the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor pair up and work together and the voters elect a team to help them lead the state. So, let me just turn to the Resolution for a second. As the Sponsor said, there are seven states that don't have a... a Lieutenant Governor position. Well, that's technically correct; however, there are two states which do indeed provide for someone to serve as Lieutenant Governor, specifically, West Virginia and Tennessee. They have ... they're either President of the Senate or what they call the Speaker of the Senate serve as Lieutenant Governor, so they do have a Lieutenant Governor's position. So that leaves five states without a Lieutenant Governor's position. So, if we abolish the Lieutenant Governor's position, Illinois, the fifth largest state in the union, a state of 13... 12.5 million people, fifth largest state in the union. We'd be right up there with, let's see, Wyoming and we'd be right up there with Maine, and we'd be right up there with New Hampshire. There you go. Let's see, New Hampshire has a.m. a budget of about one point... excuse me, has a budget of about \$6.5 billion, with 1.3 million people. Maine has 1.3 million people with a budget of \$5 billion and Wyoming, now Wyoming, no Lieutenant Governor, they've got 600 thousand people and a budget of \$6 billion. Population wise we are 10 times bigger than those other states. We are at least eight times... nine times bigger when it come to a budget, but we want to put ourselves on the par with Maine and New Hampshire and Wyoming. We're a big state, big companies have CEOs and COOs, a team

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

that runs the company. We are a big state. Now oftentimes, to show you again I've been around here too long, I was around here when... when Dave O'Neal, who was Governor Thompson's Lieutenant Governor, said, well, I don't want to be the Lieutenant Governor anymore and he just left office and it was vacant. And Bob Kustra, who was State Senator, who became Lieutenant Governor, said well, I'm going to do something else, and he left the Lieutenant Governor's Office. And for a period of time, the Lieutenant Governor's Office was vacant. And when Governor, former Governor Quinn, who was Lieutenant Governor ascended to the Governor's Office after Governor Blagojevich's impeachment, the Lieutenant Governor's Office was vacant. So yes, there are periods of time when it is and can be vacant, but that doesn't mean that the relationship between the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor cannot be positive. It doesn't mean that the Lieutenant Governor cannot be assigned important responsibilities, such as the current Lieutenant Governor was given the responsibility to oversee a task of seeing how we might consolidate all of our excess units of government in the State of Illinois. So the Lieutenant Governor can have very important functions as was mentioned by the previous speaker in terms of ceremonial functions. And in terms of a budget, let's look at the idea of savings. It's been said that the Lieutenant Governor's Office was \$1.6 million. Well, that's not entirely right. For FY14 the Lieutenant Governor's Office was \$1.4 million, for FY15 it was \$1.4 million, for FY16 the proposed budget by this Governor was \$1.25 million, and for FY17 it's \$1.52 million. Okay. It's a million dollars; a million dollars is

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

not chump change and we could do away with it ... we could do away with spending \$1.25 million by doing away with the office. However, if you don't want to spend \$1.25 million, quess what? The Lieutenant Governor's Office has to come before the General Services Appropriations Committee and ask for a budget. And three or four years ago, we cut that budget by 25 percent. We said... Sheila Simon was the Lieutenant Governor, we said what you're doing is duplicative of other services and the committee said we're going to cut your budget by 25 percent. And that's exactly what we did. So my point is this, if we don't want to spend \$1.25 million, when the Lieutenant Governor comes to the General Appropriations Committee, we appropriate a hundred thousand or two hundred thousand, but we still have the office. And I think that's the point. Now, I realize this ... this Resolution passed with 83 votes last time around; it'll probably fly out of here this time around. That doesn't make it right. It doesn't make it the right thing to do for a state that has a \$30-plus billion budget that has 1.3... excuse me, that has 13... nearly 13 million people. We're a big operation, we deserve to have both a Governor as well as a Lieutenant Governor and the issue that was brought up earlier about succession is very real. I like the Attorney General, I really do. But I will tell you that if we didn't have the Lieutenant Governor and the current Governor, who is a Republican, was somehow incapacitated or worse and couldn't perform his office, I don't want that Attorney General, who is of a different Party, ascending to the office of Governor. I want somebody who was elected as a team with the Governor... the people elected as a

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

team with the Governor to ascend that office. So again, I certainly think this is going to pass; however, I don't think it's the right idea. I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Martwick: "So, Dave, I don't want to go too far over what's been said. I... I'm just curious, like, when you... when you were drafting this Amendment, obviously, succession is a concern and I think for both sides, you know, you... you want that smooth transition if something were to happen. Was there no way to build that into this Amendment?"

McSweeney: "Representative, I just wanted to keep the current Constitution succession order that was adopted back in 1970."

Martwick: "Right."

McSweeney: "I didn't want to change the order. And it's... this does not go into effect until 2019, so the voters will know that the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, that those are potential Governors. So I did not want to change the existing Constitutional frame work. I... I'm comfortable with that and... and I believe that... that the people... that... that's what the great thing about this Constitutional Amendment is, it gives the ability for the people to make that decision in November on whether they agree with me."

Martwick: "Yeah and... and to that point, you know, I... I'm a big fan of democracy. As you know, I run some democracy forward issues, elected school boards and what not, but I wonder about that Constitutional Amendment, and I'm not suggesting it's a

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

bad idea here, I generally like to turn to the voters. But I wonder if there is an imbalance at some point, right, where we say to ourselves, well, we got elected to make decisions and... and punting to the voters, while sometimes we want them to weigh in, sometimes I think they want us to make decisions. And you know, I... as I was sitting here listening to the debate I think, well, it might be very easy politically to get rid of the Lieutenant Governor, but you know, if we allow constantly changing the structure of our government, there might be a time when a particular Governor, right, we can pass a Constitutional Amendment that says, hey, we don't need a Governor. And at certain times people might like that idea, right. So, sometimes we're supposed to be the voice of reason. We're supposed to make the decisions. I haven't decided how I'm going to vote here, but I... I think that this could be tightened up for the voters to give them a little bit more certainty. I really think the lack of orderly succession, it ... it really is troubling to me, so I... I don't know if you would consider putting that in or not, but you know, I think that's important."

McSweeney: "I... I appreciate your questions and... and the way you're coming at this. I'm comfortable with the current succession.

I... I believe the voters were... were comfortable, so I'm going to move forward, but I appreciate your questions."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Franks: "First of all, David, thank you for allowing me to be a chief cosponsor. I've stood with you before on this and I really appreciate you bringing this forward. Can you tell us, is this the exact same Bill that we passed out of here a few years ago with 83 votes?"
- McSweeney: "It's exactly the same thing, not one change."
- Franks: "Okay. And are you getting support for this Bill? Has anybody... has anybody come out against this Bill?"
- McSweeney: "I believe I'm going to have more than 71 votes, I hope; we're going to soon see."
- Franks: "Has anyone... was there any opposition in committee? Was there anyone who weighed in on any opposition?"
- McSweeney: "Jack, we're going to see here today how many votes I have. I feel comfortable where I stand right now."
- Franks: "Has the Governor weighed in on this?"
- McSweeney: "Where things stand right now he's... I'm not exactly sure what that position is, but that said..."
- Franks: "Yeah. I... again, I appreciate you bringing this. I... I'd like to comment on a few things. To the... to the Amendment... to the Constitutional Amendment. I heard one of my friends talk about one of the criticisms is how can we allow the succession to be perhaps from one Party to another? Like, gee, that... that would just be terrible because then we wouldn't have the continuity. I'm not sure what he's seeing, but I don't think things are working so well right now. Okay. Perhaps, having to work together across the aisle might actually be a good thing. I don't think anyone would accuse Illinois of being a model of government efficiency. One of the arguments, it sounds like you're worried that we might become dysfunctional

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

if people from the other side got involved. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are dysfunctional. What we have now does not work. Now I... I hope that this passes today, but let's not kid ourselves, this will not pass in the Senate. And you want to know why? Because we saw yesterday a bunch of hypocrites, who not only sponsored and voted for this Bill a few years ago, went through a series of gymnastics to justify their pathetic flip-flop. Now the only thing that changed was the Party that controlled the office. A couple years ago it was a great idea when a Democrat had it, but this year all of a sudden it's just an awful idea when a Republican has it. And we wonder why our state is in dysfunction, because it's politics 24-7, 100 percent of the time. It's not about what's good for the people, it's only about what's good for the insiders. Our state motto ought to be, where's mine? Because that's what this... that's what it's about. Ladies and Gentlemen, let's be honest, this is a ceremonial post. It is an expensive, needless, insurance policy. When then Lieutenant Governor Quinn ascended to the Governorship after we impeached him no one noticed that the Lieutenant Governor's Office was vacant. Actually, our Constitution requires that if there's a vacancy that it remain vacant because it doesn't do anything. This isn't about personalities; this is about an old system that no longer is part of the 21st century. If we're ever going to reform government, if we're ever going to ask for citizens to do... to do with less and for government to do with less, we must lead by example. And frankly, the only job description I can think for the Lieutenant Governor is to wake up in the morning, read the obituary, and see if they won the lottery.

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

That's it. There are nothing else that they do, anything else could be moved over. Let's not kid ourselves. This needs to go. Let's send a message over to the Senate that we're serious about reforming Illinois, and that we're about reforming our government, and doing the right thing. And let's put it back over there and make them rethink their stupid vote yesterday. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. Certainly, this is a popular idea. Certainly, it polls really well, but to me it strikes me as governing by gimmick. Frankly, we're doing all too much of that lately. Our higher institutions are on the brink of closure. Our debt is piling up. Our human service programs are being decimated to the point that the most vulnerable among us are being left out in the cold. Chicago public schools continue to be in fiscal crisis. Feels today like we're pandering to the voters instead of doing the real work we need to do. That's why I will not be supporting this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the... would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, B.: "And Representative, I sponsored this Constitutional Amendment 'X' number of years ago and I'll support it. And I don't... Mike, this question might have been asked and I apologize if it has and I'm going to be repetitive. How many times in the last three decades has that office been vacant?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

McSweeney: "Three times: under Governor Thompson, under Governor Edgar, and when Blagoje... when Governor Blagojevich was impeached."

Mitchell, B.: "And the state survived."

McSweeney: "Yes, Sir."

Mitchell, B.: "So the office is so important, as I recall, historically, Dave O'Neal was bored and left. Bob Kustra was bored and left. And of course we know Mr. Quinn. This is... this is a good Bill, this is a superfluous office. I support it and I urge the Body to support it."

McSweeney: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney to close."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, let's show that we're serious about cutting spending. Every editorial board in this state has supported this so far. This is a good government Bill. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "This requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no'. And the House adopts the Resolution. HJRCA33, Mr. Sandack. Out of the record. HJRCA59, Mr. Mitchell. I understand this has been read a third time, Mr. Clerk? This has not been read a third time? We... we're just going to move it to third so just place this on the Order of Third Reading. House Bill 6213. Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6213, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you. 6213, it reduces the information gap that currently exists for Medicaid recipients in managed care and it increases overall transparency within the Medicaid managed care system. HFS and the Illinois Association of Medicaid Health Plans are neutral on this Bill. I have no opposition. And it passed the committee 14-0. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Gabel: "So, thank you for bringing this Bill to the floor, Representative. I appreciate the work that you've done with the department and... and the Medicaid managed care agencies. I think you've done great work. It is still keeping the integrity of the Bill by making many compromises. So one of my concerns has always been with the quality of services provided by managed care companies. And how does your Bill address that?"

Ammons: "Thank you for the question. Right now, Representative, the Medicaid enrollees have no information on how well one plan is performing over another. 6213 requires the Department of Healthcare and Family Services to create a plan quality comparison tool that will allow consumers to compare the quality of Medicaid health plans that they have to pick from. Medicaid and private health insurance plans are increasingly moving towards consumers being able to make informed... informed apples to apples and comparisons when they choose a

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

health care plan. This Bill would allow Medicaid enrollees to do that and make it much easier for them to make selections."

Gabel: "I... again, I appreciate this Bill; I think it's incredibly important. Millions of people will have... will be having to choose their plans and I think it's really important for them to know what the quality of these plans are."

Ammons: "Thank you."

Gabel: "So, thank you, again, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "A few questions of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Carol, just explain current law, what the requirements for disclosure are, and what your Bill does..."

Ammons: "I'm sorry. I... I can't hear you. I can't hear your question. I'm sorry."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Carol, I was asking if you could explain what current law requires these managed care entities to do and publish, and what your Bill does, if it's passed."

Ammons: "So they... they do have to publish information on their website right now. The problem is that some of the information is outdated and it's not updated regularly. This Bill allows us to update that information more regularly, to take doctors out of network that may not be in network anymore, and to make the process for consumer selection much easier."

Sandack: "All right. So the previous speaker was talking about quality, which I certainly agree. Your Bill, however, is talking about information..."

Ammons: "Right."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Sandack: "...to patients and enrollees so that they know their...
their networks..."

Ammons: "Right."

Sandack: "...and they know the pricing and other information and requires more updating of websites and other information required under current law."

Ammons: "That's correct."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Ammons: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "I want to say thank you, Representative Ammons, for this particular piece of legislation. I've actually looked at some of these plan formularies. They're actually pretty challenging for individuals to understand. And I think it's very important for my constituents to know how the plan that they're picking or enrolling in actually covers medication and if there are any other requirements that kind of go along with the plan. I'm wondering, does your Bill, the 6213, actually do anything about the medication formularies and the Medicaid managed ca... managed care situation because that's been a major concern of some of the... some of my constituents."

Ammons: "Thank you so much. Some of the questions that we've had,
 I've had from my office is, you know, I don't know how to
 choose these formularies. And so this Bill is going to make
 this much clearer for them to understand, put it in clear
 English for people to make a selection when they go on the
 website. It requires the plans to clearly show how the

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

formularies were last updated. How consumers can report information to the Medicaid managed care plan if the formulary is inconsistent or if there needs to be some corrections on the list. And so the Bill will make it much easier for people to make their selections through the formulary process."

Wallace: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative Ammons. To the Bill. I... I know that it's very difficult for individuals to kind of understand how these formularies work in terms of what medication will be provided for them. And I... I stand in strong support of this particular legislation because it... it just kind of sets the tone. It sets a commonsense provision for those who are having to deal with the Illinois Medicaid managed care system. And it really helps me to kind of be able to respond to my constituents and their needs. It helps all of us be able to respond in that way. So I encourage an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5729, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5729, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5729 is the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Act. It is designed to

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

do two things: provide tools to our high schools and community colleges to address the situation in which many students come from high school into community college and are... are not prepared for college level work and end up in remedial classes that don't bear credit, delay their completion of college or their certificate program, and also make college more unaffordable. So it gives some flexibility to high school districts to prepare students by looking at fourth... fourthyear math options that would make them college ready. The other provision is to provide school districts with an opportunity to develop... to develop alternative competency based high school graduation requirements. It sets up a pilot program for high school districts to do that and lays out the procedures by which they would go to participate in that pilot program. It has many supporters including the school administration groups, Advance Illinois. It has the support of lots of education-based advocacy groups. I urge an 'aye' vote and ask for... look forward to any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1190, Representative Kelly Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 6013, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. House Bill 6163, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6163, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

"Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 6163 allows a Home Rule municipality to disconnect property held within the fire protection district if the Home Rule municipality provides services to at least 80 percent of the territory within the municipality. Under this Bill, the municipality may submit a petition signed by the mayor or village president to the Circuit Court including statements providing, among other things, that the disconnection would not impair the ability of the district to render fully adequate fire protection service to the property remaining in the district. That it is a Home Rule municipality that provides for its own fire service for at least 80 percent of the territory within the municipality. This basically allows one of my towns, Hanover Park, which I represent, to have complete responsibility for all aspects of fire and EMS services within their corporate boundaries. And be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "I know that part of the problem I'm hearing from the Bloomingdale Fire Protection District is by having this break apart it will actually affect their... their budget quite significantly. That they have a concern that they will not... it's almost 10 percent of their budget by having this disconnect. Are your figures the same as that or is there a contingency plan to assist the fire protection district?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Crespo: "It is my understanding, we've heard numbers above it's like 400... \$450 thousand that they claim that they won't be able to collect through their taxes. We're trying to reconcile that with the fact that their... based on their call volume, these two parcels represent three percent of the calls that they get. If in fact... if that is true, we also know that they have a bond that expires this year in which they're paying \$500 thousand, so the net effect would be zero since they're not paying the bonds anymore after this year. It would've been a problem two or three years ago because they still had the bonds and if, in fact, that were true, which we're... which we're not sure, but with the bonds expiring now this year, with the \$500 thousand that more than covers whatever potential loss they claim they might have."
- Willis: "So you're stating that they would need to reapply for new bonds or continue the bonds to be able to..."
- Crespo: "My understanding is that they won't need to do that anymore. You know, those bonds expire. So..."
- Willis: "Okay. And my other question is, what would this do to the taxing rate for the people that are in that district that... that area that'll be switched over to the municipal fire protection as opposed to what they're paying right now on the... the district rates?"
- Crespo: "So what I can say about that is in talking to... to the municipality, they're telling me that they can provide the same services to those two parcels at a cost of, like, \$185 thousand compared to the attest \$450 thousand that this fire protection district is claiming they need to... to serve that... those two parcels."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Willis: "But are we looking at a tax increase for the people that are in that particular area?"

Crespo: "Well, the tax levy should be the same, so they should be able to recover whatever it is that they need. And not only that, but let me just tell you, they still have to go through a court proceeding and one of the things that the... that they have to show in court is if, in fact, they... they're... if they do say effectively that by disconnecting that they're going to lose the ability to render services adequately to the district where they are or if it provides a... a negative financial impact on them, then the courts might decide not to do it. So they still have that appeal process."

Willis: "So, I guess my question is, are we setting a precedence to allow other areas to switch when... when this first went into effect, I believe it was like 30 years ago, with the fire protection district as opposed to the municipalities and recently, we've gone through where there is, I believe it's in statute, that states when you switch over there has to be a payment that graduates into there to take care of that. Where do we stand on that? 'Cause I'm understanding that the two, the municipality and the fire protection district, are at two polar opposite ends on this and... and that's a major concern for me on it."

Crespo: "Well, in terms of what you just stated, the payback, and I think it was like 80/40 I forgot what... what the terms were."

Willis: "I think it's 80, 60, 40 or something like that."

Crespo: "It only... it only applies if there's an annexation, which does not apply here. These two parcels are already inside the corporate limits of the municipality, so... so in effect, that

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

law does not apply to this situation. They're not annexing property; it's already included within the corporate boundaries."

Willis: "Even though we're switching who their fire protection is?"

Crespo: "Correct."

- Willis: "So it's on that. To the Bill. I... I am very hesitant to support this Bill. We're... we're taking something that has worked in the past and putting in to something else. Fire protection is important no matter who gives it, whether it is from a municipality or for... for fire protection district. One of the advantages, though, of going to a fire protection district is that you do have much better transparency. You know specifically what the levies are going to be, you are able to FOIA and see specifically where the expenses and the cost are with that. When you deal with a fire municipality, oftentimes it muddies the water and it's... we're... while we always want to support our police and fire, it's sometimes much more difficult to break that out when we're looking at where's the money going, what's it getting spent for. So, with that in mind, I would urge a 'no' vote on this. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt. Leader Turner in the Chair. All right.

 Representative Lang back in the Chair. Mr. Moffitt is recognized."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sure thought that looked like Leader Lang still there, although, the visual is changing here at the moment. I think you're being..."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Speaker Lang: "And since you tap danced long enough, Leader Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Leader... Leader Turner, and you look very nice there and stepping in like..."

Speaker Turner: "Sure."

Moffitt: "...a Lieutenant Governor or whatever. It's great to see you. Representative Crespo, you and I have talked about this a little bit, and I certainly, you know, know that your desires are... are honorable. Do have some concerns. There are lots of opponents to this legislation yet, right? The Illinois Association of Fire Districts. I'm sure you're... you're analysis shows, but there are a lot of opponents. None of those have been removed, have they?"

Crespo: "I'm sorry. What was the question?"

Moffitt: "Have any of the opponents been removed with any of your..."

Crespo: "No, no. So we knew, Representative Moffitt, when we introduced this piece of legislation, that it's natural for the fire protection districts to come together and oppose it. We expected that. But I need to add that the Illinois Municipal League is strongly in favor of this. I need to add that the State Fire Marshal has no position, they're neutral. But most importantly, the Illinois Firefighter's Association is neutral on the Bill as well. I have met with them; they understand the issue. The… as far as the opposition, we'll be expecting the opposition; it's a natural thing. But just for the record, I want to be very clear that the Firefighter's Association is neutral on this Bill."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Moffitt: "Okay. I didn't ... my question was, and you've answered it, there are about 11 or 12 opponents listed. Some of them, one of them... is an association representing a lot of districts that are opposed to this, the very people that provide the service. Secondly, I'm concerned that this... if not this one, another one can kind of lead to what I'll refer to as cherrypicking or even cannibalizing another district, picking the ... the parts that they want. You did say that it had to be within their corporate limits or it would be this time, but I'm concerned that ability of someone else to come and take away from an existing district. Keep in mind, if you were the taxpayers in that district that's going to lose, you helped pay for equipment. You helped pay for the needs to provide the adequate protection and now it potentially is being removed. The next question, Representative, is, does the district that is losing part of their territory... part of their district, do they get to vote on this and would it be the entire district that would get to vote?"

Crespo: "No. This would go against the mayor or the president of the village the option of this going to Circuit Court to make the case. During that time the fire district also can claim whether this is going to have a negative impact on their ability to render services to their district or if it would have a negative financial impact as well. So, there's still going to be a hearing on that so they can appeal the process through that hearing."

Moffitt: "Okay. But the people, the taxpayers that have been funding, paying for that district, that stand to lose part of it are not going to get to vote. Is that correct?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Crespo: "This Bill does not address that."

Moffitt: "So they're not going to get to vote."

Crespo: "Well, whatever the process was before. The process is still very similar. We're just changing some of the requirements before they go to the Circuit Court whereas in past... in the past they had to prove which one could provide better services. We're outlining some other considerations that they should be able to take into account, but the process remains the same."

Moffitt: "Okay. You said it would go to court, and it's just, I think that taxpayers that have funded, decided what kind of protection to have, paid for the equipment and got the staff should be... have to be part of that decision. I'm real concerned about that."

Crespo: "Yeah, Representative, if I may add, I'm sorry, so the residents of the district can file petitions during the court proceedings as well. So they can ap... file objections, I should say."

Moffitt: "I think... and there's legislation moving that it would say that they would... they would get to in the future, if the legislation becomes law, that the entire district that is being... having some taken away would get to vote. Just because of those cons... conditions, this potentially sets up where to take away from a district that's been established, been paying for equipment, geared up to protect the entire area now could have something removed without having the say that... that they should have, would not be a referendum. I think the proper vote today is a... is a 'no' vote. In all... all due respect and I... I respect what you're trying to do, but I think in the... in

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

the interest of fairness to the people that have built that district they should be a part of the decision. It should be a vote for everyone. And it will... I'm concerned it will not improve fire protection. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Harris."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, just so that we're clear on the Bill.

It's my understanding that in order for this to take effect,

the municipality has to provide 80 percent of the... of the
fire protection throughout that municipality, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "And this parcel is within the corporate limits of the municipality, right?"

Crespo: "Two parcels, yes, correct."

Harris, D.: "Two parcels. Okay, two parcels are within the corporate limits. And the other... another protection is that, as you mentioned earlier, there was a... well, the... the area being taken over is still responsible for any bonded indebtedness, but you're saying that the bonds are going to be paid off so that there is no liability there with bonded indebtedness. Is that correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. And I know that there is some concern on the part of some firefighters that there may be a job impact. But there's nothing that says that the fire protection district is going to require any fewer firefighters, right?"

Crespo: "No. And... and based on conversations that the fire chiefs have had from the Hanover Park Fire Department and the fire

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

protection district, our understanding based on statements they've made that in the event that there has to be a reduction, firefighters will not be fired. They will accomplish that through attrition."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Crespo: "So, again, firefighters will not be fired."

Harris, D.: "Okay. And then that... that parcel... there's two parcels which are going to be taken over and covered by the municipal fire department that fire protection is going to be just as full as they have now. So there's no danger in loss of fire protection?"

Crespo: "That's correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. And then the last question. In terms of EAV on the… for the fire protection district, do you know what their total EAV is, roughly?"

Crespo: "I don't have that with me, Representative."

Harris, D.: "I was... well, I don't want to put a figure in the... in the record that isn't accurate, but it's my understanding that it's a fairly substantial equalized assessed valuation for the district and what's this disconnection... disconnected area is a relatively small portion of that... of that EAV, in terms of what they would... what they would have to levy on. So I think the impact would be somewhat minimal. I know there's a concern, but I'm... I'm pleased to stand in support of the Bill. I know there are some questions. I think there are protections built into the Bill and the... the approach that you've taken seems to be reasonable. And I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Fortner."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Fortner: "Representative, I think maybe it's useful to talk a little bit about the unique and special circumstance that Hanover Park has to understand why we need this legislation. As I understand it, it was back in 2000, so not so long ago that Hanover Park voted to create a municipal fire department. Is that correct?"

Crespo: "That's correct in 2002."

Fortner: "And now let's... it's a little different. Most of the time and much of our law anticipates that we go the other way that municipal departments... I know it happened in my city of West Chicago, the municipal department, the voters said no we want to go to a district to expand it. But there's certainly the law exists to have it go the other way, which is what Hanover Park chose to do by their own vote of their people back in the early 2000s, right?"

Crespo: "That's right."

Fortner: "So, and as I understand at that time, there were, I think, four different fire districts that overlapped at least some of the corporate limits of the Village of Hanover Park."

Crespo: "That's correct."

Fortner: "And now, if this were a situation that you would normally find where there was a city or a village that had a municipal fire department, as it were to move into unincorporated areas that municipality that had the municipal fire department would be automatically, upon annexation, able to move those unincorporated areas into the coverage of their

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

municipal department. And that's... that happens all the time in the State of Illinois, as I understand it."

Crespo: "Th... that's right."

Fortner: "So, what's unusual in this circumstance is that the Village of Hanover Park opted to go to a fire department after the fire districts were established in this area. Now, they've been able to successfully negotiate, as I understand, with two of those other three to have their corporate limits match the coverage of their fire department. Is that correct?"

Crespo: "That's correct. And back in 1990, they were served, as you pointed out, Representative Fortner, by four fire protection districts. In 2002, when they did establish their own fire department, they were able to work with three. They reached an agreement. There's just this one that for some reason they haven't been able to get there."

Fortner: "That's right. And so, what this Bill does is it really helps Hanover Park do what any other municipal organization that had a municipal fire department would be able to do. Which it says, as we annex we move it into the coverage of our municipal fire department. What makes this situation unique is the fire department decision by the people of Hanover Park came after the districts were established and after that annexation had already occurred. I support this Bill; I urge everyone to support this Bill. All it really does is it just deals with, really, a problem in our law that didn't anticipate the type of situation that faced the Village of Hanover Park after they made the public decision to switch over to a fire department. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Crespo: "Thank you."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo to close."

- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Thank you, Members. Again, we... Dave gave us some historical perspective. Thanks to Representative Fortner that the town has been able to negotiate with three other fire dis... protection districts, this one we have not. Again, the property in question represents close to 15 percent of the Village of Hanover Park. Their fire stations are closer to the properties in question as well. It's something that's pretty important to my town. I hope I can count on your... on your support. Thank you, Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6163 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 67 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 6163, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 22, 2016: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 581 and Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 5918."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 747, Representative Lang.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 747, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. In 101 counties, township assessors assess property. In Cook County, the 30 township assessors do no assessing at all. However, the statute requires that those who run for township assessor have to possess certain qualifications, take certain classes, get certain certificates. Since township assessors in Cook County do no assessing, this Bill would say they no longer have to take those classes. There's no reason for them to take those classes at all because they don't do any assessing at all. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

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

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

Sandack: "Leader, was there... was Cook County... did you exempt Cook County from this Bill, the Cook County Assessor?"

Lang: "Not the Cook County Assessor, just the township assessors." Sandack: "Okay. So explain that to me a little bit. So why?"

Lang: "In all other counties, township assessors assess property.

In Cook County, the county assessor assesses property, the township assessors do not. They act as clerical people to help people with their property tax appeal; they answer questions about their property tax bills. They don't do any assessing; and therefore, shouldn't have to take those classes."

Sandack: "Well, if... let me ask you a question. Do we need township assessors if they don't do any assessments?"

Lang: "Well, they... in fact, we do. They do some very important work for local people. So if... in Cook County, if you lived in

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Barrington, you wouldn't have to drive... you wouldn't want to drive down to see Mr. Berrios downtown, park your car, et cetera. You'd want to see the Barrington Township Assessor to get the answers to your questions."

Sandack: "Well, but they... but they don't, but they're not experts
 in assessment. So..."

Lang: "But they are ex..."

Sandack: "...the questions may be..."

Lang: "...they are experts in the assess... in the process, in how to file an appeal, et cetera, just like many lawyers are... do that for clients. And so this is not the time or the Bill to talk about how people feel about township government. This is a very narrow piece of legislation."

Sandack: "Well, I don't know, maybe it is, maybe it isn't, but I'm just interested in your legislation and exempting out Cook County Township Assessors which really don't assess. And then I was looking at kind of the efficacy of the assessment process in Cook County. Some would argue it's not that great, but that... that's why I'm interested in why this exemption. I'm wondering if there are just some real disconnects in the way we're structured and some of the education requirements and/or training requirements. Any opinion on that?"

Lang: "Well, my response would be, if at some point you want to talk about the issue of whether this office is a necessary appropriate one, I'll be happy to have that conversation with you. But for now, it seems to me, when someone wants to run for public office, they shouldn't have any more qualifications upon them then they actually need."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Sandack: "Thank you, Leader. To the… to the Bill. Kind of a curious mismatch here of exemption versus education in assessments when assessors assess but maybe not so much. This is one of those strange Bills you may want to think about voting 'no' on, Ladies and Gentlemen, I will be. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "So Representative Lang, why now are you running this Bill to exempt them from the qualifications of assessor. Why this year, why now?"

Lang: "No, particular reason, Representative, other than this is a... an issue that I've thought about, and as I deal with candidates for various offices it's been suggested to me that since township assessors don't assess, there's no real reason for them to have these classes and have this designation."

Ives: "So the reason that you're running this Bill is probably because this is the first year that they're actually going to have to show that they've had the continuing education classes to run for election as an assessor..."

Lang: "No that couldn't..."

Ives: "...and this is the year that they're running."

Lang: "...that couldn't be farther from the truth, Representative.

I didn't even know that was the case. What I did know is that
for many, many years township assessors have had to file
paperwork with their statements of candidacy asserting that
they've taken these classes, which are costly and which they

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- do not need. I should add that this Bill came out of committee unanimously."
- Ives: "Do you know whether or not the Cook County Assessor, Joe Berrios, has an updated certification to run for office this year?"
- Lang: "Not only don't I know the answer to that question, it's irrelevant to the Bill."
- Ives: "Okay. Actually, I would say it's very relevant. And why is
 it that Cook County Assessors don't actually assess like other
 county assessor or other township assessors do? Why is it
 that those don't?"
- Lang: "It's the law that was in place long before I was in the General Assembly, which as you know is a very long time."
- "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Here's the problem with this Bill. The problem is that in 2011 they put in a requirement that said that township assessors needed to be certified and have continuing education. It just so happens that this year is the first year that they're actually going to enforce it, where you have to actually receive a certificate of educational qualification that's issued by the Illinois Department of Revenue. And that says that you are... that you... in order to be appointed or to fill a vacancy of an office, to enter upon the duties of the office, to file nomination pictures, to participate as a candidate in any Primary or General Election for the office, or to be actually elected to the office of township assessor, you actually have to have done the continuing education that was put in the statute in 2011. It's now five years since and this is the first year they're actually going to enforce it. And the truth

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

is, the Cook County Township Assessors aren't up to date. They don't have the continuing education to actually be called an assessor in a township. Now, it is true that they don't necessarily assess property, but perhaps they should. I want to read to you a few little of the statistics because Cook County is the largest assessing jurisdiction, not only in the state, but in the entire country. It assesses over 1.8 million parcels, but it's also the least accurate jurisdiction in the state. It's Coefficient of Dispersion, which is a measure of accuracy, ranges anywhere from 30 to 106. Now, in DuPage County the average is 17.42, so their... their assessments are wholly inaccurate, but it gets even worse. For Cook County, the appeal rate, the appeal rate is 22 percent, which is the highest in the state; 37 percent of those appeals go to the PTAB Board and 66 percent of the time PTAB sides with the property owner. That tells you that they have a problem in Cook County assessing property correctly. The statewide average conversely... remember Cook County's appeal rate was 22 percent... the statewide average is 4.32 percent, and only 1.2 percent of those appeals go to PTAB. So what you have here is when you're not requiring these assessors who are ostensibly there to help in the appeal process as well, if they're not certified, if they don't have the proper education, you're undermining the integrity of the assessing system which is already suspect. Because assessments in Cook County are widely disparate from fair market value. Let's just take the one example. In... in March of 2015, the Willis Tower sold for \$1.3 billion. Cook County assessors had it on the property tax rolls for \$534 million. That is a widely differentiation

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

in what it's assessed at and what it is actually... fair market value is. But it's even worse than that, there ... there's property that was sold in 2015 and 2014 that sold... it was on the books for only 11 percent of its fair market value price, the price that it sold at. That is a problem. And if you don't think that it affects you, if you're in Southern Illinois, if you're in Central Illinois, if you're in the suburbs, it certainly affects you because if the assessments been wrong and the equalized evaluation is wrong, guess what? It skews the entire funding formula. So 101 counties in the State of Illinois have the same property tax laws, but Cook County's the only county allowed to operate under different rules. Their under evaluation of property for both residential and commercial makes them seem to have even less local resources and results in them receiving additional state education dollars than they deserve. The bureaucrats politicians have known this for a year, but the politico class headquartered in Chicago that run this state for decades wants the rest of us to play the game that they rigged. You need to vote 'no' on this. You need to require that these assessors that are duly elected comply with the same requirements of every other assessor in the entire State of Illinois. No carveout for them on this Bill. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not going to disagree with a lot of what my previous... what the previous speaker said. However, there is a significant difference and that is, she's talking about assessments in Cook County, which are done by the county

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

assessor and maybe they're done improperly, maybe they're not... they're not... they're out of line with the rest of the state, and I won't disagree with that, but they're done by the county assessor, not the township assessor. Gentleman has brought forth what I consider to be an eminently reasonable Bill. I have... I'm a Cook County guy. I live in a township in Cook County. My township assessor's a great guy, I like him a lot, but he doesn't assess property. The county assessor does that, the township assessor does not. So why should we require the township assessor, who does not assess property, to be a certified Illinois assessing officer with a certificate from the Illinois Property Assessment Institute with a minimum of 300 additional hours of successfully completed courses when... they're, pardon the... pardon the term, they're paper pushers that help citizens and they do... do a good job. They help citizens who come into their office to file a complaint, to file a... a challenge to their property assessment. That they do and they do very well, but they do not assess property. Yes, Cook County is different from every other... every other county in the state, but that is the way it is. So if a.m. if a assessor is not required to assess property, why make that person go through the assessing course and get the certificate. So I think the Gentleman has an extremely reasonable Bill. I would certainly encourage a 'yes' vote and I applaud him for bringing it forward."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Many of you know, and maybe some of you do not know, that in my other life I am a township assessor. I am not a Cook County township assessor

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

though, and so before anyone thinks I have a conflict on this Bill, this Bill does not affect me. Many years ago in 1994 they required assessors outside of Cook and the Cook assessor himself to undergo continuing education. You had to get a CIAO, which is a designation for assessors, and you had to do 30 hours of continuing education. The difference is I take \$3 billion worth of property in my township and I assess it yearly. I do the assessments. No different than the Cook County assessor, although at a higher level, obviously, for Cook County. The assessors in Cook County do not assess; they are there to help guide people in the process. No different than if you had a clerk that understood the system, no different than your supervisor. Quite frankly, and this is probably going to get me in trouble, you could probably do away with these assessors. If you really wanted to change There's been some discussions about levels of assessment and why Cook County has different coefficients of dispersion. Well, 1) they have very different properties throughout their... the county, from the south side to the north side to the Gold Coast, all over the place. You're going to have those problems. When you go to PTAB though, we have underfunded PTAB over the life of the time I've been in the General Assembly and so most people just want to go to PTAB 'cause it's easier if you're a tax attorney, to get a settlement, to get that done without having to actually go through the process at the township level. And if you want to save money, why would you make assessors that don't assess learn about how to assess and have their townships have to spend the money to do that. So if you want them to spend less

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

money and put more money at the township level into services that can be used, vote for this Bill. You will save money. You won't make them go to these classes that really don't apply to them anyways. Please folks, let's not overthink this. This is a good cost saving measure, it's a cost saving measure for townships throughout Cook County. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "Thank you. I appreciate the comments of the last two eminently reasonable speakers. Some have tried to make this some kind of referendum on township government, it isn't that. It has nothing to do with whether you like township government. Some have tried to make it a referendum on the Cook County Assessor, that's great, you can have whatever feeling you want about him. But this is a Bill that simply says that people that don't assess shouldn't have to take assessing classes. That's all it says. It's about ballot access and making sure that people get to run for office without having extra qualifications on them that are irrelevant to their needs. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 747 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 79 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 747, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 582, Representative Lang. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 582, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang. You're good to go."

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill honors caregivers. As we know, there are wonderful caregivers that take care of the disabled, the blind, the elderly in Illinois. They do incredible work. This Bill simply honors them by saying we will make November of every year Family Caregivers Month. I think it's a great way to honor them and to give them the kind of feeling that they deserve that the Members of the General Assembly appreciate their work on behalf of all of us."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 582 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 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 582, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Manley, for what reason do you rise?"
- Manley: "Mr. Speaker, I want... if you wouldn't mind, let the record reflect that I meant to vote 'no' on House Bill 6163."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request. Mr. Clerk, Senate Joint Resolution 49. Representative Crespo. Please proceed."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 49 is the waiver report on School Code Mandates which the State Board of Education submits twice a year. This time we had 83 waiver requests, they approved 81, two were denied, one had to do with School District 308, which they withdrew anyway. And the other one had to do with School District 10 and they were

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

asking for a Building Code waiver that relates to doors that failed to comply with current safety standards. And the State Board of Education recommended denying them because it represented a safety hazard. As always, we do explain that voting 'yes' means that you approve of the modifications to the school district waiver applications outlined in the Resolution. Voting 'no' means that you support the original school district waivers applications without any changes. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall... Excuse me. The question is, 'Shall Senate Joint Resolution 49 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 99 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Joint Resolution 49, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4715, Representative Bryant. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4715, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a second Bill that actually originated as one Bill for what we nicknamed, Molly's Law. It's the FOIA portion of... of our attempt to... on a constituent driven issue, to bring some teeth to FOIA. So we are asking that a fine that is right now already established, the upper end go from \$5 thousand to \$10 thousand and the... and that a judge be allowed to order \$1 thousand per day after

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

30 days of noncompliance. So, this is... a judge controls this. It has to be court ordered. It's a government entity that has clearly not complied with a court order. It's very narrow. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4715 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 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4715, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6292, Representative Fine. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6292, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6292 would streamline the process for disabled individuals receiving a pension under the Cook County Pension Fund. This allows the board of the fund to waive the required physician's proof of disability if that employee is already being compensated by the county for a disability or loss under the Workers' Compensation Act or if the employee claims an ordinary disability of up to eight weeks for maternity."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Ives: "We saw... we heard this Bill in Pension Committee and there were quite a few questions. And I guess the bottom line

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

question is, is that... does this Bill allow then people receiving disability to also work and receive other income and the board does not have to look into that?"

Fine: "According to the Amendment and the people who are supporting the legislation, what they said was it would allow them to work in the private sector if they can no longer hold on to their position in that public job."

Ives: "Okay. So the answer is, is that if people... people can work in the private sector and still receive their public sector disability checks. That's... is that what this Bill allows them to do?"

Fine: "Yes, in this particular pension fund."

Ives: "In this particular pension fund, which is 62 percent funded."

Fine: "That's correct."

Ives: "Okay. So, to the Bill. So, if you think that people who are receiving a public sector disability check and a pension fund that has come here and dim... said that we need reform, and oh, by the way, we need to add on some more taxes because we're underfunded to the tune of only having enough reserves for 62 percent of our liabilities. If you think that that's okay that they get those checks but are capable and able and ab... have the ability to work in the private sector. If you think that's okay that they still accept a public sector disability check then go ahead and vote 'yes', but this is the wrong direction. Especially for the Cook County Pension Fund that has come to us multiple times and asked for relief. This is going in the wrong direction. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Representative, have there been any actuaries that have opined what this will do to the fund? Will it keep it stable, will it potentially cause more claims to be paid? What... has any expert opinions been sought, actuarially, with respect to your Bill if it becomes law?"

Fine: "With the body of the Bill?"

Sandack: "Yes."

Fine: "No, what really the body of the Bill says is if you already have a disability, there's a doctor that has said you are disabled."

Sandack: "Right."

Fine: "What this is saying is, if you've got that doctor that already says that you are disabled and you're receiving this disability, you don't have to go to a doctor that's also under the Cook County Pension Fund to sort of double that diagnosis of the disability."

Sandack: "Wa... wait a minute. So, right now, as the law currently exists, you need two doctors' notes with respect to finding of disability?"

Fine: "As it was explained to me that if you are already considered disabled because you are found to be disabled and you are put on disability pay, you also have to... what the board does now is you have to go to the Cook County Pension Fund and you also have to see one of their doctors that is with the Cook County hospital to say, yes, we agree that you are disabled."

Sandack: "So, essentially, is... is that... is the idea that's an independent medical examination or an independent medical

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

determination of disability versus potentially someone's personal doctor making that prognosis or conclusion."

Fine: "Well, you... you've already been found to be disabled and so you... you're already under workers' compensation, so you've been through the process already."

Sandack: "Right."

Fine: "And so what this is saying is every year you don't have to continue to go through the process."

Sandack: "I see. Okay. So, by the way, the… the process as it's currently set up, I… I'm assuming that was to, I guess, belts and suspenders, make certain that claims that should be paid were being paid and that there wasn't potential mistakes or worse. What's the efficacy of the system as it currently exists? I mean…"

Fine: "Well, what..."

Sandack: "...is... is it working or are you arguing that it's basically hamstringing the system?"

Fine: "Well, as it was explained to me, is it... it increases the red tape and this would just streamline the process that you would only need the one doctor."

Sandack: "Thank you. I appreciate you answering the questions, Representative."

Fine: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Morrison is recognized."

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

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

Morrison: "Thank you. Representative, in committee there were some questions that came up after… after the committee voted on the Floor Amendment. And we believe that, you know, that

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

there are parts of the underlying Bill that seem okay. But to some of the questions that came up with the Floor Amendment, whose... whose idea was Floor Amendment 2? Was there a particular group that was urging that passage?"

Fine: "I believe it was AFSCME who was uncomfortable adding that language to the Bill because that language was not in the original legislation. So, they wanted to take that out and that eliminated all opposition to the Bill."

Morrison: "And the fund... this is a change to the way the fund handled disability payments. So, didn't it seem like it was a good idea to have that there in the first place, to prevent abuse?"

Fine: "To have the Amendment?"

Morrison: "No, no. Wasn't it a good idea for the fund to have an additional check just to make sure that the individual was disabled."

Fine: "Well, this would... this came from the fund and what the fund said was this is just creating additional work for us and it's unnecessary."

Morrison: "But as... as a previous speaker mentioned, with a fund that's only 62 percent funded it seems like it's a good idea to... to limit abuse if someone is working the... the question might be, are they genuinely disabled? Do you think that's a fair question to ask?"

Fine: "Oh, absolutely, but they've already been declared disabled."

Morrison: "Was there... Do you know what the cap was?"

Fine: "No..."

Morrison: "There was a..."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Fine: "...I don't."

Morrison: "Okay. And then lastly, I just wanted to ask this... this deals with new hires. Is that correct?"

Fine: "Yes, I believe so."

Morrison: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. There... there are some questions regarding if... if someone is working in another position, then there's a question whether or not they... they... they may be disabled in the current or in the position that they had, but they're still able to be gainfully employed somewhere. And due to the condition of the, you know, poor condition of these pension funds, I think it's an appropriate question to ask. And I would ask... also ask for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine to close."

Fine: "Thank you. And again, this Bill did come from the... the pension fund and they feel that it will just streamline the process. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 6292 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 70 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 6292, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5472, Representative Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5472, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 47... 5472, it expands the definition to include witnesses that are asked by the prosecution to offer testimony and information that links an offender to a crime. This Bill was negotiated for almost a year in conjunction with the Attorney General's Office. The Crime Victims' Compensation Fund offers assistance to victims that are the victims of crime, also many times the witnesses that are asked to come forward and testify in violent in... in crimes, because of a violent crime, oftentimes prosecutors have a very difficult time getting witnesses to come forward. And I was blessed enough to have heroes come forward in the case that involved my stepson. Without the participation of those individuals, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for my family to receive justice for my stepson's murder. And so, through that process, I realized that oftentimes many of these people who don't necessarily live in the most comfortable situations, they step forward and they're heroes and they oftentimes risk their comfortability. And we have to honor that the fact of the matter of it is, is that we have violent crime going on in our communities and there are witnesses to these crimes and oftentimes these witnesses just need a little assistance to be comfortable coming forward in these cases. And so, again, what this legislation would do is it would expand the definition of victim; it would allow the State's Attorney to determine whether or not that individual's testimony is required for building a nexus between the crime and that offender. This legislation, again, is supported by Attorney General Lisa

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Madigan and the State's Attorneys Association is a proponent on the Bill as well. I'm open for your questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Representative, thank you for that explanation. Obviously, I want to be sensitive to this because this is sensitive topic. Essentially, your Bill expands a definition of victims and lets vic... I'm sorry, witnesses in a criminal matter, basically be regarded as a victim under a victims recovery fund. Yes?"

Gordon-Booth: "That's already the law, yes."

Sandack: "Witnesses can collect?"

Gordon-Booth: "So, yes, that is already the law."

Sandack: "So, then, what is the expansion that your Bill does?"

Gordon-Booth: "So the expansion would allow an individual... so the way that the law is set up now, if you are an eyewitness, you are allowed to receive assistance through the Victims' Compensation Act. Expanding the definition of witness would then allow an individual that may not have been an actual eyewitness, but based on what took place in that particular incident, the prosecutor may need to develop a nexus between what happened in a particular situation. So although they may not have been an eyewitness, they may have been there, they may have been in the other room, they could've been around the corner, and they may have germane information to offer to the case."

Sandack: "Certainly. And I... obviously, part of that's part of the prosecu... prosecution of a criminal case. Was the original

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

basis for this law that an eyewitness is essentially a victim of seeing something horrific and hurtful, et cetera, so they are kind of a victim under the... the original basis of the law?"

- Gordon-Booth: "The original basis of the law is that, I think, that there's a clear understanding that when you are asking people to come forward in a court of law and testify, particularly when you are testifying in a violent crime, I think it's understood that these individuals are under fear... they're because they were a witness in a violent crime, there is a great degree of fear that comes along with that. And so when you come forward, although you may not be an eyewitness, you may be called to provide a nexus between what happened between the victim and the offender. Your participation makes you, potentially, just as much in jeopardy as someone who is an eyewitness."
- Sandack: "Understood. And certainly, a lot of these folks, while they do come forward voluntarily sometimes they're subpoenaed because they have to be compelled to come forward. Would a subpoenaed witness or reluctant witness still be potentially afforded compensation under this Act?"
- Gordon-Booth: "The only person who will make that determination is all of... are the individual state's attorneys, which is why they're a proponent on the Bill."
- Sandack: "Understood. And by the way, how is the fund, the victims' fund, where does it come from? Is it GRF, is it... where ... where does it come from?"
- Gordon-Booth: "So there's a 6:1 match. Most of the mon... most of the money comes from the Federal Government, but we have a...

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

a small pot that we... a small allotment that we send to them each year, but most of the money comes from the Federal Government."

Sandack: "And you correctly noted there's no opposition. The State's Attorneys, obviously, didn't feel this was a financial burden or cause any problem, with respect to their discretion, to... to determine whether someone could possibly be awarded some compensation."

Gordon-Booth: "Right. They're actually proponents on... they're proponents to the Bill. They believe that this... having this... having this expansion actually assists them in being able to get witnesses to come forward because clearly, oftentimes early on in a case, people feel a little more compelled at the beginning of the case then say maybe six, seven, eight months later when the court... when the case actually goes to trial. And so you're right, oftentimes people are subpoenaed but then when said witness gets on the stand oftentimes a prosecutor then has to make the decision, do I even want to call this witness because they may be a hostile witness. They may not want to come forward with information. And so, they were very supportive in this effort. They were involved in the conversations because they believe that being able to offer this small assistance to some folks may be ... it may be of... incentive to allow folks to do what it is they are naturally trying to do, which is be a hero and give families some justice."

Sandack: "Thank you for your answers. One last question, I don't see any opposition to your Bill. Is there any known opposition?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Gordon-Booth: "None."

Sandack: "Thank you for answering the questions, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon-Booth to close."

Gordon-Booth: "Again, this... this Bill came from an unfortunate situation that my family and I dealt with. We were blessed enough to be able to get victim... to be able to get justice for my stepson, but there are many, many families throughout this state that are not so lucky. And so, we want to provide an incentive and a tool to be able to help families get the justice that my family was so blessed to receive. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5472 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 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5472, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4999, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4999, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill follows up on legislation that was passed by my colleague Representative Ford a few years ago, protecting employers from having their social media accounts looked at by, excuse me, protecting employees from having their social media accounts looked at by employers. This language was

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

worked out between employer groups, civil liberties groups, and social media companies. It's agreed language in that regard. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4999 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 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 4999, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 335, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 335, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill would simply extend the sunset date for what is called Advanced Deposit Wagering from the sunset of February 1, 2017 to December 31, 2018. In addition, it would... it would make sure that the Standard Breeders Fund Advisory Board makeup is... is properly defined. And I know of no opposition to the Bill. It would ensure that the horse racing industry as it currently stands would still remain viable."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 335 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 81 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 335, having received the

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 746. Representative Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 746, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. As you know, this Bill I had yesterday and I pulled it off of the... out of the record, had some conversations with a couple of my colleagues. It's the consensus with the legislative staff here... legal staff here that this is constitutional. I guess that was the big question. But one of the things is this... the forest preserve district was decided by referendum about 75 years ago. And forest preserves are... they are units of government that already exist, so it's not creating another... another unit of government. And the... the best thing about it, I think, is that the county board is requesting that we do this. So with the deadline coming up, I was trying to get an extension, but with the deadline coming up, I'd just like to have an up and down vote on it and let the Members here in... in the chamber decide."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. We... the Gentleman is correct. We did talk about this and we had an offline conversation as well. We simply have a disagreement, but I would ask every Member before voting for this there may be a proclivity to de... to defer to the Gentleman because it's his district or part of his district. The law on this is unambiguously clear. If we pass this Bill, we're violating our own previous law

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

that we... that we passed almost unanimously out of here, went through the Senate, passed almost unanimously out of the Senate and the Governor signed. The bare minimum thing we said we... we'd do about Illinois's prolific units of government problem is we wouldn't create new ones. At a bare minimum we agreed we would not create new units of taxing bodies and would start to address and we are doing so in various ways. The Lieutenant Governor has a task force, the Chairman of DuPage County has a task force, and we know we don't need new units of government. Be clear, Ladies and Gentlemen, this creates a new taxing body and I asked the Gentleman and counsel on the Democratic side, could hypothetically, a current county commissioner and a new forest commissioner serve in both capacities? The answer was no. Why was the answer no? It's because they're legally incompatible. They're legally incompatible because they're two separate units of government. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And as well to the Bill. I... I don't normally disagree with my distinguished Floor Leader, but in this particular instance I want to commend Representative Verschoore for... for working with us and answering questions. And as he'd said, this unit of government's been in existence for 75 years. But one particular reason that I... I had an interest in this was the issue of forest preserve district versus county boards. Because we thought... we faced this issue in DuPage County, when a county board essentially took land out of McDowell Forest Preserve and cut Diehl Road, a busy road right through

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

the middle of one of our forest preserves and that spurred the people. We were so angry about it we created a forest preserve district because it is a conflict of interest between a county board and a forest preserve district. The county board's there to develop property. The forest preserve district is there to preserve property, to preserve our open space for use and enjoyment by the people. And so by creating a forest preserve district here, we are... here we are, are we on Earth Day, or nearby to Earth Day, we're actually doing the green thing and doing the responsible thing by allowing the folks in the county to properly set up two separate bodies. And so for this particular issue, again, I think it's legal under our current law. Frankly, even if it isn't, we are the General Assembly. We make laws. It's the right thing to do in that county and I think we should support Representative Verschoore who has worked very hard on this worthy, worthy initiative. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Demmer: "Representative, I was a part of the task force on local government consolidation that a previous speaker brought up. And one of the issues that we looked at was how might we be able to combine responsibilities under specific units of government to make it easier for citizens to identify who's responsible for which... which aspects of government that are provided to them. So one of my questions for you is, right now, the county board members serve as... as forest preserve district members. Is that correct?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Verschoore: "Yes. Yes, it is."
- Demmer: "Has that been correct since the inception of this unit of government?"
- Verschoore: "I can't answer since the inception. I'm assuming it has a... as far as I go back I think it's been that way, yeah."
- Demmer: "And have you thought about the idea of instead of splitting off and creating a new unit, rather reducing it and combining, so the... the forest preserve dis... district is a part of the county?"
- Verschoore: "It goes from 25 board members down to 7 commissioners that are elected in apportioned district through the county... throughout the county."
- Demmer: "But isn't it true that the... these duties are being carried out by the county board members today? It's reasonable to think that those same duties could be carried out by county board members in the future and rather than splitting and having two units of government do one job, we could, rather, take a... take a leg... piece of legislation that combined them together and let one unit of government do the job that it has been doing."
- Verschoore: "That's basically... that's not what the... the people want or the... the representatives that represent the county are... they're the ones that basically asked for this, the county board people. To get it... to get it out of the, like a political football to a more transparent, elected by all of the citizens of Rock Island County."
- Demmer: "And I appreciate the importance of having an elected body, but you know, one of the... the items... and one of the challenges that we talked about during the task force was

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

that there are so many units of government that your average citizen doesn't have the ability to even list off all the different units of government that... that they're a part of. So when we talk about creating new elected officials, a new set of meetings, a new set of meeting minutes and agendas, new reports, new locations for people to meet, don't you think that makes it more difficult for citizens to understand who to go to with a question while when, you know, when they can make their voice heard? Doesn't splitting this up make them have to run from meeting, to meeting, to meeting just to have an interaction with their government?"

Verschoore: "I think it would make it easier rather than dealing with 25 members they would be down to dealing with 7 members. I think the biggest question here is like I said in my opening statement is the legality of it. And I'm hearing from our legal staff saying they feel it is legal then, of course, there's anoth... another opinion from the colleagues of mine that say it isn't. And that's, like, the only reason I'm not trying to delve into this further because I don't have any time because of the deadline. So, that's why... that's why I'm asking for an up and down vote."

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative. And... and to the Bill. I... I just bring up, again, this concept that when we have a unit of government who's providing services of all sorts, it makes sense to consolidate that to empower one group of elected officials to do the job they have been doing rather than split this apart and let two units of government do one set of jobs. This is a great opportunity for further consolidation rather than creating another unit of government even after this Body

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

has nearly unanimously supported a moratorium on creation of units. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Smiddy."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Smiddy: "To the Bill. Again, as I indicated yesterday this forest preserve for the six entities actually reside in my district and I do... do not wish to create another layer of government in Rock Island County, and that's why I still oppose this Bill today. And I urge my colleagues to also vote 'no' on this. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Moffitt: "Representative, just to reinforce. Will these board members be paid?"

Verschoore: "No, there's absolutely no payment. It's a bipartisan..."

Moffitt: "Do they have...

Verschoore: "Pardon?"

Moffitt: "Go ahead."

Verschoore: "And... and it's a bipartisan election when they elect them. There's no pay. The only possible pay is if they would have to attend a meeting or seminar somewhere that they were requested to go to and if they do they... they would be paid in... just expenses that were backed up with receipts."

Moffitt: "Reimbursed. Reimbursement. Okay."

Verschoore: "Reimbursement, right."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Moffitt: "So they won't be paid. They do not have taxing authority, do they?"

Verschoore: "No. No way under..."

Moffitt: "They cannot levy any tax?"

Verschoore: "No."

Moffitt: "It's been referred to as a unit of..."

Verschoore: "The county board can do now."

Moffitt: "County board can..."

Verschoore: "Right."

Moffitt: "...and will be doing that. It's been referred to as another unit of government. I think one that can't tax and isn't paid and that the county board would have to de... make the taxing decisions..."

Verschoore: "That's the way I understand it."

Moffitt: "...it's questionable if it'd be really called a unit of government. We don't call every advisory committee or task force a unit of government. This is... this is a board that will help govern the park... the forest, the various parks of the forest preserve and the people will elect them. The stated objective for doing this was to give greater transparency."

Verschoore: "Right."

Moffitt: "We say we're for that. Greater efficiency, we say we're for that, and remove it from partisan politics, 'cause they will run nonpartisan, right?"

Verschoore: "Exactly."

Moffitt: "Whereas the county board is partisan."

Verschoore: "Exactly."

Moffitt: "I think if you're for... for more efficiency, more transparency, removing politics and they have no taxing

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

authority, I think this is a... a good way to improve the efficiency in response to the people of this... of this area. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Verschoore: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to set the record straight from some earlier statements that were made. Before I had the pleasure of joining this group, I served as a Will County Board Member and all the Will County Board Members serve at the same time as the forest preserve board. Not a conflict of interest, we were able to do both things. And yeah, I just wanted to set the record straight that it's not a conflict of interest to do both things; and they could continue to do it in this case as well. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Fortner."

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

Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Fortner: "I... I want to make sure I clarify the statement that came up in a previous one. I support your legislation. But the Downstate Forest Preserve Act provides that forest preserve districts, those that are concurrent with their county boards have the power to levy taxes, to conduct referendum questions, and if referendum questions pass, they can bond, they can buy open space. This is something that county boards do when they wear their hat as a forest preserve commissioner. Isn't that correct?"

Verschoore: "The way I understand it, yes."

Fortner: "Yeah. And to the... to the Bill. If you lived in the county of Rock Island, I... I would expect that right now and

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

looked at your tax bill, you would see probably two lines, or at least two lines on your tax... probably have a lot more than two lines, but there are two lines. One that would be collecting taxes for the county of Rock Island and one that would be collecting any taxes that were levied by the forest preserve district of Rock Island to maintain those open spaces."

Verschoore: "Yes."

Fortner: "Certainly, that's the case wherever, and in most places where there are established downstate forest preserve districts. The point is there are already two taxing lines because they are two taxing bodies. Those two taxing bodies exist. The difference is that the law as it typically stands provides that the same body, the same elected body, serve in the capacity for both of those districts. Let's not confuse the number of districts for the number of elected bodies that run those districts. So what the Gentleman's Bill would propose to do is to say, we're going to keep the same number of taxing bodies but we're going to have a different number of elected boards. We want to make sure, as a previous speaker pointed out, sometimes there might be conflicts of interest between the work done by a county board and the work done by a forest district, and we've seen this come up before. It was mentioned DuPage did this quite a long time ago. Just in the last few years, Winnebago asked for this same power to be able to separate the two; and in this case, Rock Island is asking for that same thing. To recognize that sometimes it's better that the two separate taxing bodies also have two separate boards. That's all they're asking for. So let's make

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- sure we know what they're trying to separate and what they're not separating. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Verschoore to close."
- Verschoore: "Like I said, the question was whether adding another unit of government; I don't feel it is. And there's been a lot of conversation in our... in the General Assembly here about having more elected rather than appointed. This takes the politics out of it and lets the whole county vote on it. And I would ask for a... an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 746 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 55 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', and 0 voting
 'present'. Representative Verschoore?"
- Verschoore: "I'd like to put it on Postpone Consideration, please."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk please move this Bill to the Order of Postpone Consideration. Leader Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Bradley is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "House Bill 4257, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4257, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4257 is an initiative that came from my special needs caucus that we have in my

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

district. And what it is... it's an autism Wallet Card meant to deescalate interactions with emergency personnel and police with an individual that has autism. The card is... describes what the condition of autism does, which does include becoming physically agitated if somebody close to them or if they touch them. And it also includes stating that they might have difficulty understanding directions. This Bill was... is still going to be amended in the Senate. And I have talked to Representative Bellock and Representative Gabel and they have my word that it will come back for Concurrence and the Senate Sponsor has concurred to amend it in the Senate."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, for your edification virtually all the Bills left on the list to be called today are on Short Debate. The rules of Short Debate are a Sponsor and one person in opposition. And so, unless somebody takes a Bill off of Short Debate, we're going to proceed on that course so that we can move this process along. Those in fav... I don't see a light, but I think Representative Bellock is trying to get my attention. Representative Bellock is recognized."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I'll keep it short. I think, Representative Kifowit, didn't you say that all the opposition had been removed."

Kifowit: "I... I did say that we were still working on it. DHS is still opposed and we are working with them. Due to the deadlines, we told DHS that we would amend it in the Senate."

Bellock: "Okay."

Kifowit: "And... and continue to work on it."

Bellock: "All right. Okay."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Kifowit: "And... and I have the Sponsor... Sponsor's word that that
 will happen as well."

Bellock: "Okay. But all the autism groups were okay with it?"

Kifowit: "All the autism groups love this Bill."

Bellock: "Okay. So, and you've committed to working on it, so I'm okay with it."

Kifowit: "Correct."

Bellock: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4820, Mr. Cabello. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4820, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4820 amends the Liquor Control Act and it provides that alcohol liquor may be served or sold in buildings of a public university that the… at events that the board of trustees at that university deem necessary. This is a Bill that I thought was necessary. We're… we were lucky to pass a Bill out to help our universities today. This should help our universities generate new revenue. This is a Bill that the college boards themselves will deem if their university wishes to do this. It's not a mandate; they do not

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

have to do this. I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote and answer any questions if necessary."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Maybe we can move this process along, please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill... House Bill 4515, Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4515, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. I rise to present House Bill 4515. This... the Bill this afternoon, this morning, addresses the event of 45 percent of Illinois adults have criminal records. Even so, there are more than 500 employee... employment barriers along with... under Illinois law making it hard for these Illinoisans to find jobs and build financial, secure lives for themselves their family. HB45 (sic-4515) will improve and opportunity for people with criminal background in the health care ... in health care without compromising patient ... patient's safety. House Bill 15... excuse me, 4515 improves the waiver process, removes low-level cannabis related to conviction, and it creates a work group to continue to improve the waiver process. Nothing in this Bill requires employers to hire people with criminal backgrounds. I have been working with

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

advocates, the department, and the industry for over two years. We have no opposition to this legislation with the Amendment #3. This Bill is supported by many groups: Safer Foundation, Heartland Alliance, Cabrini Green Legal Aid, Community Renewal Society, Chicago Coalition for the Homeless, and the Illinois Policy Institute. If there's no questions, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Mr. Sandack is recognized. Do you stand in... in opposition, Sir?"

Sandack: "I have questions for the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Ask your questions, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative, your Bill is permissive or mandatory?"

Lilly: "I'm sorry?"

Sandack: "Is your Bill permissive or mandatory."

Lilly: "The hiring is permissive."

Sandack: "And the... the change in law it simply reduce... it takes away some aspects of past criminal behavior. And does what? Creates a registry and a waiver process?"

Lilly: "No, it does not. It clarifies the current waivering process."

Sandack: "And how does it... but it makes it easier to obtain a
 waiver?"

Lilly: "Correct."

Sandack: "In... in what way?"

Lilly: "It makes it... it makes it more... it provides clarification to the employer about the registry process. It improves it so they will have, what we call, better information."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Sandack: "And it does not require an employer to hire anyone. It just gives them information from which to make a decision."

Lilly: "That is correct."

Sandack: "And I... I know you mentioned this earlier that this has been an ongoing process. Is there any remaining opponents or opposition to your Bill?"

Lilly: "Not to my knowledge."

Sandack: "With respect to the crimes a person may have had in their... past background, are there some that no longer require any disclosure?"

Lilly: "The only change that we changed is the low-level cannabis."

Sandack: "Low-level..."

Lilly: "Cannabis, low-level cannabis. That's the only change."

Lilly: "For that level, yes."

Sandack: "For that... for that minimum level. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4312, Mr. Martwick. Out of the record. House Bill 4492, Representative Mayfield. Please read the Bill."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4492, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you. This Bill had come before us once before. This is an initiative of the North Shore Reclamation District. The Bill that you have before you is the exact amendatory language that came from the Governor's Office. We took out the provision that allowed them to provide a raise for themselves. There is no opposition to the Bill, ask for an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan, do you stand in opposition? This Bill's on Short Debate."

Sullivan: "Sorry. I'm in favor, but that's fine."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6098, Mr. Demmer. Out of the record. House Bill 6291, Representative Nekritz. Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6291, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I begin I really would like to thank President Preckwinkle for working on this legislation along with the Justice Advisory Council that she

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

has. They... they've done some really excellent work on this. This Bill deals really with two issues for juvenile offenders. The first is a commitment to the Department of Juvenile Justice for drug offenses and second is the length of probation. The goal of the first part of the legislation dealing with commitments to ... for drug offenses, our goal is to keep youthful substance abusers out of the Department of Juvenile Justice and get them the treatment they need to addru... address their drug problem. On the second part dealing with probation, the goal of this legis... the goal of this part is to offer a probationary period that is long enough to get the youth the services and the programming and the treatment they need, but short enough to keep them motivated to working toward the goal of getting off probation. Research is very clear that it's the best public policy to reducing recidivism to shorten that period of time and give them an achievable goal. With that, I will be happy to take questions and ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 50 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. Wish Postpone Consideration? The Lady asks that the Bill be placed on the Order of Postpone Consideration. House Bill 1380, Mr. Phelps. Please read the Bill. I understand you have a Floor Amendment, Sir. So we'll move the Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1380, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps on the Amendment."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Floor Amendment #2 it just simply takes out unfair labor practices. And I just ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1380, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1380 is an initiative of the Associated Firefighters of Illinois. It plainly says any party who fails to comply with an arbitration award for a frivolous appeal only will be responsible for court fees including attorneys' fees. Now let me just say this 'cause I know there probably will be some debate on this. We have had some very good discussions with the Governor's Office on this. The Associated Firefighters are very sincere 'cause there are a lot of frivolous appeals out there and they're just wanting them to stop. As far as who this is concerned to, it's only for unions with binding arbitration only. Only binding arbitration. They've been used... these frivolous lawsuits have

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

been trying to tighten things up and they're just wanting things, more or less, justice delayed justice denied, so to speak. So I just ask for its passage."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack, do you rise in opposition? Mr. Sandack is recognized."

Sandack: "A few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "All right. Going to your Amendment first, Brandon. What did the Amendment do? It took attorneys' fees out of an unfair labor practice claim?"

Phelps: "Yeah. It removed unfair labor practices and... and for this Bill."

Sandack: "So, then..."

Phelps: "It's only interest and grievance arbitration only, Ron."

Sandack: "Thank you. So where do attorneys' fees apply then under your Bill?"

Phelps: "Only to frivolous appeals if determined by the judge."

Sandack: "But would..."

Phelps: "In grievance arbitration and interest arbitration."

Sandack: "With all due respect, isn't that already the law? If there's a case of frivolity, a court can award damages and fees if there is a finding that an appeal or an action was frivolous."

Phelps: "It's not in interest and grievance arbitration, Ron.

That's why... it's not under this... these two deals, interest and grievance arbitration. That's why they want to do it because most municipalities, Ron, the way we look at it the municipalities use this. They appeal, appeal, appeal, appeal.

And you know, Oak Lawn, you know what all happened there."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Sandack: "Sure."

Phelps: "So they're just wanting to take this away just if the judge determines if it's frivolous or not, that's it."

Sandack: "But I want to make sure I'm clear. If a court in its findings says this appeal is frivolous, there was no basis whatsoever to bring the appeal, it was a waste of the judge's and court's time, it was made in bad faith. You're saying the court cannot... cannot then award attorneys' fees?"

Phelps: "No, not at all."

Sandack: "Okay. Good, because..."

Phelps: "It's that totally misunderstanding..."

Sandack: "...I'm pretty sure a court can..."

Phelps: "...that's why we're trying to fix..."

Sandack: "...do that whenever it wants."

Phelps: "You lose... bring a claim, you lose. Then you get... you got to pay, more or less you got to pay. Loser pays."

Sandack: "Loser pays fees."

Phelps: "Loser pays the fees and the attorney fees, Ron."

Sandack: "All right. To... to the Bill. I... the Gentleman is bringing a Bill that's worthy of debate. I'm... I'm sorry it's on shortened debate. As he said, the Governor's Office has had negotiations. The Governor's against this and I think one of the most fundamental reasons why is in Federal Law we call the Rule 137. At the state level, it has a different number. If a frivolous appeal is brought, it's frivolous and sanctions are typically awarded not limited to attorneys' fees. We don't want frivolous appeals brought. They are a waste of the court's time. They... they tax the court and they frustrate justice of other cases. This is a potentially abusive and/or

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

redundant use of fees and I just don't think it's ready for prime time. So, I would recommend a 'no' vote. I wish the Gentleman would pull it off and we could have further discussion and maybe real debate, but I think this is entirely unnecessary. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Representative Sandack, I appreciate your thoughts. We...
we are very sincere about this. There are a lot of bad actors
out there right now. And we are sincere about working with
the Governor's Office on this. And everybody, I just ask for
an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting 'yes', 30 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Franks, the reason you weren't recognized is that the Bill was on Short Debate."

Franks: "And I'd like to and perhaps we should then take the Bills off of Short Debate because I had a few questions that weren't asked."

Speaker Lang: "Sir, Bills are on Short Debate. People may... people may move to remove them as we go through them, Sir."

Franks: "But how can we be recognized to remove them?"

Speaker Lang: "It's a very good question."

Franks: "That's... that's what I was trying to do."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 581, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 581, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on the Amendment."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This would... this would remove the opportunity for social service contracting groups to cancel a contract after there's been no payment for 90 days. I know this was a hardship for the agencies. I would appreciate adoption of the Amendment and then I would ask the... the Chair to leave the Bill on Second Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments, but notes have been requested and have not been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading pending the notes. House Bill 5604, Representative Conroy.

 Please read the Bill."
- Conroy: "House Bill 5604, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation.

 The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee

 Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative

 Conroy."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Conroy."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. The Amendment was a compromise that was worked out with the insurance companies and removed all opposition."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5604, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Conroy."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill will have... insurance companies will offer a plan to companies so that children who have pediatric autoimmune neuropsychiatric disorder caused by strep throat have the option of getting an insurance policy to cover the treatment that they need to get healthy."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mayfield. Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Breen. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Breen: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like the record to reflect that I had intended to vote 'no' on House Bill 1380."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. House Bill 5918, Mr. Thapedi. I understand there's an Amendment. Please put the Bill back on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5918, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Floor Amendment #3 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Thapedi."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi on the Amendment."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I offer and move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 5918. Believe it or not, this actually removes all opposition to the Bill. And I'd like to debate it on Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5918, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. House Bill 5918 has become well-known in this chamber over the last couple of weeks. I'm pleased to report that there is no, I repeat, no opposition whatsoever to this Bill. I want to thank, especially, Adam Rogalski and Sean Denney for their tireless efforts on this Bill. These two gentlemen went to the mat for their members day after day and night after night to protect their members' respective interests. I also want to commend Jim Reed, Commissioner Larry Suffredin, Ariel Johnson, and D'Javan Conway for their aggressive, yet meaningful work to get us to this point. This Bill passed the Charter School Policy Committee unanimously and it's my understanding that this has never happened before. House Bill 5918 remains an innocuous charter school transparency Bill.

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

The Bill does primarily two essential things. Of course, there are other issues with charter schools that are interesting and worthy of discussion, but this Bill only has two primary components and those two components are the ones that are before this Body today. As for the first component of House Bill 5918, the current state of the law allows a new charter school to initially operate for 10 long years before it is required to reapply for a subsequent 5-year term. This is far too long for an inadequate, underperforming charter school to operate. This is a statutory loophole that can easily be exploited. To close this loophole, this Bill cuts the initial operating period in half to 5 years and transposes the length of time the charter may initially operate and then reapply with detailed performance metrics. It was these performance metrics that formed the basis of the dis... of the disa... disagreement between all of the parties involved. The... the final primary component to House Bill 5918 addresses loans awarded from the essentially defunct charter school revolving loan fund. This fund is operated by the State Board of Education and provides loans to charter schools for soft start-up costs as we... as well as materials. The fund currently has a little over... or a little less than \$27 thousand in it. After being decimated by sweeps, there appears to be no plans to replenish the funds, but if it is replenished, House Bill 5918 reshapes the fund to ensure that the money is spent in the correct and appropriate way. To be clear, Mr. Speaker, this Bill does not tinker with Section 27A-7, (a)-(c) of the School Code, which sets forth the criteria for the awarding of charter schools, nor does the Bill modify Sections 27A-

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

9(b) of the School Code, which sets forth a test for the renewal of charter schools. Equally, if not more importantly, this Bill also does not modify the revocation procedures set forth in Section 27A-9(c) of the School Code. And if Members look at the Bill on its face, you will see these provisions in the law and you will see that they remain completely untouched. I also, Mr. Speaker, lastly, want to thank the current rosters of cosponsors that stuck it out with me on this Bill that even though with external pressures and robo calls they stuck it out with me and... and didn't bail on me and... and didn't bail on the Bill. And I want to thank the current roster of cosponsors for doing that. So as a result, Mr. Speaker, I'm available to answer any and all questions. And after I do so, I'll ask for a 'green' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Sir, you've apparently answered all questions. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6167, Representative Sente. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6167, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 2014, the General Assembly passed a Bill with overwhelming bipartisan support to allow 17-year-olds to vote in a Primary, so long as they will be 18 years old on the date of the immediately following General

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Election. Since that time, 11 thousand 17-year-olds have registered to vote in Illinois. So this Bill adds two cleanup provisions and one new provision to that language. Number 1, it allows individuals who are 17 by the Primary and 18 by the General to sign and circulate petitions. Number 2, it allows 17-year-olds to vote in a township Primary or caucus. And third, it allows 17-year-olds to serve as a deputy registrar. The Bill passed unanimously out of Executive Committee."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Please take the record. There are 98 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative DeLuca is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect that. House Bill 5958, Mr. Kay. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5958, a Bill for an Act concerning land.

 Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."
- Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. The Bill is fairly simple and straightforward. It authorizes the Department of Transportation to convey certain parcels of land in the counties of Grundy and Madison. And it further authorizes the Department of Natural Resources to convey, so long as the property is used only for public purposes, certain

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

parcels of land in the counties of Bureau and Stephenson. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5566, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5566, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5566... adds and allows for the chairperson of the Illinois P-20 Council to authorize a working group to discuss issues related to postsecondary college affordability. As many of us know, there's a crisis of... crisis for students here in the... in the State of Illinois and across the country where students are being asked to fund their college education. And they're going into debt to do so, to the tune of \$1 trillion. And we're want... we want to make sure we have strategies in place to make sure the college remains affordable for our students in the State of Illinois. And I'd answer any questions and ask for a favorable... I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

record. There are 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5681, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5681, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill has been the result of some ongoing discussions and what we're trying do is make sure that we have a... we put a plan in place for retiree... retiree pension in the Chicago... in Chica... City of Chicago. What we are attempting to do is continue the discussions with all stakeholders and what we'd like to do is move the Bill over to the Senate to... to continue those discussions because all parties are... have come to the table now, but they'd like to continue the process. So what we're going... what we're asking Members to do is to trust that the discussions will continue and we're going to move the Bill over, park it in the Senate as discussions continue. So I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6162, Mr. Skoog. Out of the record. House Bill 6123, Mr. Smiddy. Please read the Bill."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6123, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy."

Smiddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking that we'd be able to pass 6123 over to the Senate and make some corrections over there. What the Bill will do is require the Department of Military Affairs to test National Guards member for depleted uranium prior and post service. And I'm asking for an 'aye' vote. And I'm willing to take all questions."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Mr. Harris, do you rise in opposition?"

Harris, D.: "I do, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "You... you're up, Sir."

Harris, D.: "Thank you very much. Question of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, the Bill states that, very simply, that the… a Guardsman will be tested for both pre- and post-deployment. Is that correct?"

Smiddy: "Yes, Sir."

Harris, D.: "How do you define deployment?"

Smiddy: "Well, that's... we are going to try to get that fixed over in the Senate. I've talked to Senator Hastings and what we are going to do is we're going to put specific areas, such as Iraq, Afghanistan, and Kuwait and Qatar in there for deployment for National Guards members."

Harris, D.: "Okay. And what does the testing consist of?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Smiddy: "It is a urinalysis over a 24-hour period where they will test to see if there is any depleted uranium in the system of the soldier."
- Smiddy: "That is correct."
- Harris, D.: "So the test for pre-deployment is to ensure that there's nothing there ahead of time, right?"
- Smiddy: "Yes, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "So, if you're testing... the testing is a urine test,
 but how long does it take?"
- Smiddy: "As... as I stated, it's a... to test for depleted uranium it is over a 24-hour period."
- Harris, D.: "It's over a 24-hour period, but it actually takes two days, does it not?"
- Smiddy: "If that's the case then probably, yes. I don't know exactly how long. It's just over a 24-hour period."
- Harris, D.: "Well, let's just very specifically and for... for the folks in the chamber, I ask your indulgence on this. It does take two days and what re... is required is the urine is tested throughout the entire day. An individual wakes up, the morning sample is destroyed, not used, but the rest of the sample for that day as well as the morning sample the following day is tested. So you've got... you've got significant number of urine samples that are... that are collected over two days. It requires that that individual Guardsman be on... at a single location, which means they have to be at a... at a National Guard facility. They can't be at home. Is that correct? Do you know?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Smiddy: "Yes, Sir. My light went off."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So how do you get a Guardsman to go to that armory and... and stay there overnight? What authority does... does the Guard have to do that?"

Smiddy: "Well, they would have to be called up prior to being put on Federal Active Duty."

Harris, D.: "Yes, they would. And the problem is this, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I don't mean to bore you with details and I hope you will forgive me, because as the former Adjutant General of the Illinois National Guard, this Bill has a very significant impact. You heard the man ... you heard the Sponsor correctly say that it requires somebody to be there for two days. There is no authority to call that person in on state active duty and I... there's ... well, let me get into that in a moment. There's no authority to call that person in on state active duty to ... to be at that location; in addition to which there's no authority to pay the person. You know, when the Guard is called out in a national... in a state emergency for a flood, or a fire or a... or a tornado, the Commander in Chief, namely the Governor, issues an order saying call out the Guard in... in state active duty and the Guard is called out based on that authority. There is no authority to bring a Guardsman in for two days and do this testing. And let me, so as not to delay it too much, let me just talk to the Bill directly. Each urine sample takes... costs about 100 and some dollars to process, each urine sample. And you could take as many as seven to nine urine samples during the course of that 24-hour period. The estimate... and I'll ask the question of the

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Sponsor, do you have an estimate of what the cost is to the Guard?"

Smiddy: "From what I was told by Military Affairs, it would be approximately \$4.6 million."

Harris, D.: "Four point six million dollars. And that's... that's probably fairly accurate because of all the deployments that ... that you have, the way the Bill currently reads, of all the deployments that you currently have if... if all those people are required to get urine samples and do this and have to be paid state active duty, \$4.5 million. And that's... those are state dollars, 4.5 million state dollars. The entire budget... the entire budget for the Department of Illinois... Illinois... the entire budget for the Department of Military Affairs is \$14 million. You're putting a \$4 million requirement on the department that only has a budget of \$14.5 million. If you want to close armories, if you want to take away Lincoln's Challenge voting for this Bill will do that, because it's impossible to afford it with the budget that they have now. There is no appropriation for the Bill. Yes, you can talk about deployments, you know, first of all the deployments over to Iraq and Afghanistan and... and other areas of the world for depleted uranium, the ... the military no longer uses depleted uranium munitions and they haven't since the Gulf War. It's gone out of ... we use titanium munitions now instead of depl... depleted uranium. The Gentleman is concerned about burn pits, where they burn excess... all sorts of excess items, it could be plastic, it could be human waste, that sort of thing. But the Department of Defense is now monitoring all of those... all of those burn pits wherever the military goes. And

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

when a soldier comes back, and remember that there's a difference between a National Guardsman on state duty and a National Guardsman when he goes on active... he or she goes on active duty. When they transfer to active duty, when they deploy and transfer to active duty they're under the authority of the President of the United States and the Department of Defense. So the Department of Defense has a very rigid testing session when they come back from active duty that they have to go through. I can tell you that when... when we set up the pre-deployment test for Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom back in 2002, before we deployed all those guardsmen, we... we tested those guardsmen from the tip of their toes to the top of their head and everything in between to make sure that they were qualified to deploy. And sometimes you have to kind of get a sense here, sometimes, not sometimes, a lot of times an individual who's with a military unit says, hey, I don't want to leave my military unit I want to go with my... with my unit to... to provide the service that I've been asked to provide. And they don't tell you about things that may be wrong with them. I had a soldier, as an example, he couldn't qualify for... for medical reasons because of his dental condition. He went out that day and had seven teeth pulled because he wanted to go with his unit, seven teeth pulled. So we test them very thoroughly. When they come back off of active duty, they are tested by the Federal Government, by the Department of... the Department of Army, Department of Navy, Department of the Air Force. To put this requirement on the National Guard is extremely onerous. You are not helping a solider or an airman by voting for this Bill. It has nothing

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

to do with veterans. You are putting a requirement on the National Guard, which they do not have the ... the ability, financial ability... certainly, they don't have the money to do it, but it's already being covered by the Federal Government. And the Federal Government has a depleted uranium website where you can register if you think there is a problem and they ask you when you come back whether or not you think you have been exposed to depleted uranium, so you can register for that website. It is not like Agent Orange, which some people would say, well, the ... the government didn't recognize that problem and they didn't, but on this one they do recognize the problem. They have taken action and they're ... they're addressing it at the federal level. So it's unfair to put this... this burden on the Guard. And let me come back, just a second, to what I first asked about, what cons... constitutes a deployment. If you're at Scott Air Force Base, as an example, if you're down at Scott Air Force Base and you happen to be a pilot of a KC-135 air refueler, those KC-135 air refuelers fly all over the world. And every time they fly... let's say they're flying a refueling mission to Incirlik, Turkey. Every time that... that KC-135 refueler gets up there and refuels an airplane, that crew is on active duty. They have deployed. So you're not only dealing with the Army Guard here in areas of ... of active combat, you are dealing with the air guard that might deploy to Germany, they might deploy down to South America. The C-130s up in Peoria go down, wouldn't surprise me if... if an International Guard C-130 was down in South America helping the earthquake refugee... or the earthquake victims in... in Ecuador. My point here is the Bill

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

sounds good. It has real, serious implications on the Illinois National Guard. I ask you, look at it very closely. It may very well pass. Maybe you try to reserv… resolve it in the Senate, but this Bill has real problems, and I think really deserve a 'no' vote. And I thank you for your attention."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy to close."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again, I want to Smiddy: reiterate that I have already spoken with Senator Hastings who has prefiled for this piece of legislation, and I'm willing to work with him and others to try to find a solution to this. I believe that it's imperative that we take care of the men and women in our Armed Forces that have fought and defended this country. I had ... the reason why this Bill came about is due to a soldier that lives near my area that was exposed and this past summer passed away. And I felt it necessary to bring this forward due to time constraints, trying to get it out of the... the House. That's why I'm very willing to work with the Senate and try to find a funding source and try to do everything I can to ensure that this is not going to be as burdensome on the state as it currently is. And I... I make that commitment here today and I just ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5995, Mr. Sullivan. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5995, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. The Bill was read for a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Sullivan."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The underlying Bill is in response to a person that would injure or kill a K-9 unit service dog. In committee, there was some opposition from Representative Mayfield who asked me to bring Amendment. It basically says that this Act or penalty would not be in violation if the K-9 unit was used outside of the force continuum or force policy. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons, do you rise in opposition?" Ammons: "No, Sir. I rise to correct a vote on House Bill 5918,

for the record, being a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. On the Amendment, those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5995, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "As many of you remember, we had an Officer Casey Kohlmeier that was killed in the line of duty alongside him was a K-9 unit by the name of Draco. This is going to be known

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

as Draco's Law. When the unit was... when the K-9 officer was killed, they could only charge the person that had a felony DUI with damage to property. And so we're going to take this Bill and... and change some of the penalties and also offer that the person that is charged has to replace the animal. This is somewhat of a work in progress. And I have worked with the chairman of the committee, Representative Sims. We have an agreement in place to change some of the penalties, lower them over in the Senate. And I see he's probably getting up to speak and maybe we could have Representative Sims explain the agreement that we have in place."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Representative Sullivan mentioned, we have agreed to work... continue to work on this piece of legislation in the Senate. I've spoken to the Senate Sponsor just this afternoon who has agreed to pick up the Bill and prefile for the Bill. This Bill is a work in progress. And we will continue to work with Representative Sullivan to get a favorable outcome on it."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6298, Representative Tabares. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6298, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Tabares."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Tabares: "House Bill 6298 provides the Fireman's Annuity and Benefit Fund of Chicago the authorization to lend securities owned by the fund. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, do you rise in opposition?"

Franks: "I... I don't know what the Bill does. I don't know whether I'm... I'm for or against."

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor will yield, Sir."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, can you describe the… since we had very Short Debate, I… I don't know what it does and we don't have enough time to read the analysis when we have a description like that. I'd appreciate if you could give us a little background. Thank you."

Tabares: "So, this Bill allows the Fireman's Annuity Benefit Fund to lend securities held by the fund to third party borrowers in exchange for pledged collateral, borrowing fees, and interest earned during the length of the borrowing term. Lending terms are negotiated at the time of borrowing and can be terminated by either party at their discretion."

Franks: "And why do we want to do that?"

Tabares: "Well, this... according to the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability's Pension Impact Note stated that the Fireman's Annuity and Benefit Fund has utilized the lending of securities since 1984. So what this Bill does is just provides the necessary statuary authorization for the fund. And there is no fiscal impact."

Franks: "So are we codifying what they've been doing for a long time and they're looking to get our approval because they've been doing it without statutory authority?"

Tabares: "Yes."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Franks: "Are there other pension funds that have this same opportunity to... to invest the same way?"

Tabares: "Yes. There is identical language found in the Illinois

Pension Code for the following pension funds, such as: the

Chicago Police Fund, the Chicago Municipal Fund, Cook

County's Employees, the Chicago Laborer's Fund, the Chicago

Park District, and Chicago Teachers. All of these funds have

a one-year limit on such transactions except for the Chicago

Teachers."

Franks: "So, this brings them into line with all the others except for the Teachers?"

Tabares: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. And I presume they have all the same protections for the fiduciaries and... and are required to be investing in the best interest of their members?"

Tabares: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. And there's no opposition?"

Tabares: "No opposition."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt, do you rise in opposition, Sir?"

Moffitt: "I just had a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield for your question."

Moffitt: "Representative, this only applies to Chicago Fire Pension. Is that correct?"

Tabares: "Correct."

Moffitt: "It's not a statewide application."

Tabares: "Correct."

Moffitt: "And... and who... who makes the decisions on the Chicago Firefighter Pension Board?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Tabares: "The Board of Trustees of the Fund."
- Moffitt: "Which consists of... can you give any explanation of that?

 How they're selected? How they're appointed? Who's on it? If

 you... if you don't have it, that's fine. I'm most... Do you ha...

 do you have the answer?"
- Tabares: "We can get that for you, Representative."
- Moffitt: "No. Okay. No... main question was if it only applied to Chicago. Thank you."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Mitchell is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to reflect that I wish to be recorded as an 'aye'... excuse me... as a 'aye' vote on House Bill 6123."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. And you may remain standing, Sir, 'cause the next Bill is yours. House Bill 2262, Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2262, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2262, it provides that the minimum amount of a \$2 million of liability insurance required for a vehicle with a school bus driver permit may be satisfied by either a \$2 million combined single

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

limit primary commercial automobile policy or a million dollar primary commercial automobile policy with a minimum of 5 million excess or umbrella liability policy."

Speaker Lang: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Mr. Franks, do you rise in opposition?"

Franks: "I need some questions answered."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Mitchell, B.: "I kind of fig... I kind of figured you would."

Franks: "Yeah. Why do we need this Bill?"

Mitchell, B.: "This just gives some school districts some flexibility. There were some issues with the \$2 million limit, so now they can use their umbrella 5... 5 million."

Franks: "Is it only for school districts?"

Mitchell, B.: "It's for those applying for the permit."

Franks: "Okay. So, this could also apply for private companies that provide services to schools."

Mitchell, B.: "Correct."

Franks: "Okay. Would this... would this be enough? I mean, I don't know... do we know what the typical claim might be if there is an accident with a school bus if it's... We've had... and the reason why I'm asking this is 'cause we've had tremendous tragedy in school buses in my county years ago. Unfortunately, a school bus was caught between two crossing sections and the... and there was fatalities when a train hit the school bus. So, I'm wondering whether these numbers are sufficient to cover this type of tragedy."

Mitchell, B.: "I'm sorry. I couldn't catch your last question."

Franks: "I... I just..."

Mitchell, B.: "The last part of your question."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Franks: "Okay. I'm sorry. I described an event that happened in my district years ago, which was a... was a tragic event."

Mitchell, B.: "Right."

Franks: "A school bus did not make it over a train crossing. The school bus was struck and there was a number of our children who were killed. Okay? There was litigation, obviously..."

Mitchell, B.: "Sure."

Franks: "...ongoing because of this. I'm wondering whether this Bill would lower the thresholds or not be sufficient to cover a tragedy such as this? So, will the... I want to make sure that the families could be made as whole as possible for their loss."

Mitchell, B.: "Yeah. The 2 million is already in the statute and then moving it to 5 is..."

Franks: "But why... then why do we need this Bill?"

Mitchell, B.: "It just gives them more flexibility."

Franks: "But what you're... what you're doing is achieving a minimum insurance requirements for school buses and I'm not sure how we're doing that."

Mitchell, B.: "The Secretary of State's Office were interrupting it as a \$2 million primary policy. So this... we're just kind of clarifying..."

Franks: "Okay. Well, I see in our analysis..."

Mitchell, B.: "And the Secretary of State's Office supports this effort. I mean, this is a Bill that took... came to me from my home area. There was many parties involved in this negotiation. And the school bus folks are okay with it as well as..."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Franks: "Well, I bet... I'm sure they will be because if this is a... if it's easier for them to get to a minimum, I'd expect..."
- Mitchell, B.: "As sure as the school district... Sir, let me repeat... finish, Sir."

Franks: "Okay."

Mitchell, B.: "As well as school districts and..."

Franks: "Can I ask why the Property Casualty Insurers Association is opposed?"

Mitchell, B.: "They think that one in the five at too high."

Franks: "Okay. Okay."

Mitchell, B.: "Too high."

- Franks: "I just wish we had more time... I'm just... I'm sorry. I think this was a shell Bill. I'm not sure when this Amendment was put on. So, I'm not sure how much..."
- Mitchell, B.: "Put on a week ago and it went to committee. And it was unanimous in committee."
- Franks: "Okay. And I don't if other folks are... are experts in insurance. I'm not. So I'm asking questions and maybe I don't..."
- Mitchell, B.: "And that's great and neither am I, that's why I'm relying on my..."
- Franks: "Right. I just want to make sure we're doing the right thing here. And I don't know if any..."
- Mitchell, B.: "We all want to do the right thing. And we want to do... protect Illinois citizens. And we think this does."
- Franks: "Tell me in a sentence how this protects Illinois citizens? That's what I'm not getting."
- Mitchell, B.: "It increases coverage on buses."
- Franks: "It does increase buses? It doesn't increase coverage?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Mitchell, B.: "The fund... you meant, it allows them to use the \$5 million umbrella. So, it's... it..."

Franks: "And before they were prohibited from using the umbrella?"

Mitchell, B.: "Right. The interpretation was it was the 2 million, so this increases it to 5 million. So, you can use the excess umbrella which is the 5 million not just the primary policy."

Franks: "Okay. And before they were not able to use the excess umbrella..."

Mitchell, B.: "That is correct."

Franks: "...so now you're actually bringing an umbrella policy in."

Mitchell, B.: "Correct."

Franks: "Well, why didn't you say that?"

Mitchell, B.: "Well, you're much more articulate than I am as this Body already knows."

Franks: "All right. Thank you very much. We came in together, Mr. Mitchell. We got to... I have to give you a hard time when you stand up."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you."

Franks: "All right. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5580, Representative Wallace. Out of the record. House Bill 8... excuse me... House Bill 4648, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4648, a Bill for an Act concerning digital assets. Third Reading of this House Bill."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4648 is a product of a lot of work that started last summer. It creates the Revised Fiduciary Access to Digital Assets Act. It allows a legally recognized fiduciary, a personal representative, a guardian, agent, or a trustee to access the digital assets, e.g., photos that someone may post on Facebook of a person who is deceased, under legal disability or subject to a trust agreement. This is a bipartisan Bill that we worked hard to make an agreed Bill. It is supported by respected organizations like Northern Trust Bank, the Illinois State Bar, the Cook County Public Guardian, Corporate Fiduciaries Association Illinois, National Association of Elder Law Attorneys, AARP, and... and the tech industry. I do want to compliment all of those that were involved particularly those from... representatives from Facebook, Google, Yahoo, Apple, who all came to the table and worked with us diligently to get this done and come to an agreement. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 104 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 887, Representative Williams. Representative Williams. Out of the record. House Bill 4935, Representative Winger. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4935, a Bill for an Act concerning health. The Bill was read for a second time, previously.

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4935, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Winger."

Winger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4935 is legislation that amends the Newborn Hearing Screening Act that was created in the early 2000s. This Bill outlines timelines for reporting on newborn testing, screening, testing time frame after birth and has information sharing protocol between the service providers and repeals the Newborn Hearing Advisory Committee. There's an approximately 50 percent loss to follow up for babies that fail the newborn hearing tests. These procedures can help close this gap. Proponents include IDPH, Illinois Academy of Audiologists, and the Illinois Hearing and Speech Association. There is no opposition. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly, do you rise on this Bill?

Mr. Franks, do you rise in opposition?"

Franks: "I have some questions."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "What happens if they don't provide this service? What happens if they don't test the kids? 'Cause I'm reading the Bill and it says that they 'shall' complete the... the hearing prior to discharge. What happens if they don't? Is there a penalty?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Winger: "Well, if they don't then... I'm not aware of a penalty within the Act; however, if the hospital does not do that, they're not in compliance and then that baby does not... 'cause the parent doesn't know if that baby has a hearing impairment."
- Franks: "Is there an affirmative obligation by a parent who has a child outside of a medical facility and has the... has the baby at home..."

Winger: "Yes."

- Franks: "...and is then there an affirmative obligation by that parent to have to bring the child in for hearing screening within 30 days of birth?"
- Winger: "The directive is on the physician or... or the health care provider that helped with that birth to direct the parent to... to follow up within 30 days."
- Franks: "And what happens if the parent does not do that? Is there any penalty for the parent or for the health care provider?

 I'm just... I just want to make sure that we're not criminalizing, you know, home births."
- Winger: "No. There's no criminal penalty invoked."
- Franks: "Well, even a civil penalty. I'm just wondering where does... where's the burden on this? So, let's say someone has their baby at home and they're assisted by whoever... some health care professional. Okay? And then they say, you know, you're supposed to go to get... get the hearing checked. What... what happens if they don't?"
- Winger: "We're checking on if there's a civil penalty within the rules."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Franks: "Okay. And I'm wondering how this is drafted because you say they 'shall' do this before discharge."

Winger: "Correct."

Franks: "Wouldn't it be better that you encourage it. What happens if they don't have the opportunity before discharge? What happens if it... whatever it might be? I mean, does it really need to be mandated in the language and that they must do this before discharge?"

Winger: "Yes. And when I gave birth seven months ago, I wasn't even thinking about can my baby hear. But this is in place because all too often babies are born with a hearing impairment and the first six months of life are key to development. And what it does is it keeps cost after two, three years into the baby's life that limits cost of services then. So, we need to address this immediately when they're born and hospitals have the audiologists... well, the one that does the testing, going through the maternity ward, and there is an opportunity within the stay that the mother has with that baby. So... so, there is flexibility. It's to see the person doing the testing does... doesn't come in once and leaves for the day that that's their key role."

Franks: "Does there need to be follow-up? What happens if, you know, it's not definitive, the test, on the first time? Is there required follow-up on this?"

Winger: "Well, when I gave birth, the person doing the testing came back shortly 'cause it was inconclusive and then the test was done again, and thankfully, my daughter passed the test. But for follow-up, that's where there is a second

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- follow-up that's written in the Act that has to be done before it's a confirmed hearing impairment."
- Franks: "Okay. Well, I appreciate the answers. And I understand what you're trying to do. I just want to make sure that we're not providing penalties for people we're not trying to penalize. And I know that your staff is... is looking to determine that, so I appreciate your efforts."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can you please let the record show that I intended to vote 'no' on House Bill 335?"
- Speaker Lang: "The record will show your intention. Mr. Demmer is recognized."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."
- Demmer: "I'd like to give a warm Springfield welcome to the fourth graders from Tilton School in Rochelle. Welcome to the Capitol. Their teacher Sheri Klindera is here too. Representative Stewart and I would like to say welcome to the Capitol."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for joining us today. House Bill 5781, Representative Bellock. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5781, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time, previously.

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Bellock."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock on the Amendment."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Lang: "Quickly, briefly, what does it do?"

Bellock: "Floor Amendment #2 takes out the immunity in the Bill and doctors and nurses from being able to dispose of medications."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5781, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And what this Bill does is it codifies the authority of police officers and coroners to go in and take out unused medications found at the scene of a death and dispose of them properly."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Harper, Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4554, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4554, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4554 as amended is an agreed Bill that codifies existing practice with the Department of Health Care and Family Services. The Bill required that the Illinois Medicaid include in its coverage prep and any other type of corresponding program to deal with HIV and STD testing, medical and monitoring. I know of no opposition to the Bill. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack, do you rise in opposition?"

Sandack: "I have a few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "I want to make sure I... 'cause it got noisy. Does your last Amendment taken off... Thank you. Your last Amendment, has it taken off all known opposition?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Sandack: "Because it was quite a bit... at least originally and then as amended everyone worked together and we're all on the same page."

Flowers: "There was quite a bit and there's none as of this date."

Sandack: "Thank you, Ma'am."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please take the record. There are 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Bill 5417, Mr. Ford. Out of the record. House Bill 5762, Representative Harper. Representative Harper. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5762, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5762, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "Can we hold the Bill on Third?"

Speaker Lang: "We certainly can hold the Bill on Third. You understand today's the deadline, Representative."

Harper: "Can I have an extended deadline?"

Speaker Lang: "That... that you'll have to take up with someone of... ahead of my paygrade."

Harper: "Gotcha. Okay."

Speaker Lang: "All right. So, this Bill will be on... held on the Order of Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6027. Mr. Tryon. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6027, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. The Bill was read for a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6027, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that we've been actually working on for a couple of years that will allow Illinois to participate in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's nutrition incentive program at our farmers markets. And it create an appropriation so that people on the SNAP program using LINK cards may be able to use them at farmers markets as well as get some incentives to actually buy fresh fruits and vegetables. We have 500 farmers markets, only 68 of them take the LINK card. We feel that this will allow the LINK card to be used all over the State of Illinois at farmers markets. Be able to encourage other farmers markets to open up in our small towns throughout the states as well as take advantage of the \$100 million of federal money that's been appropriated for this type of use. So, if you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them, otherwise, I... I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 5763. Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5763, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. The Bill was read for a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 5572. Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5572, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5572 is the result of numerous discussions and work that Members of this august Body have done. What House Bill 5572 does, it creates a sex offenders' registry task force. What we've tried to do is to put together a task force representing victims' rights groups and other interested parties to come together and make sure that we are putting together a policy in the State of Illinois that represents and reflects the concerns that we have regarding individuals who create some very heinous crimes. I ask for... I know of no opposition, I ask for its favorable 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? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 5684. Representative Breen. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5684, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Breen."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that resulted from...

 Well, first off, we've got to adopt Amendment 3 which is agreed language to work out with the IFT and IMRF that would provide that a payment that occurs more than 90 days prior to the retirement of a... an IMRF participant but after they've indicated their intent to retire, a payment of more than six percent would need to be made through an open meeting. It exempts anyone involved in collective bargaining agreements, so really the only folks that are getting hit here are the very, very top folks in the municipality. So, I would move the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Lang: "Those... Excuse me. Mr. Franks on the Amendment. Mr. Mitchell on the Amendment."
- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple questions of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Mitchell, C.: "Representative, I'm curious. So, I actually really, really, really liked your sort of initial Bill because, as you know, one of the challenges we've had on some pension stuff is that, you know, there's been sort of back loading it's why... and our pension proposal we went from projected units earned at entry age, normal. So I'm just curious, why, if it is such a good idea, would you go from effectively banning a practice to asking voters whether or not they want to ban the practice?"
- Breen: "So... so, here's... here's what we did. The initial Bill, there were constitutional concerns. And of course, we run into this regularly any time we are dealing with payments towards the end of a career. And so, we were not able to get

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

that initial language through. But what we wanted to do was still to ensure..."

Mitchell, C.: "Just for clarity, Representative..."

Breen: "Sure."

Mitchell, C.: "...when you say weren't able to get it through you mean, get it through..."

Breen: "In other words, there was not able... we... we did not have agreement that the language would have even been constitutional."

Mitchell, C.: "Okay."

Breen: "And... and we could not get agreement with the unions and with IMRF and even amongst the pension committee. So... so, that language really was not ... Well, let me put it this way. We've got two main issues here. One is a... the governing board of a municipality or a local unit of government increases greatly, the final pension of a very highly paid employee and does so without knowing what they're doing. So, in other words, there's... they take those benefits a little more than the 90 days. It spikes the pension and the folks who are on the board don't know what's going on and the public doesn't know. There's another situation which was one that one of my... our chief cosponsors experienced, where the board knew what it was doing but the public didn't know that they were spiking. And so, what we're trying to do is really go at it from a notification way. I hope that based on this language... you know, there's many ways to skin a cat... what we wanted to do was say, hey, if you're going to spike someone's pension like this, you've got to put it out in an open meeting. You've got to dictate what you're doing so that there's no confusion

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

that that's exactly what's getting done. And that way, too, we avoid any constitutional issues and we avoid putting any burden as well on IMRF and the state funds."

Mitchell, C.: "And just to be clear for the record. What is the constitutional issue with... with mandating the provision?"

Breen: "Well, so initially the thought of trying to make something that is a payment not a pensionable payment changes... or has a potential to change the way..."

Mitchell, C.: "The benefit."

Breen: "...change those benefits from where they were the moment that the person entered the pension system 40 years... you know, 40 years earlier. And so, you're really... when you're making changes and want to avoid the constitutional issues, you try not to change the definition of payments. And so, that's why we retreated from that language and kind of came at the... the problem from a different angle. So, I think we still are going to get it done, but we do it in a way that no one's even challenging the constitutionality of it."

Mitchell, C.: "Okay. Thanks for your... thanks for answering those questions, Representative. Just to the Amendment. I think what the Sponsor's trying to do is a good thing. I'm going to keep listening to the debate. I'm just concerned about the precedent of taking a practice we know isn't a great thing, leaving it open, yes, to the public, but still saying that it can be done. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Franks: "Representative, I'm trying to understand the House Floor
Amendment #3 where it says it removes the language that
exempted unused vacation time or other benefits from being
included as a disclosable payment."

"And... and Representative, I think I... and I don't... that's Breen: not in my analysis, that's in yours. What... here is the problem. One of the earlier versions that had come out of LRB had exempted end of career vacation payments, which was not my intent. And so, we had to get rid of that in the third Amendment. The point of the third Amendment is really to pull it... We'd initially been... I like small, simple Amendments to Bills. Unfortunately, we just couldn't get it done. So, we actually put a new Act together. It's called... You know, so now we have... it is called the Local Government Wage Increase Transparency Act. I don't know how that works as an acronym. But so what we've done is we took out that part where somehow end of career vacation days wouldn't be included, because that's part of the abuse is when sometimes the highly paid employees have the ability to negotiate a little better deal for themselves and they can take it more than 90 days out that spikes... that can... that has the potential to spike their pension."

Franks: "We've... we've seen a lot of that in this state. What concerns me is the fact that we passed a law saying that they couldn't have increases greater than six percent for their last four years. That was before your time, before you got here. But what we've seen is abuses at the local level where they've done it time and again, but we also have a penalty in there for when the local governments do that. So, as a result,

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

they... they ignore the law and then they pay a penalty, but they don't care because all were tax dollars anyway. Right?" Breen: "Well... well and this was the thing. In some units of government, some local municipalities, it's happening without people knowing."

Franks: "Right."

Breen: "So, the elected officials don't know; the public doesn't know and so, then, all of a sudden, they turn around and get a bill from IMRF for \$200 thousand. So, we want to stop that. And in other places, you've got sweetheart deals happening where the elected officials know, but the public is in the dark. We want to shine the light brightly on that conduct. And again, hopefully, what this will do is because of the bright light shine... shone on the problem, we will hopefully shame people into stopping this. So, we'll stop the accidental and we'll be able to stop the... the deliberate as well."

Franks: "Well, I saw in the analysis that IMRF was against..."

Breen: "Initially."

Franks: "Okay. And that was... and why were they initially opposed?"

Breen: "Because the burden was on them to determine what was a payment and I... I think that... that involved them too much. That it was touching on this constitutional issue a little too much. And so, what we did was remove the burden to say, hey, you know, the municipality is going to determine that. And so, that removed the objection of IMRF. We also we had the IFT and we were dealing with some of the union issues. And so, my colleagues, who are now on the Bill, said, hey, how do we keep the little guy out of this? So, we don't want the unintended consequence, so we exempted folks who are

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

subject to collective bargaining. So, there's no issue there. This is really hitting the folks that are the worst abusers in the worst cases and really, I mean, it's as clean as we can go. A nice clean shot at this abuse which is happening everywhere from Rockford to Lombard to Bloomington, all over the state."

Franks: "By taking IMRF out of determining whether there is an issue, you're leaving it really the fox to watch the hen house, because you're saying that the municipality are the ones who are... who are the ones who are... who are doing this or the local government are also the ones you're asking then to... to report, correct?"

Breen: "Well... well and I don't think so. I mean... what we've got and... one of the intentions here is once you put something like this into the books, municipal attorneys across the state then get it into their training materials, everyone looks at it. It starts... it comes to mind and hopefully, we will then see everyone going, wait, are we doing something that we cannot do? And so, at that point, you are then able to, hopefully, change the mindset so this never happens. I hope this... I hope this new Bill, should it become law, never gets invoked because people will say I don't want to put this in front of my people. But if it does, we've got this in the way to be able to say, whoa, back the truck up. You've got to disclose this to the public before you go... before you go forward with it."

Franks: "But there's no way to stop it, are you telling us?

There's no way to stop these spikes above the statutory limit of six percent?"

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Breen: "Well, and... and what was done here, as I understand the penalty provision, you know, in the Teachers situation, you know, there were some... some abuses from some of those top administrators."

Franks: "Absolutely."

Breen: "But you see at the school board level, they can say, well, the state's going to pay the pension. So we don't mind. In the IMRF situation..."

Franks: "But... but they still have to pay the penalty."

Breen: "Oh, we all... well, they have to pay a penalty..."

Franks: "Right."

Breen: "...but we as taxpayers all get stuck. The... in the IMRF situation, when you spike, it's on your municipality, just on your municipality. So, you're paying your own fund... that penalty payment. So, folks, you know, that's the problem. We can't... we can't get around that..."

Franks: "But is there a way..."

Breen: "...but we can come at it..."

Franks: "...did you look to see whether we could cap it at six and say, you're not going higher than this; you're not going higher. You can't even pay a penalty if you want to go higher."

Breen: "Well, you know, I don't think there would be support for that and if we did so, I believe we would have to do so for everyone hired after a particular date. And at that point, you're already dealing with a Tier 2 which I believe already has a lot of these issues taken care of."

Franks: "Well, they..."

Breen: "This only applies to the Tier 1."

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Franks: "Okay. Well, I appreciate it. I'll listen to more."

Breen: "Sure."

Franks: "I think it's intriguing with what you're trying to do."

Brady: "We're trying, yeah. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5684, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen, did... Amendment 3 became the Bill?"

Breen: "Yes... yes, Mr. Chair."

Speaker Lang: "I believe it's been thoroughly debated. I see no one wishing to speak. Therefore, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1181, offered by Representative Walsh. And House Resolution 1184, offered by Representative Jimenez."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, May 3 at the hour of noon. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned. Have a nice week."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

Second Reading in full as amended of House Joint Resolution

Constitutional Amendment #58.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend Article IV of the Illinois Constitution by changing Sections 2 and 3 as follows:

ARTICLE IV

THE LEGISLATURE

SECTION 2. LEGISLATIVE COMPOSITION

(a) One Senator shall be elected from each Legislative District. Immediately following each decennial redistricting, the General Assembly by law shall divide the Legislative Districts as equally as possible into three groups. Senators from one group shall be elected for terms of four years, four years and two years; Senators from the second group, for terms of four years, two years and four years; and Senators from the third group, for terms of two years, four years and four years. The Legislative Districts in each group shall be distributed substantially equally over the State.

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

- (b) In 1982 and every two years thereafter one Representative shall be elected from each Representative District for a term of two years.
- Assembly, a person must be a United States citizen, at least 21 years old, and for the two years preceding his election or appointment a resident of the district which he is to represent. In the general election following a redistricting, a candidate for the General Assembly may be elected from any district which contains a part of the district in which he resided at the time of the redistricting and reelected if a resident of the new district he represents for 18 months prior to reelection.
- (d) Within thirty days after a vacancy occurs, it shall be filled by appointment as provided by law. If the vacancy is in a Senatorial office with more than twenty-eight months remaining in the term, the appointed Senator shall serve until the next general election, at which time a Senator shall be elected to serve for the remainder of the term. If the vacancy is in a Representative office or in any other Senatorial office, the appointment shall be for the remainder of the term. An appointee to fill a vacancy shall be a member of the same political party as the person he succeeds.
- (e) No member of the General Assembly shall receive compensation as a public officer or employee from any other governmental entity for time during which he is in attendance as a member of the General Assembly. No member of the General Assembly during the term for which he was elected or appointed shall be appointed to a public office which shall have been

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

created or the compensation for which shall have been increased by the General Assembly during that term.

SECTION 3. LEGISLATIVE REDISTRICTING

- (a) Legislative Districts and Representative Districts shall each, in order of priority, be substantially equal in population; provide racial minorities and language minorities with the equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice; provide racial minorities and language minorities who constitute less than a voting-age majority of a District with an opportunity to substantially influence the outcome of an election; be contiguous; be compact; respect, to the extent practical, geographic integrity of units of local government; respect, to the extent practical, communities sharing common social or economic interests; and not discriminate against or in favor of any political party or individual.
- (b) No later than June 30 of the year in which each Federal decennial census occurs, the Chief Justice and the most senior Justice of the Supreme Court who is not affiliated with the same political party as the Chief Justice shall select eight commissioners to an Independent Redistricting Commission. Commissioners must reflect the ethnic, gender, and racial demographics of Illinois, and there must be at least one commissioner from each Judicial District.
- (c) A person is ineligible to serve on the Commission if within the previous four calendar years the person or his or her spouse or immediate family member was appointed or elected to a position with the State or local government, a State employee, a lobbyist as defined by law, a person with an

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

ownership interest in an entity with a state contract, or appointed or elected to serve a political party. A commissioner is ineligible for a period of ten years to serve in the General Assembly or to be appointed to a position subject to Senate confirmation. Commissioners must file financial disclosure statements and abide by any ethics requirements established by law.

- (d) The Commission shall act in public meetings by affirmative vote of five commissioners. The Commission shall elect its chairperson and vice chairperson, who shall not be affiliated with the same political party. All meetings of the Commission shall be open to the public and publicly noticed at least seven days prior to the meeting. All records of the Commission, including all communications to or from the Commission regarding the work of the Commission, shall be available for public inspection. The Commission shall adopt rules governing its procedures.
- (e) The Commission shall hold at least fifteen public hearings throughout the State before adopting any redistricting plan, with a majority occurring before the Commission releases any proposed redistricting plan and at least five occurring after the release of any proposed redistricting plan. The Commission may not adopt a redistricting plan until the Commission adopts a report explaining its compliance with the United States and Illinois Constitutions. Prior to the adoption of a redistricting plan, the Commission shall release to the public the final plan and its associated compliance report. The meeting to vote on adoption of a redistricting plan shall occur no sooner than seven days after

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

the release of the final plan and its associated compliance report.

- (f) The Commission shall adopt and file with the Secretary of State a redistricting plan for the Legislative Districts and Representative Districts by June 30 of the year following the Federal decennial census. The Commission may adopt separate redistricting plans for the Legislative Districts and the Representative Districts.
- (g) If the Commission fails to adopt and file a redistricting plan by July 1 of the year following a Federal decennial census, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the most senior Justice of the Supreme Court who is not affiliated with the same political party as the Chief Justice shall appoint a ninth member to the Commission. The nine-member Commission shall adopt and file with the Secretary of State a redistricting plan for the Legislative Districts and Representative Districts by August 1 of the year following the Federal decennial census.
- (h) A redistricting plan filed with the Secretary of State shall be presumed valid and shall be published promptly by the Secretary of State.
- (i) The Supreme Court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over actions concerning redistricting the House and Senate, which shall be initiated in the name of the People of the State by the Attorney General.

SCHEDULE

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act and applies to redistricting

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

beginning in 2021 and to the election of General Assembly members beginning in 2022. This was Second Reading in full as amended of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #58. Third Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #59.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend the Illinois Constitution by changing Section 3 of Article IX as follows:

ARTICLE IX

REVENUE

SECTION 3. LIMITATIONS ON INCOME TAXATION

- (a) A tax on or measured by income may be imposed by law. At any one time there may be no more than one such tax imposed by the State for State purposes on individuals and one such tax so imposed on corporations. In any such tax imposed upon corporations the rate shall not exceed the rate imposed on individuals by more than a ratio of 8 to 5.
- (b) Laws imposing taxes on or measured by income may adopt by reference provisions of the laws and regulations of the United States, as they then exist or thereafter may be changed, for the purpose of arriving at the amount of income upon which the tax is imposed.

SCHEDULE

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Constitutional Amendment Act. This is Third Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #59. House Bill 6565, offered by Representative Bryant, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6566, offered by Representative Wheeler, Barbara, a Bill for an Act concerning health. First Reading of these House Bills."

"Introduction of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 210, Clerk Bolin: offered by Representative Bourne, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 229, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 232, offered by Representative Andrade, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 235, offered Representative Mitchell, Bill, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 238, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 240, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 241, offered Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 242, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 279, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 280, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 303, offered by Representative Harris, Greg, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 388, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 389, offered by Representative Sente, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 392, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

concerning local government. Senate Bill 440, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 466, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 565, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 579, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2047, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2138, offered by Representative Sullivan, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2186, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2214, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2227, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2236, offered by Representative Ammons, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2261, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2270, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2279, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2300, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 2301, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2306, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 2314, offered by Representative McDermed, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2331, offered by

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Representative Mitchell, Christian, a Bill for an concerning public aid. Senate Bill 2355, offered Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2393, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2433, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2443, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2469, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2527, offered Representative McDermed, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2531, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 2567, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2587, offered by Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Senate Bill 2600, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2604, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 2677, offered Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2701, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2746, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2819, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2820, offered Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate 2822, Bill offered

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning public benefits. Bill 2824, offered Senate Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Senate Bill 2827, offered by Representative McSweeney, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 2835, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2837, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 2840, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2845, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2893, offered by Representative Batinick, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2905, offered Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2910, offered by Representative Bryant, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Senate Bill 2921, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2948, offered Representative Wheeler, Keith, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 2975, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2989, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act liquor. Senate Bill 2992, offered concerning Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3007, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 3024, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3032, offered Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning

123rd Legislative Day

4/22/2016

State government. Senate Bill 3047, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3049, offered by Representative Leitch, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3062, offered by Representative Harris, Greg, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3095, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act Senate Bill 3104, offered concerning liquor. Representative Jesiel, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3119, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning the Department of Juvenile Justice. Senate Bill 3130, offered by Representative Butler, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Senate Bill 3162, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Senate Bill 3177, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3312, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3325, offered by Representative Tabares, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3335, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3368, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. Senate Bill 3412, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. First Reading of the ... of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."