124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

- Speaker Turner: "The House shall come to order. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Patrick E. McGrath who is the President of Loyola Academy in Wilmette, Illinois. Reverend McGrath is the guest of Representative Martwick. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."
- Reverend McGrath: "Let us pray. Eternal God, we give You thanks for another day. Send Your spirit and lead us to action on behalf of the common good and move us to compassion and care for the most vulnerable Members of our human family. Grant strength and wisdom to the Members of this House. Inspire them to imagination and creative action and service to the people of this great state. Bless all Illinoisans who this day labor to provide for their families, educate their children, and care for their elders. During these challenging times, allow us to be touched by the better angels of our nature in service to Your will. May all that is done in this House today be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen."
- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Flowers."
- Flowers 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 Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Brown."

  Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Jeanne Ives is excused this afternoon.

  Thank you."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

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

Speaker Turner: "With 115 Members present, a quorum is established. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 02, 2016: approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 4312, House Bill 5764, House Bill 5931; approved for consideration, referred to Third Reading is House Bill 5417, House Bill 5762, House Bill 5580. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1185, offered by Representative Fortner. House Resolution 1197, offered by Representative Anthony. House Resolution 1199, offered by Representative Fine. These are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jimenez, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Jimenez: "I have two quick points. First of all, I want to recognize my student advisory group. They are here representing all of the high schools in the district. They are up here in the chamber. To Kadea, Steven, Riley, Zach, Elliana, Luke, Hannah, Jimmy, and Will, thank you very much for being here today."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol."

Jimenez: "And... and also, in continuing with the tradition, you can probably smell it in the chamber, but Ag Director, Raymond

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Poe, the man who sat in this seat for a long time, has chicken here and all the goodies with Poe's Catering. And thanks to the Village of Rosemont. So please, join Representative Poe, he's back by Representative Leitch's office and enjoy the chicken today."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And thank you, Representative Poe.

Representative Ammons, for what reason do you rise?"

Ammons: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Ammons: "It is my pleasure to share with the Members of this great Assembly, the 75th anniversary of SERS and SUAA, which is the State University Retirement System, and our new attends will celebrate their 75th year of service for the State of Illinois today between 5 and 7. We'd love for you all to come over and wish them another 75 years. We want to thank SERS for their service."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1099. Representative Martwick."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 1099.

Be it RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we recognize the significant milestones of Loyola Academy's 2015 football team and we wish them many more years of success."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention for just a brief moment. In... in 1980, I had a very distinct privilege and honor in one of the great moments of my life when I was accepted and

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

enrolled at Loyola Academy High School. In 1984, I graduated to go on to further Jesuit education. Loyola Academy is not just one of the finest academic institutions in our state and in our country, but the Jesuit tradition of service and integrity and leadership and the principles that they instill in the young men and women that attend that fine institution is something that I take great pride in. But today, we bring down a number of the members of the Loyola Academy football team which accomplished a tremendous feat this year, not just in winning the Class 8A State Championship but in going undefeated from the beginning to the end of their season. A really impressive feat. So would you please join me in welcoming some of the players that have joined us today. We have Sam... Badovinac... Sam Badovinac, sorry Sam, Desherow, Frank Doherty, Eric Eshoo, Ben LeRoy, John Shannon, Robby Sullivan, and Patrick Tata. Please give them a warm Springfield welcome and join me in congratulating them on their class A State Football Championship."

- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative, and congratulations, guys. Members, on page 6 of the Calendar we have Constitutional Amendments on Second Reading. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 58. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill... Read the Res..."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution 58 is on the Order of Second Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please move this to the Order of Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #58, third time as amended read in full.

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Be it 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.
- (b) In 1982 and every two years thereafter one Representative shall be elected from each Representative District for a term of two years.
- (c) To be eligible to serve as a member of the General 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

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

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 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

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

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 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 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

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

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 two 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. The Commission may not adopt a redistricting plan until the Commission adopts a report explaining its compliance with the United States and Illinois Constitutions.
- (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

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, just a few months ago we had the distinct honor of having our former colleague and now our President, Barrack Obama, come to this General Assembly and address this chamber. And at that time, you... you may recall just a few short months ago, he spoke of creating

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

a new politics. One in which entrenched partisan and economic interests would be replaced by a system in which the people have more of a say in the direction that their government takes. And one of his specific proposals was to take the power of drawing Legislative Districts out of the hands of politicians who have every reason to gain the system for their own benefit. We come before you today with a proposal that will address that. HJRCA 58 would allow the voters of Illinois to decide to if they want to completely remove the Legislature and the Governor from the redistricting process. The people of Illinois have been left out of the process and they need to be included. That's why we introduced this Constitutional Amendment, so that the voters could have the chance to make this important decision for themselves. Now, if they choose to take that step, an independent commission made up of people who are not elected officials, they are not lobbyists, they are not state employees or anyone else who might have a potential conflict of interest, or anyone who can gain financially or politically from the drawing of these boundaries. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the highest ranking Justice of the opposite Party will appoint an eight-member independent commission. And the members of the commission will accurately represent the racial geographic makeup of Illinois. And if the commission is unable to approve a map, the two Justices must then appoint a ninth Member to the commission to finalize the map. And we decided to go with the Supreme Court because all the maps ultimately end up there anyway, so why not just start there. The

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

commission will take in to account factors such as racial and ethnic makeup, electoral competitiveness, and geographic integrity. And the commissioners must reflect the ethnic, gender, and racial demographics of Illinois. And there must be at least one commission from each... commissioner from each Judicial district. The appointed panel must hold 15 public hearings throughout the state before adopting a plan. And the commission must send out public notice seven days in advance that a meeting is going to be taking place. And I want to make the reasons as to why this Body should vote in favor of this Constitutional Amendment crystal clear. Both Parties agree that we need structural reform in Illinois in order to move our state forward. Now, we may not agree on all the structural reforms that have been proposed by either side of the aisle, but this is one such reform that defies partisan barriers. Adopting this reform will allow the people to decide if they want to have more control over the government, and I believe that's exactly what they want and they deserve the chance to have it. Now, it's easy to forget that government at all levels belongs to the people and not to the entrenched political players and special interest. By voting for this Amendment, we can send a powerful message to the people of Illinois that we recognize this and it is still their government and that they are entitled to a better system that accurately reflects their reality and not ours. This Body will show the people that we serve that we are not limited by the desire for power and influence, but that we are still a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Now, I realize that what we're asking here is not a small thing. We're asking you to give up an enormous power to an uncertain future. But our reason for being in the General Assembly is not simply just to work the system to better our chances for reelection. It must be beyond our own personal desires and be about serving our people, our constituents in an honorable way. By changing the map-making process in Illinois to an independent system, we can create a better and more honorable politics. Now, I'd like to thank the following organizations for their advocacy on this issue: Common Cause of Illinois, the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform, the Illinois Public Institute Research Group, the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, and the Small Business Advocacy Group. Now, the work done by other groups on this issue is laudable, and I have taken what I believe to be the best parts of their proposals along with the best practices from other states that have adopted redistricting and reform into this Amendment. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Thank you. Jack, we had a brief conversation, I think, Second Reading, and I... I just want you to compare and contrast, if you will, the... the citizens' initiative which I think we saw last week was filed."

Franks: "Yeah."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Sandack: "And it had, I think, 560 thousand signatures which culminated in about a year's long journey to... to... because frankly, this Body didn't do it. So, what makes your Bill... or your Constitutional Amendment proposal better than the Citizens' Initiative which has taken a year to kind of unfold itself, reveal itself, and looks like get on the ballot."

"I appreciate that question. It's a valid question and Franks: one that needs to be discussed. And let me preface my... my comments by saying I do support the Independent Maps movement as well. I'm not convinced, however, that theirs will get on the ballot for a number of reasons, mostly constitutional, which we don't have to debate now. But I also believe that after reflection and I had seen what they had done and taken part of what they had put together, and ours is better. And I... and I can tell you that Common Cause says that our initiative provides a promising path forward for ending the unfair manipulation of Legislative and Representative Districts in Illinois. It praises the Bill. It says it cre... because of the independent commission is tasked with drawing competitive districts that provide neither Party with a distinct advantage. So ours is well thought out, but the ... if you're asking for the nuts and bolt differences, I can tell you how we differ in a number of significant ways. Our... our Bill... our Constitutional Amendment prioritizes the creation of districts that allow racial and language minorities in an opportunity to elect their preferred candidate or at least substantially influence the election. This is really... helps empower minorities."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me... excuse me. Members, we have a very important debate going on. Can we please keep the noise level down in the chamber? Thank you. Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It requires the commission to reflect the ethnic, gender, and racial demographics of the state. Importantly, this also removes the General Assembly from the process completely. Absolutely, completely. It prohibits commissioners from serving in the General Assembly or being appointed to a position subject to Senate confirmation for 10 years, and it also provides for greater transparency. It leaves 15 meetings and all meetings open to the public with at least 7-days' notice and all records and communications open to the public without any attorney/client privilege. Those are the most significant differences."

Sandack: "You're aware... you're well aware of the effort Independent Maps has undertaken. Isn't that right?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir. I supported them."

Sandack: "Okay. So you've known for the better part of the year they were endeavoring to get the Citizens' question on the ballot. Isn't that correct?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Sandack: "And did you engage Independent Maps with the drafting of your Constitutional Amendment... Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 58?"

Franks: "We showed that to them after I'd put together the draft."

Sandack: "My question was did you engage them in the process..."

Franks: "Not... no, because I... I came up with a different philosophy on how... how which to go forward because the... as I said, I supported them, but my concern was because they were amending

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

more than one Article of the Constitution that I... that I believe that there... that there will be a Constitutional challenge. And I..."

Sandack: "Well you know there will be..."

Franks: "Right, but I..."

Franks: "But I'm also..."

Sandack: "Not that good lawyer but someone else."

Franks: "Whoever may challenge it..."

Sandack: "Right."

Franks: "...I'm saying it may not pass Constitutional muster."

Sandack: "So, did you..."

Franks: "And I want to make sure that we have the best one going forward. So, that's why we were... I wanted to have the best one and we looked at what other states had done. I had looked at what... I had looked at what Independent Maps had done."

Sandack: "Well, Jack, you have to admit, there's going to be some skepticism from people about the propriety of your Amendment coming in the last days of this Session for purposes of getting a Constitutional question on the ballot. Given what happened in the last version of Independent Maps and who basically kicked them off the ballot and the challenges that are likely to come, you... you kind of get it that people all of the sudden see, oh now the folks in charge want to write something that we've had to endeavor to move forward. Now all of the sudden, they want their rules. Don't you... I mean, you understand that skepticism, don't you?"

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Franks: "Mr. Sandack, I've never engaged in that type of politics.

I don't play..."

Sandack: "That wasn't what I was asking you personally."

Franks: "I know, but... but the idea is the skepticism, I think, is based on those people who wish to cast dispersions on a clearly superior effort that's done in good faith..."

Sandack: "Well I don't think anyone's casting dispersions."

Franks: "For the... for the purpose of protecting the taxpayers."

Sandack: "Wait a minute but hold on. Folks that have moved Independent Maps forward, heck, they did so out of necessity. This Body, including yourself, Sir, didn't run to make a Constitutional Amendment. I will note that there were several filed, none by you, that sat in Rules in perpetuity. And in what..."

Franks: "Sir, I've done this... I've done this the years before." Sandack: "Okay. Well, hold on."

Franks: "I was a strong proponent of the Con Con, because I wanted to discuss this at the Con Con, where people on your side of the aisle spent three and a half million dollars and trotted out Jim Edgar to say, hey, if we have a Con Con, it's going to cost a lot of money and we might talk about fair maps and God forbid. So, this is something that isn't new to me. This is something I've been working on for years."

Sandack: "Good. I'm glad. I'm glad, but you... you don't have a...
you didn't have a Bill filed until..."

Franks: "I have I have in the past. I didn't do it this year."

Sandack: "Okay. Well, that's wonderful, but I'm talking about the year that since Independent Maps filed their proposal,

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Representative Franks, you have not filed anything until last month. Isn't that correct?"

Franks: "After I woke up in a cold sweat and realized that theirs probably wasn't going to make it on the ballot, I took it upon myself to make sure that we protected the voters of this state. Because if I wouldn't have brought this forward, there's a good chance that nothing is going to be on the ballot. This is... and beyond the fact that this is the best one written, it also has the best chance of getting on the ballot."

Sandack: "Thank you for your answers. To the Constitutional Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm not sure why we have a lot of idle chatter. This is a pretty important issue and it should be undertaken... your vote should be undertaken diligently and thoughtfully. Unfortunately, I ... I suspect this is more political than it is legitimate. The timing of the Gentleman's proposal and other Constitutional questions before us indicate a distinct political scent to everything we're doing now. The Independent Maps folks did their job. No one wanted them to move forward, frankly, on that side of the aisle and when they did... and when they did get momentum, now the issue is going to be hijacked as though this is something the Speaker and the Democrats in charge, i.e. the map drawers, now want to make sure that you'll still have some semblance of control. The Chicago Tribune wrote a pretty thorough opinion piece on this. And they, despite the Gentleman's comments, took great issue with the specter and environment of his question and again engaged the populace to vote for the Independent Maps, it's... that should be on the ballot. The

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Gentleman suggesting it may not make constitutional... may not make the ballot suggests exactly who wants it off the ballot. I think it's going to be on the ballot and all we're going to do now is maybe have two questions and have a confusing situation in front of us. And that may be part of what's involved here. I would simply suggest everyone's for Independent Maps on my side or folks I talked to. The question is, are you with the people or are you with the Sponsor? Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Fortner."

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

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

Fortner: "First of all, I'd like to thank you, Representative, for bringing this proposal forward. I know you have worked on it in the past as I have... virtually since I have come to this chamber offering different forms of Amendments to try and deal with it. When I look at your Amendment, one of the things that I think is important to notice is the way you put limits on who can be on the commission and how they might serve in the future, right. There's like a 10-year bar either way from having people who would benefit by this process from the ones being drawing the maps. Isn't that right?"

Franks: "Correct. And Independent Maps can't do that."

Fortner: "And... and speaking of the group that has been doing the petition drive, in the version that they filed for in 2014, it seems to me that is exactly what they wanted, that they actually had that same kind of limitation. Isn't that right?"

Franks: "Exactly, but unfortunately, they couldn't do that legally. We're the only ones who can do that legally."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Fortner: "And that's the point I wanted to make, is that one of the strengths of this proposal is they're able to do exactly what the group for Independent Maps sought to do originally... sought to do in 2014. But because of the restrictions of our Constitution on the petition process, they had to jettison that from their proposal from 2014 to the effort that is filed in 2016. So I think one of the strengths is really that this goes back to what that group, in fact, did intend. It's just that the limitations of our Constitution prevent that. So I want to thank you for that. The other thing is, and I know we had this discussion in committee on some of the other provisions that might be interpreted as vague. When we say a district is compact, there are something like 50 different mathematical measures. I want to make sure that for the intent, it is the case that we still have the ability to provide clarity to some of the terminology in this Amendment by legislative action."

Franks: "Yes."

Fortner: "And so... so just everyone is clear, the... that places where language might be vague or might even change because of Federal Court direction, we, the Legislature are not giving up that power. We still can provide that clarification and make sure we stay in step with anything that's happening from Federal Courts which routinely are ruling on questions affecting redistricting in it. And... and again, I want to make sure everyone's aware that we're still going to be able to do that because we'll need to do that should events happen at the federal level."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Franks: "I really appreciate that. And one other thing I wanted to point out... and I really appreciate your help on this, Mr. Fortner, because you've made this a better Bill. And the previous speaker had talked about the other efforts to get it on the ballot. Nothing precludes Independent Maps, should they withstand any constitutional challenge, to have theirs on as well. And then wouldn't that be a great problem to have to have two of these. The people have a choice and they... we could actually change how we redistrict. I think it'd be wonderful."

Fortner: "Well, I certainly think it'd be wonderful to change how we redistrict. I..."

Franks: "I like mine better."

Fortner: "I... I list... I support yours. I listened to a lot of testimony in the last redistricting cycle from members of the public who are often frustrated by a process over the decades that both Parties have used that have selected voters to support their agendas rather than letting the voters select their own representatives as it should be. And by really taking this out of the Legislature's hands, I think whatever process we would able to do with an independent commission is much better than what we currently have in our Constitution. I would encourage an 'aye' vote from everybody and would hope this same message gets along to our colleagues in the Senate, should we get the requisite number of votes, and that they will also share in the effort to put this on the ballot. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Breen is recognized."

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

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I had filed an Amendment for you, a helpful Amendment to add congressional redistricting, which we discussed last time, and I just wanted to make sure to renew that discussion here now we're debating the actual Amendment. And why is it that we did not include congressional redistricting with this particular Amendment proposal?"

Franks: "It was something we considered, but I didn't think it was necessary because once... assuming this passes, we could always by statute... put it in to the same commission as we wish. And as you may know, the Independent Maps didn't have that either."

Breen: "Right. And... and then the reason for Independent Maps was because the Supreme Court had not acted in the case involving the State of Arizona, which actually allowed an independent commission to draw Congressional maps so there was an issue with the U.S. Constitution. But again, I respectfully disagree. But again, just to be clear, for the purposes of our legislative intent, we fully intend that we can give to this independent commission the power to do the Congressional redistricting."

Franks: "Yes, for... absolutely."

Breen: "Okay. Now... I... Representative, who is the Senate Sponsor of your Amendment?"

Franks: "Presently, it's the President."

Breen: "The President of the Senate?"

Franks: "Yes."

Breen: "Have you had..."

Franks: "Not the United States, he was here earlier."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Breen: "Okay. Right, right, unless he'd like to come back and guest star as the Senator again. Have you had any assurances about what will happen to this Amendment when it gets to the august upper chamber?"

Franks: "We're still... we're still in discussions on that. I'm encouraging them to have this called as... clearly every one of the good government groups sees this as a superior one. And interestingly, just a moment ago, I ever... I received a text that the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund just sent a letter to my office in Woodstock that they support our Bill over the Independent Maps proposal because it would better protect the interests of racial and language minorities covered under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. I was very happy to receive that letter just a moment ago."

Breen: "And then... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. The Representative is correct. His measure is superior to that being proposed by the Independent Maps group. That is in part due to the constraints placed on citizens trying desperately to force changes on this Body. And so, he is not bound by those constraints and really, I... I hope that we and that those who are involved in the Senate side would take the example of the State of Ohio and others where the Legislature, having been shamed by the people of the state, finally took action themselves. Because we're hearing a lot of promises of change and reform, but unfortunately, the people of Illinois are like Charlie Brown and the politicians who run this General Assembly continue to pull the football out from... from them every single time promising wonderful change and reform. So

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

with all that said, I do certainly support the Amendment and urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Shh... Thank you, Members. Representative Christian Mitchell is recognized."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. I appreciate what the Gentleman is trying to do and I understand that for folks in this chamber, this Bill is going to be very popular. Sounds like a good idea, sounds important, sounds like something we should do. But I will be voting 'no' on this Amendment and I want to explain why. It's my belief that we as Legislators are Members of a Democratic Republic. That we are elected to represent our constituents. That we all agree that this process is not working right now and that there are changes that need to be made. Senator Raoul passed a Bill out of the Senate that makes some changes but keeps this in the hands of the Legislature. I think that's appropriate. What's dangerous about what we're doing here, Ladies and Gentlemen, is that we as a Legislative Branch are ceding our authority to a coequal branch of government. We are giving over a legislative function to the Judicial Branch. The same Judicial Branch with, by the way, there was some violation of minority rights or ... the districts being contiguous or any other tenant of the Bill would then be ruling on the legality of a process made by commissioners whom they appointed. Commissioners, who by the way, will have no accounting to the public. We are taking from the hands of the people the one measure of accountability they have which is the ballot. And we are giving it over to the Judicial Branch and then asking them to rule on the legality of the

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

thing that they have just done. I think that's dangerous. I think that people have fought and died for minority rights, for representation in government, for taxation with representation. I think there are measures that we can take. I know, as I said, Senator Raoul passed something out of the Senate. I believe Senator... or I'm sorry, Representative Cassidy is working on something over here. We should continue those efforts because what we are doing right now, Ladies and Gentlemen, if the voters indeed were to agree to this, would be to be ceding our authority as the Legislative Branch to the Judicial Branch. I think that's wrong and the wrong way to go. I think we all agree that there's more reform that needs to be made. I think this is not soup yet and I think that it deserves a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Davis, W.: "Representative, earlier I heard you talk about a commission hosting hearings. As you know, one of the concerns that I would have... have had is regard to how this effort speaks to minority populations, how it speaks to communities of color, however you want to characterize that. And in your... some of your opening remarks or earlier in earlier dialogue, you talked about a commission holding hearings across the state, so let me understand those hearings. How would it be determined where those hearings will be held?"

Franks: "I think the commission would make those determinations, but we'd ask for them to be held all over the state. Because

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

as we talked about the commission is going to have to be... the commissioners are going to be from each Judicial District. So they're going to get to be all over the state, and they have to represent the racial and ethnic and demographic makeup of the State of Illinois. So..."

Davis, W.: "You mean the commission itself or ultimately the..."
Franks: "The... the commissioners as well."

Davis, W.: "Well, I can appreciate that. But sometimes, as I've come to appreciate down here when it comes to having minority participation, it seems to be the same old minority folks who aren't always in touch with the minority communities, therefore. So, I'm just asking kind of how that maybe... and again..."

Franks: "I wouldn't know... I'm not."

Davis, W.: "...maybe... maybe that's too much detail for..."

Franks: "Yeah, that'd be too... that's..."

Davis, W.: "...the Amendment, but my concern would be them having conversations like for instance, they'll say we'll have one in Chicago and that that'll represent Chicago and like south Cook. And I would argue that areas like south Cook should be a separate piece and maybe have their own hearing to have this conversation."

Franks: "And... that's something we could address by a statute after this passes because there will be rule-making authority as well. There'll be an opportunity so if you have those concerns. But understand with this, as we talked about the redistricting criteria and... having at least 15, they'll be all over the state. So, I understand your concern, but understand that they have to have a priority of providing

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

racial minorities and language minorities with the equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice. I would think that would have a lot to do with where they have some of these hearings."

Davis, W.: "Well, I know sometimes we have language that speaks to that but sometimes in the implementation of that there's always sometimes a challenge. So again, I'm just... thought I'd ask how that conversation might take place to make sure that there's some way. Because again, and I don't know if the south Cook is in a particular judicial..."

Franks: "Circuit."

Davis, W.: "...area... circuit, you know, and if that means that that circuit will have it's hearing in Chicago, say versus a south Cook area. You know, I... I just... I'm challenged sometimes."

Franks: "I... I understand and that's something we should discuss for sure. And I would think simply based on population of this state that most of them would be in the collar counties and... and in Cook."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, that was only my question, Representative.

Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis is recognized."

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

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

Reis: "Representative Franks, can you explain how your Resolution treats the concept of nesting, and how it compares to the Citizen Initiative?"

Franks: "Thank you for that question. We allow for denesting in this proposal."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Reis: "And how does that compare to the Citizen Initiative?"

Franks: "I... I think they require nesting."

Reis: "That's what I thought too. Why... why did you go that direction? And that's one of my biggest concerns with your legislation is that... and for people that don't know that, right now you have to have two Representatives that are included within a Senate district which is nesting. Under your proposal, Senate districts would be drawn completely separate from Representative Districts, so..."

Franks: "They don't have to be, they could be, but they don't have to be."

Reis: "Well..."

Franks: "Well, what this... the reason why I did this, because it... it allows for more flexibilities to where we're able to meet the criteria that we've laid out. Which I think is... I think it's very important to protect minority interests."

Reis: "But that also allows."

Franks: "And... and Independent Maps doesn't... doesn't have that.

And also, we can keep towns together. I'll tell ya when I first ran... and you see it in Cook County, I mean, southern parts of Cook you... you can have seven different... eight... eight different Reps in communities. I think it's important to keep communities together as well. And this would help do that."

Reis: "Well, it could also completely do the opposite where you may have Champaign-Urbana split up east and west, and you may have Champaign-Urbana split up north and south with two separate Senators. So, it could, in fact, allow for more gerrymandering, more confusion with the voters because..."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

- Franks: "Oh, I don't think so. There's not going to be gerrymandering because you and I aren't going to be involved. People who look like you and I, people in this room, will not be involved. It will be people who are divorced from the political process, who don't have conflicts of interest like we do. And so, instead of us picking our constituents, the constituents will actually for the first time get to choose who their Legislators are. So people in this room, will no longer have any influence which I think is by far the most important part of this."
- Reis: "Well, speaking on our side of the aisle, we haven't had any say for quite a while, Jack, so..."
- Franks: "Oh, but you have, and in the past, and you're just as bad as we've been."
- Reis: "Only 25 percent of the time 'cause we've only drawn one map since 1970. And I agree with you on that concept. It's just... how many other states have denesting? Do you know that?

  I mean, I think it adds to the confusion for voters where..."
- Franks: "I... I don't think there's any confusion. I think that's a red herring that you guys have put out over the weekend, because someone on the second floor said there could be confusion. But that fact is I think our voters are smart enough to understand, and I don't think denesting is confusing whatsoever. And I would also venture to say that most people don't know who their Senators and State Reps are. So I don't think there's going to be a lot more confusion."
- Reis: "Well, speak for yourself there, Representative. A lot of grade school kids know who their Representative and Senator

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

are in my district. But anyway, that's one of my concerns with it. I'll listen to the debate as we move forward."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "He will."

Batinick: "I apologize if you answered this previously. I can't hear amongst all the chatter. What would happen if both... both passed? The Citizens' Amendment made the Constitution, you know, passed the ballot, and then this... this got passed as well. What..."

Franks: "Well, I... I think... I appreciate the question that has not been asked, okay? And I think that's an unlikely scenario, but if they do make it both on the ballot, then the citizens would have a choice of which kind of reform they would like, and it'd be up to the Judiciary to decide how it goes. I think in other states, when there's been Amendments like this, they've looked at the ones that have gotten the most votes. But it would be our Judiciary who would make that determination."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ammons is recognized."

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

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

Ammons: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you."

Ammons: "I just wanted to clarify a couple things that I worked on over the... the past week around this issue. So we have currently 37 State Legislatures are responsible for drawing their districts. How does the process you're proposing make

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

districts better as a result of what you're considering as independent people, which I don't know who they are but..."

Franks: "I'm sorry. Your... your question was... 37."

Ammons: "So... so your proposal... 37 states currently draw their districts, of course, by law, and still draw their districts by law. There have been some states that decided to put into independent commissions and the results of those commissions have... or actually reduced representation of minority Members of those Legislatures. So how does your process that you're proposing actually avoid the obvious?"

"That's... that's a good question. And what we do now is not... there are no protections for minorities. What we do now is blatant gerrymandering so we can make... what we have now is an incumbent protection program that the incumbents, whoever... whatever Party's in power that gets to draw the maps, draws it in such a way that they don't worry so much about who the constituents are, but how that individual who's currently representing that area can get the most votes and keep their job for the next 10 years. That's what it's based on. This, what we're trying to do is to divorce the politics from this and empower the citizens to make sure that they get to choose who their Representatives are because the... the criteria, I think, is important. They have to be substantially equal in population. They have to provide racial minorities and language minorities with the equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice. They also must provide racial minorities and language minorities who constitute less than a voting age minority of a district with an opportunity to substantially influence the

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

outcome of an election. They have to be contiguous and compact, and they also have to respect to the extent practical, geographic integrity of units of local government as well as communities sharing a common social or economic interest. So those criteria, I think, will greatly enhance the abilities."

- Ammons: "So let me... let me clarify because the criteria itself tells me that the average lay person won't make it on to this commission. The average person won't know how to draw maps in consideration of those things you just identified. Who are these people that are going to be nonpartisan to do what in essence the Legislature really should do."
- Franks: "I don't think the Legislature should do it, because the Legislature has done it and we've done a rotten job of it. So..."
- Ammons: "We got 21 Members and the most in history of African Americans in this Legislature. I don't know who did it, but I think that's a high number in today's times."
- Franks: "My point is, what we're doing is we're picking our constituents, not the other way around. So the question is, who are going to be these commissioners? They're going be... they are going to be appointed by the Supreme Court, the Chief Justice, and the Justice of the... of the... highest ranking Justice of the opposing Party and putting those folks in with one person from each Judicial District. So that's who the folks are based on these criteria, they're the ones who have been making those decisions. But understand that every map that we've ever drawn has always ended up in the Supreme Court. Okay. They're always ultimately making that decision.

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

So what we're doing now is starting there and protecting minorities."

Ammons: "So... that's... a very... actually a very good point that was... raised by one of the scholars at the university. And the question was, if it ends up in the Supreme Court or Illinois Supreme Court, ultimately at some point, how are they who are appointing then going to turn around and judge on the actual map anyway?"

Franks: "I don't think it's... I think we avoid it this way because they're the ones who are drawing it. That's the idea."

Ammons: "That's a little unclear but I... I get that. I think there is certainly some concerns that have been expressed to me just through the research and look at other so-called independent commissions. I would hope that the commission as a result of this process if this passes, that this commission also will reflect which we don't know how it could because we don't have very many judges actually on the Supreme... as a matter of fact, I don't think we have any. Do we have any minorities on the Supreme Court in Illinois?"

Franks: "Sure we do."

Ammons: "How many do we have?"

Franks: "Well, you have some women on the Supreme Court. You have African Americans on the Supreme..."

Ammons: "I mean, African American, Latino, people of color."

Franks: "Sure, you do."

Ammons: "How many do we have there?"

Franks: "I know we have Justice Freeman, who's African American, and... yeah. Justice... I'm not sure who else. We have a couple of women as well."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Ammons: "So I think that that bears some concern certainly in communities of color that this issue is being talked about in relationship to helping communities of color..."

Franks: "But... but let me..."

Ammons: "...but it doesn't actually reflect that in the judiciary."

Franks: "No, no, no, no, no, because that's the difference here.

Because right now, even if the Supreme Court doesn't have as much diversity as you would prefer, this requires..."

Ammons: "It requires the commissioners..."

Franks: "...the commission to... to be reflective and also... of what the racial and demographic of the whole state is, and it takes into account to provide for the racial minorities and language minorities. This is by far the most protections that we've ever had and this far exceeds the federal requirements, far exceeds. This will become the model for the nation."

Ammons: "I hope you're right. Thank you, Representative Franks, for taking my questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Riley."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Riley: "Jack, there's been, you know, many community forums that have gone on about this Bill. There's been a couple of them out in my district and I attended one. And it's funny, you know, we don't make public policy on the basis of anecdotes or one meeting. But one of the things I thought was interesting at the one that I went to is there was a divide on the basis of age."

Franks: "I'm sorry, I'm having trouble hearing you."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Riley: "There was a divide. Mr... Mr. Speaker. Thank you. There was a divide on the basis of age whether people were for or against a Constitutional Amendment for redistricting. The younger people tended to be for it. The older people tended to be against it. Let me just tell you what happened at this one meeting that I went to. There were people in their 50s and 60s who basically said, you know, when we make gains... and for the most part majority/minority group was attendance. They said, when we make gains in the political process like we were told to do, then they want to change, you know, the rules in the middle of the game. Some might view that as being cynical. I didn't, I think they had some concerns. But one of the things... and there was an attorney that spoke. He said, I remember when there was merit selection of judges, for example, we weren't getting selected. So then we came up with subcircuits and all of those types of things and through the political process. Now there are rumblings about going back to merit selection of judges. Similarly, people have, you know, taken over the years, a lot of time and effort to be elected by their peers. And they would have been the ones to redraw these maps. Now you're seeing all of these competing Amendments and ideas about mapping. And I've drawn a lot of maps in my life. I really could understand what some of these folks were saying. So, if you were there at that meeting, what would you have told them regarding those concerns?"

Franks: "I really apprec... I really appreciate that question, Al. Because this..."

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

- Speaker Turner: "Members, can we please bring the noise level down in the chamber? Take all conversations to the rear. We are finishing up this debate, and it is becoming increasingly difficult for Members in the chamber to hear. Can we please bring the noise level down? Thank you."
- Franks: "It's a great question. I'm glad you brought it forward, because this Constitutional Amendment is designed to maximize those gains and to... and to protect those gains. Where the system we have now, if Legislators were drawing them, whoever... whoever might have that ability, they could take away those gains by artificially gerrymandering it to break up those communities of interest. This is by far the best protection for those gains and to maximize those gains because the minority interest must be paramount, where nowhere else are they paramount."
- Riley: "But there are still districts that are under the Voters Right... Voting Rights Act though, Jack."
- Franks: "I'm sorry, I'm not understand... I don't understand the question."
- Riley: "Well, no, I'm just making a statement. You said that this gives a lot of protections and I'm saying there's a lot of districts that are still under the Voting Rights Act that's supposed to give those protections too. Matter of fact, a lot of people are fighting to bring back, you know, the preclearance clause that was taken out. So, how does this protect minority political gains and rights, you know, to elect people of their choice? How does this give them more protection than that would do?"

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Franks: "Because the way this is drafted right now, the criteria for the districts besides being substantially equal in population, these are prioritized in order of priority. The… after being equal in population, it provides racial minorities and language minorities with the equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice. So it is the most important issue after it being about equal size. We can't be any clearer. This is to protect and empower racial minorities, not to diminish."

Riley: "Well, thank you for your explanation. I think, you know, there... there are people who have pause about that and I can understand, you know, some of their concerns. As I said, there was that big age differential. And you know, some of the folks were around my age. You know, where we remember. We were in high school when a lot of things like... open... you know, the Fair Housing Act and open... the Voters Rights Act were passed. And so clearly, they would have some pause at something like this. But I just wanted to convey that to you and let you know what at least some people anecdotally were thinking that I met with."

Franks: "I appreciate that."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks to close."

Franks: "Thank you very much. I really appreciate the debate. Ladies and Gentlemen, let's do something for the people. Let's leave our cynicism outside of the chamber. Let's not hide behind... people might be confused and let's not insult the voters. We have an opportunity to fundamentally change how we draw our Legislative maps and to finally empower the citizens

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

of the State of Illinois. I understand we're asking you to give up a lot of your power, but the power we're giving up is only to help us not to help the citizens. The power that we presently have is only done to protect incumbents. It's not about good government. This is about good government. This is about empowering the people to allow them to determine who is going to represent them instead of vice versa. Let's not play political games here. If you really believe that we need to fundamentally change how Illinois... to fundamentally change Illinois politics, we... many of us who have been here for a while have seen the corruption that seeps throughout very many levels of our government. One of the reasons we have that is because of these districts that we draw. This may be one of the most important votes that we do for the future of our state. Please vote 'yes' for the future of Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "Members, the question is, 'Shall HJRCA 58 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', 7 voting 'no', 0 voting
'present', HJRCA 58, having received the requisite amount of
votes, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davidsmeyer,
for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Rep."

Davidsmeyer: "Today, I have a couple of Pages with me. I have Trisha Thompson down front. If you'll stand up, Trisha. She is from Pike County and she just won three medals at the local

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

Special Olympics. Can we give her a round of applause? And... and I also have a friend of mine, Kylee DeJaymes, who also won a medal in the Special Olympics. If we could give her a round of applause. I see these two all over the place and they love a parade. I thought I was in a lot of parades, but they are everywhere. So, and I want to welcome Kylee's mom and brother up here in the gallery if you guys could wave. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Congratulations and welcome to your Capitol.

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

Cavaletto: "Point of personal privilege, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Cavaletto: "Thank you. I'd like to introduce my Page for the day:

Katherine Turley, eight years old from Greenville, Illinois.

She's brought here by her grandma and grandpa from Greenville, up in the audience."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you for being here and welcome to your Capitol. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees are meeting this afternoon. Immediately after Session is Appropriations-Elementary & and Secondary Education in C-1, Agriculture & Conservation in D-1, Juvenile Justice & System Involved Youth in 115, Tollway Oversight in 118. Meeting at 3:00 is Environment in 114, Judiciary-Criminal in D-1. Cities & Villages was canceled for this afternoon."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1186, offered by Representative Unes. House Resolution 1188,

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

offered by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 1189, offered by Representative McAuliffe. House Resolution 1190, offered by Representative Drury. House Resolution 1191, offered by Representative Drury. House Resolution 1192, offered by Representative Butler. House Resolution 1193, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 1195, offered by Representative Sandack. House Resolution 1196, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1196, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1198, offered by Representative Reaves-Harris. House Resolution 1200, offered by Leader Durkin."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves that the House adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. And now, Leader Currie moves that the House adjourn 'til Wednesday, May 4 at the hour of 12 noon. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House is adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 179, offered by Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Senate Bill 186, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Senate Bill 212, offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 384, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 514, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2213, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

safety. Senate Bill 2282, concerning offered by Representative Ammons, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal Senate Bill 2346, offered by Representative Anthony, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2364, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2404, offered Representative Butler, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2585, offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2589, offered by Representative Acevedo, a bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2657, offered Representative William Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2757, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 2771, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2839, offered Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2882, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2883, offered by Representative Cavaletto, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Senate Bill 2884, offered Representative William Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2885, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2934, offered by Representative Skoog, a Bill for an Act Bill 3010, concerning revenue. Senate offered Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3023, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

3036, offered by Representative Barbara Wheeler, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 3042, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3063, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning land. Senate Bill 3099, offered by Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3131, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3164, offered by Representative Stewart, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3178, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 3289, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 3301, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an concerning education. Senate Bill 3324, offered Representative David Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3343, offered by Representative Hays, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3401, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6567, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6568, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 6569, offered by Representative Keith Wheeler, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. First Reading of these House Bills. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action

124th Legislative Day

5/3/2016

taken on August 03, 2016: approved for consideration, referred to Consideration Postponed is House Bill 6291. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."