137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 1016, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 574, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1582, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2861, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 3162."
- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The House shall come to order. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Ben Stone, who is with the First Christian Church of Watseka, in Watseka, Illinois. Reverend Stone is the guest of Representative Bennett. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Reverend Stone: "Thank you, Sir. Good afternoon. Let us pray. God of our Fathers, we give You all praise and glory, You are greatly to be praised. We acknowledge here and now our dependence upon You. We remember Your promise to that great leader long ago, King Solomon, as recorded in II Chronicles 7:14. How in times of trouble and times of difficulty and times when we lose our way, if my people, who are called by my name, humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven and forgive their sin and heal their land. Today, Oh God, we pray and we understand that conditions that must be fully met. We take a humble position before You and seek Your face. Grace us to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly before our God. We do ask for Your forgiveness for yielding too often to

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

temptation, to forget You in public and national light, for the times we reject Your gracious providence, for confusing liberty with licentious, for substituting our own agendas for Yours, for the tendency to abdicate our responsibility to deal with tough problems, we ask for Your forgiveness and Your help. And as you have directed us, we pray for our leaders, those here today, for their families while they are away, for their safety while they serve and for integrity and wisdom in shaping laws that will shape our future. We are thankful for each Representative who stepped out of his ordinary life to serve, they have given up much, sacrificed much. Please care for each Representative, each Senator, each staffer, and all the family members in a very gracious way. I ask for Your spirit of grace, counsel and wisdom to be upon these men and women to do right in Your sight. To endeavor to govern the people in this great state even as those who will give an account on that great day. Help them to remember the poor, the immigrant, the marginalized, and the unborn. And from such a position of humility and prayer, we ask that You, Oh God, would heal our land. We ask for Your merciful blessing today on this great State of Illinois and upon this General Assembly. And we ask it all in the name of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, Amen."

Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Phelps."

Phelps - 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."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Chapa LaVia and Monique Davis are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brown."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative John Anthony is excused this afternoon.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 115 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. The Chair recognizes Mr. Lang for a Motion. Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, at the end of session yesterday we had a tumultuous time on the House Floor. There was a request for a verification, which was somehow missed. Please allow me to finish my comments. Many, after the House adjourned yesterday, from the Minority side of the aisle approached me and said, you're a fair guy, Lou, this is wrong, can't we fix this. And so, I commenced my own investigation and when I did I found out that indeed there was a mistake made and indeed it was inadvertent. Because of that and because we should not have those lingering feelings from yesterday and because we should have an appropriate vote, an appropriate verification, if that's the still requested, I move, Mr. Speaker, that we reconsider the vote by which yesterday's budget Bill passed. Senate Bill..."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has... the Gentleman has moved that we reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 2408... 2048 was

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

declared passed. Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is a Motion to reconsider. This is a Motion to reconsider. Motion to reconsider. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 70 'ayes', 41 'noes', and the vote by which Senate Bill 2048 passed is reconsidered. And the Bill is now on Third Reading. This was debated last night. I would suggest three for, three against. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2048, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie for the Bill."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the first step in budget making for the coming fiscal year. Although we adopted a budget in May of 2015 and the budget went to the Governor's desk, he vetoed most of it. There has been no security nor stability for the governance of Illinois during the entire fiscal 16 year. I think it's important for us to establish security and stability, to say to our vulnerable populations that we do care about you, we know you are in need. I urge adoption of Senate Bill 2048 as the first step in making a budget. I don't know if the Governor's proposals for working groups will lead to a broad consensus, a change. I'm hopeful they will, but in the meantime I think the citizens of Illinois need an insurance policy that we will not stumble our way through another year in which our needy college students don't have access to college tuition scholarships, in which family's suffering with autism and

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

epilepsy are left on the cutting room floor. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a point of personal privilege related to this Bill, if I might?"

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Harris, D.: "I respect the Chair's preference that there only be three speakers on this Bill, but you indicated that the Bill was debated last night. With all respect, Sir, I don't believe the Bill was debated in full last night. There were a number of individuals on this side of the aisle who desired to speak before the Motion was made to move the question. I think that there is fuller debate needed on this Bill and I ask that you extend that courtesy to the Members so that it's not just limited to three individuals. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, serious and well-meaning people have been meeting for days and weeks to try to come to an accord on the budget. The reports that I have heard is that those meetings have been in good faith, there's progress being made. And to throw cold water on that process with a Bill of this nature is extraordinarily, extraordinarily unfortunate. You know, to every human service provider hanging on by a string, to every community college and four year university, to everybody who depends on this Body to get the work of the people done you are owed an apology. This Bill, \$7 billion in spending with no revenue to match up to it, throws cold water on the good faith effort of very, very good people. Yesterday it was suggested that Rome

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

is burning and I think that's accurate. And I think this throws gas on the fire. And the ... and the clock is running. Tick tock. Tick tock. Tick tock. Time is running out. And we are once again considering a measure that everyone in this chamber knows will not end up as a budget, that everybody in this chamber knows will not forward any dollars to those who depend on us to do the work of the State of Illinois. The process by which this took place, even before the debacle at the end of the day yesterday, is shameful. Posted to a committee that's not an Appropriation Committee, kind of a made up Rules Committee, where we kind of make up the rules as we go, there's no debate, no consideration. Five hundred pages, nobody knows what's in it. I would just say what happened yesterday and the process by which it took place, I think really requires the Billy Madison clothes. We are all dumber for have gone... having gone through it. I award you no points and may God have mercy on your soul."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I do want to address the Bill. And first of all, I do want to thank the Majority and I want to thank the Deputy Majority Leader for his Motion to reconsider this... this Bill as I think that it is certainly one of the most significant pieces of legislation that's going to pass out of this House this Session. And the way that is was handled yesterday was in my estimation and... and everyone I think on both sides of the aisle was inappropriate. If I can, let me pick up on the words that the Deputy Majority Leader said yesterday. He said, you know, on this side of the aisle it doesn't make any difference whether we had five

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

minutes, five hours or five days to read the Bill because we were all going to vote 'no' anyway. You know what, he's right. He's right. I'm going to vote 'no' on a Bill that is \$7 billion out of whack. I... I... you know, I kind of have a problem with a Bill that's \$7 billion out of whack. I am going to vote 'no'. I don't care whether it's... I have five minutes, five hours, five days, five months to review the Bill, I'm going to vote 'no'. In the Army we have this writing style that says put bottom line up front and the bottom line here is the Bill is \$7 billion out of whack. I don't need to read a whole heck of a lot more than that. I want these agencies and institutions in our state to be properly funded, but they are not properly funded when we pass an appropriation that is \$7 billion out of balance. Let's look at the Bill for a second though. The Majority Leader who presented the Bill she said, very carefully, she said it appropriates \$14 billion in General Revenue Fund. Yeah, it does appropriate \$14 billion in General Revenue Fund. But you know what's not being included here? What's not being included are those other dollars that come out of the General Revenue Fund that add up in the end to that 40 billion... 39 or 40 billion dollar figure. As an example, pensions... pensions isn't included. That's a minor \$7 billion hit that comes out of the General Revenue Fund. What about those statutory transfers out that we have to do, those things we call Trouts. Guess what? That's going to occur no matter what we do. Those Local Government Distributive Funds are going to come out; that's another \$2 billion. What about debt service? We have to pay the bond holders. We're not going to be able to borrow money if we

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

don't pay the bond holders. So, that's another roughly \$2.3 billion that's going to come out. My point here is that she would not say that it was a deficit appropriation, but clearly when you add... and oh, don't forget Medicaid. Medicaid has a few zeroes after the 6 or 7, like 6 or 7 billion that goes out for Medicaid. She failed to say that, oh, by the way, those things come out of the General Revenue Fund as well. So what you have is an Appropriation Bill that appropriates or that is going to spend in total and for the State of Illinois about \$39 billion. And it was admitted that we're going to bring in 32 and a half or 33 billion. So, you know, we're talking about deficits here of about \$7 billion. I don't need five days to... to read a Bill like that. You're darn right I'm going to vote 'no', consistently. You know, anything that is that bad deserves a 'no' vote. And I would think that the other Members of this House, especially on the other side of the aisle, would recognize that there's a problem with this. There really is. I buy the argument that has been made that having an appropriation in place gets the providers something. It gets them sort of a legal authority that, hey, the state's going to stand behind me. I buy that. I do. But I don't buy passing an Appropriation Bill that's \$7 billion out of whack because you're not helping those providers. They're not going to get the money anytime soon. You know it as well as I do. Those vouchers are going to go into a gueue at the Comptroller's Office and there's no way they're going to see any of that money anytime soon. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know this Bill passed yesterday, maybe it very well may pass again today. It's not the right thing to

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

do; it's not. Let's put it down. Let's vote 'no'. Come back to the table, get something a lot more reasonable... reasonable than this. And tell the people of the State of Illinois that we really can come up with a reasonable budget that gives them an expectation that this state is going to do what's right and not some false promise. Vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of clarification or parliamentary inquiry of the Chair, please. I... I think you initially stated only three or four speakers per side. I would ask that the... that you reconsider that, please and take this off Short Debate. It's a budget Bill and we were truncated yesterday. And I'd like any opportunity for my colleagues to speak. And I think it's appropriate."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sandack, the matter is not on Short Debate." Sandack: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "It was a request. Mr. Demmer is seeking recognition. Mr. Demmer."

Sandack: "Well, I..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. First of all, I... I guess I want to put it out there that we sought a verification yesterday of the Roll Call. The Motion to reconsider doesn't cure the ailments of yesterday's parliamentary mistakes and there were two. But I guess we're going to get our opportunity and I guess some people are going to be able to now say they didn't vote for a tax increase or a budget Bill that's \$7 billion out of balance. Because I have the Roll Call from yesterday and I'm... I suspect what this really is, is a chance

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

to clean the record because of the mistakes made yesterday. Let it be known that you're on the record and those who voted yesterday in the affirmative, while the record may be cleansed, there is still ample evidence of what occurred yesterday. The best way to clean yesterday's stench is to pull this from the record and to actually go through a budget process in a collegial, professional manner. This is an out of balance, inappropriate, spend more than it takes in, been there, done that, budget that has gotten us to the space we're in right now. To simply vote 'yes' on this is to continue to hang an anvil around the collective neck of the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. This is not an insurance policy. This is an assurance policy of bankruptcy. It is not an insurance policy that provides safety and stability. It is an assurance that we are absolutely making mistakes and compounding them. Your mom or dad or someone you know probably told you, when you're in a hole, the first thing you do, stop digging. Stop digging. Please Ladies and Gentlemen, I beg you, beseech you. Let's not do this anymore. We are in the process of a bipartisan, bicameral reform groups... reform working groups meeting process that is gaining steam. Many of you folks had the opportunity to sit down and be participants or to hear from the participants. You know it's got legs. You know it's legitimate and you know that's the only real way out of this hole. There's your insurance policy, engage professionally. You want stability and insurance? Engage collegially. You want assurance of continued financial ruination, vote 'yes' on this outrageous \$40 billion spend when you know we only have about 33 billion coming in. That's 7 billion in hock on

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

top of the 7 billion we're already in hock. Please Ladies and Gentlemen, do not take leave of your senses. Use independent thought processes and vote 'no'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to say a couple things and then I'd like to address the Bill at large, if I might. I took the time last night to read it. And I think it's fair that the Illinois citizens know what's in it. So, I'm going to make a quick comment and it'd simply be this that I think you knew what you were doing yesterday. And the thing that scares me the most is that when a chamber like this loses order and loses law... it becomes a lawless chamber and that's on you Mr. Speaker. That's on you. Now you may want to respond to that, but that's not..."

Speaker Madigan: "I'll ... I'll respond right now."

Kay: "...please do."

Speaker Madigan: "The motion was put at my direction, Sir. Please continue."

Kay: "So, when you become a lawless chamber and you don't follow the rules that you set up, you suffer the consequences. And that's exactly what happened last night. We suffered the consequences and the humiliation in front of the very people that we represent because we couldn't do it right. Now, somebody said that a mistake was made and it very possibly could. Others say that it was to cover some votes, maybe that's true. I'm not sure. But I will tell you that I'm disappointed in the Chair. We can do better. So, let me address the Bill. I'd like to go to page 7 to begin with. This is going to take a long time, so bear with me. I'd like

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

to know when the State of Illinois has no money and we're proposing a budget that is \$7 billion out of whack why it is that we have appropriated \$2,000,600 to a pilot program?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kay, did you direct that question to someone?"

Kay: "Yes. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Madigan: "She will."

Kay: "Leader Currie, it's... I believe you were presenting the Bill yesterday? So, I'm going to page 7 and I'm asking, when you have a state that's penniless why you'd be looking at a pilot program at this point in time for \$2,600,000?"

Currie: "Because it has value."

Kay: "I see. How about page 13, Section 120? The sum of \$750 thousand for the fairgrounds in DuQuoin. Is that something we spend when we're penniless? Does that have value?"

Currie: "It's continuing appropriation."

Kay: "Well, does that have value?"

Currie: "Clearly it did or it would have never have been in the budget."

Kay: "How about page 14, \$852,400 for contractual services. Can you tell me what that consists of?"

Currie: "This is a Department of Agriculture contract. I believe it has appeared in budgets before. I believe in the mission of the State's Department of Agriculture."

Kay: "Well, my question is though, when you're broke, when you're
penniless, is this an essential element of a budget?"

Currie: "Apparently the Governor proposed this."

Kay: "Well, he didn't propose it..."

Currie: "Maybe you should ask him."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Kay: "...he didn't propose it twice. Because you've got another \$476,500 in there and it's for the very same thing. Well, let's move on. Let's look at page 8. How about entertainment contracts for \$696,000. Is that useful?"

Currie: "I believe this is the State Fair. I believe we did this last year as well. I believe it was in the Governor's budget."

Kay: "Well, we've done the same thing every year, Leader. And that's why we're in the hole we're in. That's why I ask these questions. Certainly... certainly, when you're talking about \$7 billion in the hole and more, counting, we ought to be giving this some thoughtful... I think more thoughtful concern, don't you?"

Currie: "Why don't you speak to the local Representative in whose district that fair appears?"

Kay: "I'll do that. I'll take that under advisement. Page 17,
 awards to livestock breeders for 221,000 essential?"

Currie: "Cost of the State Fair in the Governor's budget."

Kay: "We're penniless. Awards and premiums, \$483,000, useful?"

Currie: "Same answer."

Kay: "Well, excuse me there's another... there's another line item for the same amount, so I guess we're off on our accounting already. So, the total here is \$883,500 and this is all useful to you when we're in a deep hole, right?"

Currie: "Following the Governor's lead."

Kay: "Which Governor? Page 18..."

Currie: "I think his name is Rauner."

Kay: "Yeah. Well, I can give you the history on a couple other Governors, too, so we don't want to go there today though. Page 18, Breeders Fund, grant money of \$1,187,600, useful?"

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Currie: "Ditto."

Kay: "When you're broke? That's nonresponsive. Breeders Fund, \$1,605,000... \$500,000, same answer?"

Currie: "Ditto."

Kay: "Another allocation here for the Department of Agriculture, doesn't state what it's for, 1,798,600. What's that for?"

Currie: "Ditto."

Kay: "What's ditto mean? Useful, not useful? Read... did you read this, Leader? Have you read this budget? Have you read all 534 pages of this?"

Currie: "Yes."

Kay: "How recently?"

Currie: "Yesterday."

Kay: "And did you know that our State Constitution says that each Representative is to have one of these on their desks before a Bill is passed? Did you know that? That's in our Constitution. My goodness. Well... Let's... let's talk about some pretty big money here. How about rehabilitation of county fairgrounds for 1,300,000. Is that necessary?"

Currie: "Ditto."

Kay: "How would you know that? How would you know that? Have you talked to the county fairground people? Well, how about... let's move on, we're having some trouble here getting a consensus as to what's useful and what's not. How about fair and state fair horse racing for 329,000, when you're broke?"

Currie: "Clearly some people have thought over the years that the state fairs are valuable. And I can only say one more time, Representative, ditto. And may I just suggest to the Chair and to the Body that if you're going to go through the budget

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

with one line after another my answer will continue to be ditto ."

Kay: "Well..."

Currie: "And I don't know that that is a useful expenditure of scarce legislative time."

Kay: "Here's the problem and I won't... I won't put the Body through this. It's pretty obvious you've never run a business, you've never had to account for money and debt has no impact on you whatsoever, especially when it has to do with taxpayer funds. I'm not going to go through this; this is simply embarrassing. And I'm going to encourage an 'aye' vote... or a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Demmer."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd like to thank Demmer: the Chair and thank the Assistant Majority Leader for offering us this opportunity to readdress the action that was taken last night. I believe it's important that we adhere to the House Rules and I appreciate this opportunity to... for us to revisit this action so that we... we all may act in accordance with those Rules. I think this chance for us to reconsider this vote also provides a rare opportunity for us. Rarely on a Bill of this magnitude do we have the chance to reconsider the vote that was taken. Over the course of the last 12 hours, many Members on both sides of the aisle have expressed concern with the way that this budget Bill was put together, with the amount of time that we had to review it, with the number of Members who had input into it. Today we have an opportunity to reconsider the very rushed vote that was forced on this chamber last night. When we think about the way that legislation happens in the Capitol, I think successful

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

legislation seldom happens with two hours' notice. Successful legislation seldom happens with limited input. Successful legislation is rarely sprung upon a Body and acted upon and put into law. Successful legislation also requires that both chambers address legislation and both chambers legislation. In the last 12 hours we've had a chance to hear from Members of the Senate about their comments on this Bill. In fact, a Member of the Senate in the Democratic Party stated that... she said that she thinks this is a fantasy budget. And the reality is it would hurt people. She said there's not revenue to support it and it delays us getting to a real solution. So now, we have a chance to reconsider the vote that we all took last night knowing that the Governor has pledged to veto a Bill that's this far out of balance and knowing that Members of both Parties in the Senate view this as an unsuccessful piece of legislation. We have that rare opportunity today to reconsider our vote. Many Members stated last night during the commotion they didn't understand what Bill... what it was they were voting on. Whether they were voting on the Motion to call the question or on the vote itself. Now while changing your vote today may be a politically expedient thing to do, depending on how you voted last night, it's also the right thing to do. Because we understand that as one piece of a process, of a long process, of an intentionally long process for a Bill to become law we, the House of Representatives, are but one component in that. And we must work with both the Senate and the Executive Branch to make sure that Bills that we offer on this floor can become law and can be carried out in an effective way. We have a

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

template for doing that. Working groups, productive working groups have been established that have input from the Republican side, the Democratic side, in both the House and the Senate and Members of the Executive Branch. Let me suggest that those groups are the ideal place for proposals to come from, in stark contrast to two hours of notice and a vote at the last minute. We have that rare opportunity today to reconsider the vote and I encourage you to reconsider the vote. Whether you voted inadvertently in the wrong way last night or whether, with additional time, you've had the opportunity to review this Bill and see it for what it is. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to renew my request for a verification should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "She yields."

Sullivan: "Majority Leader, within this budget do we fund line items to pay employees in State Government?"

Currie: "Not those that are covered by the consent decree that the Governor entered into... or the court order... the court order."

Sullivan: "And those... that's the court orders of the two cases in Cook and St. Clair Counties. Is that correct?"

Currie: "I believe that's right."

Sullivan: "Okay. Recently, the Supreme Court indicated that we could not pay a back pay bill from the past because we did not have appropriation. Is that correct?"

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Currie: "Correct."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, we have this Supreme Court order and we have the Attorney General who I believe has indicated that she is going to file suit to stop pay because we don't have an appropriation. And so, how will your budget, should it pass and become law, affect state salaries if the Attorney General would win her court case to stop paying employees absent an appropriation?"

Currie: "If the court order were to change or if there were to a different disposition, the Legislature as a continuing Body would be able to take action. My understanding is that the case you refer to is still in the Circuit Court in St. Clair County and so there has been no opportunity for further action until at some point in the future."

Sullivan: "Okay. Well, thank you for clearing that for us. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, what I'm pointing out is that this Bill is fundamentally flawed in relationship to the two court cases and the effectiveness of what happened in the Supreme Court. So, what we've seen is the Attorney General has said she intends to file suit or to put a new charge out in regard to the Cook and St. Clair cases to say we don't have an appropriation so we cannot pay state employees based on the recent Supreme Court ruling that says we cannot pay back pay because we don't have an appropriation. And so, by voting on this Bill today and the Attorney General going to court you're in essence voting to stop payment to employees because in your Bill there's no pay for employees, there's no appropriation. So, should the Attorney General win her case which most people believe she will, you in essence today will

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

vote to not pay the very people that you supported just two days ago. So, I think you should think that through. I think you should understand the consequences of your actions today. And maybe we should rethink this and vote this down and start afresh. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is exactly what I said, an insurance policy, a commitment to the people of the State of Illinois that there will be State Government. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take... The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ladies and Gentlemen, there is a request for a verification. So, everybody in their seat and staff shall retire to the rear of the chamber. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 60 'ayes', and 53 'noes'. There's a request for a verification. We need all those voting 'yes' to be in their seats, please. Please. Mr. Clerk, read the names of those voting 'yes'."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Representative Acevedo; Representative Ammons; Representative Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Bradley; Representative Burke, D.; Representative Burke, K.; Representative Cloonen; Representative Conroy; Representative Costello; Representative Crespo; D'Amico; Representative Currie; Representative Representative Davis, W.; Representative DeLuca;

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative Gabel; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Harper; Harris, G.; Representative Representative Hernandez; Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Jackson; Representative Jones; Representative Representative Lilly; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative McAsey; Representative Mitchell, Representative Moeller; Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman; Representative Phelps; Representative Reaves-Harris; Representative Riley; Representative Rita; Representative Scherer; Representative Sims; Representative Skoog; Representative Soto; Representative Tabares; Representative Turner; Representative Verschoore; Representative Wallace; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Questions? Questions?"

Demmer: "Representative Beiser?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Beiser's in his seat."

Demmer: "Representative Cloonen."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Cloonen is in her chair."

Demmer: "Representative Conroy?"

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Conroy is in her chair."

Demmer: "Representative Moylan."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Moylan's in his chair."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Demmer: "Representative Scherer?"

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Scherer..."

Demmer: "Representative Skoog?"

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman's in his chair."

Demmer: "Representative Yingling?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr..."

Demmer: "I withdraw my request."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. All right. The Gentleman has withdrawn his request. The parliamentarian advises me that during a verification... The verification is completed. The... there were 60 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Thapedi on a point of... point of personal privilege, Sir."

Thapedi: "It would be a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

I'm banging my switch over there and I was intending to vote

'yes'; I want to vote 'yes'. And I want that to be clear and

I'm asking the record to reflect that."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you very much, Mr. Thapedi. Mr. Lang."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Cabello: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to address what took place last night. Not with the show of opossum mistake, but what actually took place after we adjourned. Ladies and Gentlemen, this place is supposed to be filled with honor. This place is bigger than anyone of us. I believe that this chamber was dishonored by the way some of our

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Members acted. We can disagree as much as we want. We can have those emotional discussions as much as we want, but when we make somebody feel threatened we've gone too far. The people of this state expect us to have those disagreements. The people of this state expect us to have vigorous debate. They do not expect us to act in a way that brings dishonor on this chamber. I will not mention any names; I will not mention any Parties. I am mentioning this so that we never have that happen again. We owe it to ourselves to work with each other. We owe it to our constituents to make sure that they know we are working towards an end. I respect every person in this chamber. I respect your opinions. Please let us make sure that we realize that this place is bigger than us; we're placeholders in these seats and please make sure we respect each other. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Martwick: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am honored today with the presence of two very special Pages. I have with me two nephews and godsons that are here to join me in the chamber. I have Anthony Calabrese and Matthew Cox. Would you please give them a warm welcome to the Illinois House of Representatives?"

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you. Leader Currie is recognized.

Leader Currie."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Kelly Burke is excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leader. Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the chamber starts to get back in the regular order, there was... Mr. Cab... the speaker before Representative Martwick honorable, but he didn't go far enough. Two members of our staff were accosted last night. They were... No, it's true. It's true. They were touched. And besides being a heated moment where emotions were high, that can never happen. And staff in this chamber, we would be nothing as Members without staff. They work incredibly hard; they do enormous, enormous things in short amounts of time. And they didn't deserve to be treated that way. All of us in the green leather chairs are big boys and girls, we can handle ourselves, but staff should never, ever, ever be touched or yelled at or screamed at by a Member. So, I would ask as a courtesy to Members of the Democratic Caucus and on behalf of our staff that the individuals and the Members who did that find it within themselves to offer a sincere apology. It's the right thing to do. And it's something that we would appreciate as we go forward in the spirit of cooperation. So, please apologize. It was wrong, tensions were high, but we're asking for an apology for the two members of our staff that were treated that way last night. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Williams: "You may have noticed the thousands of students, parents and administrators from Chicago and around the state in the rotunda today, but I wanted to introduce a few special guests on behalf of myself, Representative Feigenholtz and Representative Andrade. We have some of our most stellar principals in the Chicago Public Schools here today. Kate from Oscar Mayer, Catherine from Burley, Nate from Hawthorne and Seth from Brentano. Thank you so much for being here and fighting alongside of us for fair funding for CPS."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you. Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I know this Body has some healing to do after last night's actions and maybe this will help us a bit. As you can see I'm wearing a red nose, which probably improves my appearance somewhat, but there are a lot of these red noses that are spread out throughout. And for those of you who don't know what it refers to, it's a campaign that was brought to the United States by Walgreens last year. And I want to give a shout-out to an Illinois corporation or at least an Illinois-based corporation in the U.S. for bringing this. It started in Europe; it's a worldwide effort. They have red nose days in Finland, in Germany and in England. Last year in the U.S., \$26 million were raised to help children... child poverty and the awareness of child poverty throughout the U.S. And again, it's a worldwide effort. So, congratulations to Walgreens and my thanks to everyone else who is... has a red nose on today. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Harris. Some... some people scattered around the floor have some red noses compliments of yours truly. Representative Conroy."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Conroy: "I'd like to have the Body welcome my two Pages for the day today. I have Ryan Hurley who's also an intern in my office. And I have Grace Que who is an intern in my office. Ryan is from College of DuPage and Grace will be a senior at York High School in the fall."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Thanks for being here. Mr. Bennet."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Point of personal privilege,
please."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, please."

Bennett: "Thank you. In the gallery today is a gentleman by the name of Roy Johnson. Roy Johnson is up behind me and he was a good friend of Pastor Ben Stone who gave our prayer this morning. So, would you please help me give him a warm Springfield welcome, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Thank you for being here with us.

Mr. Meier."

Meier: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Meier: "I would like to welcome my two Pages here today from the Hoyleton Youth Ministries. They are Mya Bowen who wants to go into cosmetology and Destin Melvin who plans on going into the Army. They are... are residents at Hoyleton there. And they are here with the workers, Monte Mister, Audrey Sawyer and Brandon Rudolph who are somewhere in the building. Thank you and welcome them to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. We're glad you're here in the chamber with us today. Mr. Butler is recognized."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Butler: "Mr. Speaker, thank you for the red nose by the way and a point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Butler: "Today is... building on Representative Harris' comments earlier, if you're looking for a little fun today's a great day in the State of Illinois. The Prospect League is a wood bat baseball league that over the years we've had a history, over a half century of history in Illinois of collegiate wood bat baseball leagues here in Illinois, where we've had thousands of collegiate players come in from around the country over the years, stay in homes of local residents and play baseball for a couple months in our towns. Today we have four teams in the State of Illinois that play in the collegiate league. Representative Frese, Representative Hays, Representative Sandack all represent teams in this league. As you can see, I'm a proud Springfiedian, home of the Springfield Sliders. Tonight we take on Randy Frese's Quincy Gems in the opener. So, we are going to have a season-long challenge amongst the four of us to see who has the best record among the four teams in the Prospect League and give the winning team what will be called the Central Illinois Collegiate League or the CICL, which was the league for many years ago, heritage trophy. And whoever wins among the four of us I'm sure will showered with local product from our... our districts and so on at a fine festivity. Last... lastly, let me recognize the brand new owner of the Springfield Sliders, Todd Miller, who just moved to town from South Carolina to own the Springfield Sliders and take them to the championship this year I'm sure. So, thank you for the indulgence, Mr.

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker. If we do happen to go past May 31, you're always more than welcome to come out and see some Sliders games here in Springfield. So, thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Sounds like a great thing to do. Welcome to Illinois, Sir. Representative Bourne is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed please."

Bourne: "Thank you. Today joining us in the State House is my page, Spencer Jorn. She's here to see all of the fun happening at the Capitol today. So, give her a warm welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. And welcome. Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Wheeler, K.: "On behalf of Representative Anthony I'd like to welcome our Page for the day, William Davis IV, he's a sixth grade home schooler who enjoys traveling, architecture, coding and swimming. He's here with his parents, Bill and Karen Davis up in the gallery. Let's give them a great big Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Thanks for joining us. Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Dunkin: "Today, I'd like to welcome some wonderful folk all the way from Chicago from Ericson Magnet Academy, young Janel and Jerrell Reed and their father up in the red shirt above the Republicans. Welcome to Springfield."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Enjoy the festivities. Mr. Hays is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go ahead."

Hays: "First of all, I would like to welcome and recognize our former colleague right behind me, former Representative Roger Eddy."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome, Roger."

Hays: "Mr. Speaker, I am proudly here to represent the Danville Dans and we take the challenge from Representative Butler and Representative Frese and Representative Sandack. You're all more than welcome to historic Danville Stadium as the Danville Dans take a victory lap through the Prospect League all summer long. We'll see you in Danville. Go Dans."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed. Is that gentleman to your left your Page for the day?"

Moeller: "No, that would be Representative Bennett's."

Speaker Lang: "Oh, I see."

Moeller: "Okay. I would like to... he's only slighter taller than I am I know that. I would like to welcome one of Elgin's finest and his daughter, Joe Valhalla and Grace Valhalla here to the Capitol today. Joe is one of our firefighters in Elgin and Grace is going to be attending Illinois Girls State this summer. And I'm happy to have them here in Springfield. Welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you very much for being here. Mr. Rita."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

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

Rita: "Tonight the Chicago White Sox Legislative Caucus has their event at D.H. Brown's at 7 p.m. Chicago White Sox Caucus, tonight at 7 p.m., D.H. Brown's."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2787. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 152, Senate Joint Resolution 51. Representative Committee Greq Harris, Chairperson from the Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2340. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: do pass Short Debate is House Bills 5167, 5168, 5169, 5170, 5171, 5172, 5173, 5174, 5175, 5176, 5177, 5178, 5179, 5180, 5181, 5182, 5183, 5184, 5185, 5186, 5187, 5188; Senate Bill 321, Senate Bill 2397, Senate Bill 2427, Senate Bill 3149; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2241, Senate Bill Representative Jackson, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 6418; Senate Bill 3284. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2896; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 235, Senate Bill 2701. Representative Lang, Chairperson from the Committee on Substance Abuse Special reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 10. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2920; recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4688. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1287, offered by Representative Reis and House Resolution 1289, offered by Representative Crespo. These were referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 42, Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill." Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 42, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. I rise to present SB42. SB42 addresses the unintended consequences of 2011 legislation that caused a number of Illinoisans to lose their livelihood and their employment. Prior to 2012 these individuals with forcible felonies were successfully granted their license and working safely within their work setting. SB42 removes the lifetime barrier to the license for health care professionals, such as doctors, occupational therapists, pharmacists with forcible

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

felonies except the sexual assault offenses and offenses against patients. SB42 allows Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation to grant license to individual with forcible felony convictions upon petition only after considering the 15 factors. At this time I ask, if there's no questions, for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, I... I appreciate you bringing this Bill.

I'd just like to ask a few clarifications about this so we...

we understand where we're at. Currently, if a person has... has
been found guilty of one of the offenses that are listed in
this... in this Bill, what's... what are their options? If they've
been found guilty of one of the offenses that you're trying
to... to recommend, what's the current situation?"

Lilly: "Currently, because of the legislation of 2011 it prohibits them for applying for their license."

Demmer: "And how... how long are they prohibited?"

Lilly: "They're banned."

Demmer: "For life?"

Lilly: "Yes."

Demmer: "For life. Under this... under this Bill what's... what would the new procedure be? How... how quickly could a person reapply for a license?"

Lilly: "Yes, the applicant waits five years after their conviction or three years from release of a... from incarceration."

Demmer: "Did you have a chance to work with the Department of Professional and Financial Regulation on this Bill?"

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Lilly: "Yes. And this Bill has no opposition."

Demmer: "And the... the procedure for reapplying for that license that... that's something the IDFPR is comfortable with and they understand how that'll work?"

Lilly: "Correct."

Demmer: "Well, I appreciate you bringing this... this Bill. I think it is a good opportunity for us to provide a path for reentry.

And I appreciate your answering some of these clarification questions. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bel..."

Lilly: "I appreciate your questions. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Ladies and Gentlemen. Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. Representative Lilly, I just had one or two questions about the Bill. And that regarding the original Bill from 2011 that was in place and now we're changing... you know we're making some changes to that, I just want to make sure that in this Bill it still keeps the ban in place for sex offenses and those against the patients?"

Lilly: "That is correct, Representative."

Bellock: "Great. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to clarify that in 2011 there was a problem and I was a chief cosponsor along with Senator Dillard on a Bill that we were trying to address of medical professionals and being involved in sex abuse. We passed the Bill in 2011 and there were unintended consequences from that Bill. And so, it was

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

probably too broad at the time. And I want to thank Representative Lilly for introducing Senate Bill 42 to address those issues so that people can move forward and get these licenses. So, I thank you very much, Representative Lilly and I fully support the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, I also stand in strong support, but for clarity of legislation... for legislative purpose, I have a couple of questions for you. The Bill sets up a procedure for people with forcible felony convictions to petition the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation to get a license. Isn't that correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct, Representative."

Sandack: "And what licenses do they apply for?"

Lilly: "Any license under the law that provides health services: doctors, nurses, respite… respiratory therapists, dentists, hygienists, et cetera."

Sandack: "So, here's an important question. Does the Bill require the department to grant a license to someone with a criminal record under the Bill?"

Lilly: "No, it does not."

Sandack: "How will the department determine whether to... whether it's safe to grant a license to someone under your Bill?"

Lilly: "There's 15 factors that the department take into consideration: seriousness of the offense, motive for the offense, discipline, history, time of the offense, just to name a few."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Sandack: "Thank you. And last question, does the... your Bill
 require an employer to hire anyone with a criminal past?"
Lilly: "No, it does not."

Sandack: "Thank you, Representative Lilly, for helping clarify legislative intent. I stand in strong support of the Bill and I encourage a 'yes' vote. Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to say, it's an honor to be a Member of the House because this morning I met a lady that told me a story about her life. And so, we were having breakfast this morning and she said that she went to school to be a CNA and she wanted to go to school to be an RN. So, she went to school and she started classes and she got her LPN license and she spent about \$30 thousand to go to school to be an LPN. She's a single mom of a few kids and she said, Representative Ford, this Bill is so important to me because I committed a crime over 20 years ago and I've always wanted to be a nurse. She said I work around nurses all the time and I do the jobs that nurses do, but I could never be a nurse. And I could never make more than what I make as a CNA. And I hope that the General Assembly would do the right thing and pass this Bill today. She said that she applied with the department and she paid her fee and the department took her money, but they only rejected her later. She believes that now, if this Bill passes, not only will she become an LPN, but she would double her income. She would double her income and she would be a stronger taxpayer for Illinois. And she may be in the chamber, I don't know, but it was an honor to be able to speak on her behalf because she's not a

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Representative. And I hope that we all pass this Bill in her honor and in her kids' honor. Thank you, Representative Lilly, for your hard work on this. And I want to thank the department for seeing the need to make this adjustment in State Law."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to congratulate the Sponsor on this legislation. I recall when you initially started this... this journey of trying to correct a wrong, just sort of really make our... making our citizens and this Legislature proud to be a part of this type of legislation really giving people a second chance who really are trying to just merely improve their lives. I've seen you work with a number of our colleagues here on both sides of the aisle, these many organizations. And I, too, actually I was a board member of the Cabrini Green Legal Aid Clinic, and I'm very familiar with the story that Representative Ford is talking about. And to hear those compassionate stories... real life stories is something that is heartfelt. And to see us just being active on something positive and progressive, this won't make the media, but it's a great, great day for this legislation to move. Congratulations. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

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

Speaker Lang: "Can the point of personal privilege wait 'til this Bill is completed?"

Soto: "Oh yes, yes. I'm sorry."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Put your light back on and I'll recognize you. Representative Flowers."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To... about the young lady that Representative Ford was referring to, not only did she pay her fee to the Department of Professional Regulations one time, she paid it twice. And so, I hope that when she goes to apply that the department automatically give her her license because they knew when they took her check the first time and the second time that according to their laws that it was... that she did not qualify. So, I hope the department is listening and I hope they do not charge her again because they took her money not once, but twice. Thank you very much. And Representative Lilly, this is a fantastic Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I know the Bill has a lot of support and I understand that, but two quick questions if, I may. First of all, the individual may petition the department, there's no requirement that the department grant the license is that correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So, it's permissive in that regard. But, let me ask you, what sorts of crimes... do you know, what sorts of crimes constitute a forcible felony?"

Lilly: "Yes. Home invasions, aggravated battery, armed robbery, kidnapping, to name a few."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Okay. And the time limit is such that it...
they're far enough away from either their time of

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

incarceration or when they got out? Okay. Thank you very much for the help."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to echo my colleagues on this issue. This was one of the first constituent services that my office provided. I, too, had several members of our community who were actively working to improve their lives, to get their licenses and had paid several times the application fee to be considered. The waiver process was very cumbersome and complicated. And those young ladies, never giving up, reached out to my office immediately after my election and my office stepped in to try to help them with their application process and to ultimately get their waivers so that they could continue to improve their lives. I just want to congratulate Representative Lilly for not giving up on this legislation and really working on this. This is going to impact hundreds of thousands of families. And we really appreciate your hard work and your dedication. This is great legislation and I applaud your work. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to take the time to commend the Sponsor. I'm aware of the fact that the Sponsor has been working diligently on this issue for more than a year and a half now. This was not an easy Bill, but clearly to the glory goes the spoils. And Representative Lilly is going to bring forth true change for families all across this state. And many of us have received phone calls in our offices from individuals who are literally in some of their most difficult, challenging times, trying to find a way to

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

make a living for themselves and for their families. And they may have had a challenge at one point in their life and they are seriously trying to do all that they can, but because of the fact that Representative Lilly brought this legislation forth, it wasn't easy because she continued to fight. Now those folks have the same hope and we hope that all people throughout the State of Illinois have and that is that they can provide for their family and live with the quality of life that all of us deserve and pray for. So, thank you so much, Representative Lilly, for all of the families that are going to benefit from this."

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, Ladies and Gentlemen. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 384, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 384, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 384 is an initiative of the Cook County Health and Hospitals System. It amends the Open Meetings Act to allow a hospital or other institution operated by a public body that provides medical care to hold closed meetings to discuss matters protected under the Federal Patient... Patient Safety and Quality Improvement Act and the Federal Health

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. The purpose of these meetings... the purpose of the meetings is to improve the quality of care and the safety of patients. I know of no opposition and will answer any questions."

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? Ammons. Please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in point of... I stand in...
I'm sorry, I stand in point of a personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Soto: "I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce some students that are here from Humboldt Park in my district. It's the Dr. Albizu Campos High School in Humboldt Park. So, they're right here to the right of me and right behind me. I just want to thank them for coming down here. They're lobbying for a school budget. So, I appreciate them being here. So, thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining us today. We appreciate it. Mr. Ford is recognized on a point of personal privilege."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, in the spirit of restorative justice, we have the nurse in the chamber and we should give her a big round of applause because she came down and lobbied for her own cause, but Tonya Anderson is right there. Please stand. Congratulations on the Bill. Thank you and good luck."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker Lang: "Thank you and welcome aboard. Senate Bill 420, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 420, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This measure does three things. First of all, it requires any provider of durable medical equipment to be accredited before they can sell to the State's Department of Healthcare and Family Services. Second, it says that if... if someone who needs durable medical equipment, wheelchairs for chronic problems for example, they can get certain items replaced without prior approval. So, we're talking about tires, we're talking about seats, we're talking about the accessories to a wheelchair. And finally, it provides that the department will codify in rule the reimbursement methodology for wheelchairs, that kind of durable medical equipment. I know of no opposition. I'd be grateful for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to thank Representative Currie for doing this, especially for the people that are disabled that need the complex rehab medical equipment that's included in this Bill. And it will be very, very helpful to them. So, I would appreciate all of your support. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons, you don't rise to this Bill do you? Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

record yourselves. Please take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ammons is recognized."

- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to record the Senate Bill 384 as a 'yes' vote, Sir."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Senate Bill 440, Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 440, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 565, Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 565, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. I do rise to present SB565. This Bill is an agreed Bill. There's no opposition. The overall measure, it would amend the School Code for mandating the Department of Public Health to include appropriate age screening and developmental screening and social, emotional screening for students in the elementary schools. It will establish a tool to ensure that the students are only screened. This particular piece of legislation requires the Illinois Department of Public Health to work to establish the rules. If there's no questions, I'll take an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Representative Lilly, we've had several discussions over this Bill in the last two years. So, I just wanted to go over some of my concerns on this Bill stemming from a long time ago from the Children's Mental Health Act when we talked about some people wanted to mandate total mental health screening on all children in all schools in Illinois. So, I'm just asking you, is that what this Bill does? Does this mandate mental health screenings on every child in schools in Illinois?"

Lilly: "It does not. It is a screening that is a 'may'. It is not mandated."

Bellock: "We've had that discussion before, but when I was looking in my analysis right now it says, provides that health examination for school children... the health examination shall include an age appropriate developmental screening and a social and emotional... and a social and emotional screening. That's the reference to mental health. So, that's going to be included in every physical exam for every child in school. Is that correct?"

Lilly: "No."

Bellock: "Oh."

Lilly: "What's happening is, we're asking the Illinois Department of Public Health to create a... the Health Child Examination Form to change the terminology from developmental screening, social, emotional screening. They will establish the form and how it will be presented through the rules."

Bellock: "I... I understand that. That you're going to have Department of Public Health to develop that..."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Lilly: "Yes."

Bellock: "...but my point... my point and my concern and I know that your Bill is very well-intentioned, but my concern is, is that there will be a screening for, whatever they want to call it, social and emotional screening for every child in school in Illinois. My objection to that is that a lot of people think that screenings can be done for mental health like they can for eye, and vision and hearing, but that is not the way that mental health could be screened. When we did the Children's Mental Health Act we encouraged screening for parents who talked with the teachers and recommended that they be screened if they saw a problem in the school. But it was not as the... President Bush did the Freedom Act and in that when physiatrists asked him about screening of all children in schools he said he would not recommend that any state do screenings across the board for mental health in children in schools because a child may have a bad day on the day that they're being screened and they may be tagged and put in their folder that they have a mental health problem. And that's my concern with your Bill, even though I know that you're very well-intentioned or you wouldn't do it to begin with."

Lilly: "Thank you, Representative. And I appreciate your question. This is not a mental health Bill. This Bill clarifies... there's two screenings: developmental screening and social/emotional screening. This Bill is not related to the mental health of a child. Also, the Illinois Department of Public Health will be working to establish the rules for the Bill. Parents have an option; this is not a mandate. This is a 'may', an option

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

to have those screened. The form will reflect all the screenings and all the examination, created one form by the Illinois Department of Public Health and the ruling department. This particular Bill does not require withholding of the report cards, all of that has been removed. This Bill is a 'may'. This is not a mandate and the parents have the option. It is to ensure that any child who have any developmental needs or issues or any social or emotional issues that they can be addressed. And once again, the parents does not have to have this screening done. It is available to them and that's what's important. Many of the services that our children in our great state are needing to have a strong education, they are not getting. They need support to make sure that the educational experience is sound and worthy of the efforts and energies of the teachers that are teaching them. This is not a mental health screening."

Bellock: "I appreciate your explanation of that. My only concern is... I'm still reading the analysis... is that with DPH developing rules that this will probably go to JCAR and then we won't have control over what their rules are as to who is mandated and who is not to have the screenings. So, those are just my concerns because I think that's what this means. That DPH is going to bring it to JCAR and develop rules over the screening, correct?"

Lilly: "The Department of Public Health in conjunction with the numerous number of statewide organizations, the teachers, districts, Department of Health and Services and Family Services will be working together to establish the rules. It is a group that's coming together to ensure that we are really

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

addressing the screening needs for developmental and social and emotional."

Bellock: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, in committee you went through a litany of how this might be applied and when it might be applied. So, for the record and for guidance of JCAR, how often do you see these screenings be offered?"

Lilly: "Again, the Department of Public Health will, and along with a number of statewide organizations, will establish how often. We initially wanted it to be at Kindergarten, first grade, sixth grade, ninth grade and all of those, and appropriate ages, all of that will be reviewed. Some people indicate that fifth grade and sixth grade and ninth grade are better times. So, we will discuss that to establish the rules."

Pritchard: "But to the previous Representative's questions, you're only looking at maybe 4 or 5 times during the child's school experience. Is that correct?"

Lilly: "It could be. Correct."

Pritchard: "I'm trying to establish intent. Going back to the previous speaker's concern that we do this every child, every year. That's..."

Lilly: "No."

Pritchard: "...clearly not the intent that you explained in committee."

Lilly: "No. Correct. You are correct."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Pritchard: "So, for intent and for guidance of JCAR, you're thinking that it would be 4 or 5 times during the child's 12, 13 year experience?"

Lilly: "Correct."

Pritchard: "You also indicated that this was basically for the benefit of the parent, not for any school records or not for any guidance of teachers. Is that correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Pritchard: "And you also indicated that you were going to look into some kind of information that could be distributed to parents that would give them some guidance on how to use the screening, where to look at referrals if there's some indicated issues, correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Pritchard: "So, for the intent and for guidance of JCAR, you've indicated some guidance that we would expect the Department of Public Health to bring forward in their rules?"

Lilly: "Correct."

Pritchard: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Flowers: "Representative, what is the purpose of this legislation?"

Lilly: "We are trying to ensure that students are receiving the appropriate services as they are educated within our schooling system. Many of our young people who may need additional help for services to make sure that they're

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

learning the subject matters and they are not receiving those additional support services."

Flowers: "So, the law already require for students with disabilities and they don't mean handicapped children as far as physically, a disability could be a slow learner. And because children are not cookie cutters, they learn at different stages of their lives, not necessary ages. So, what will this Bill do? Because that part of the law is already... that's Federal Law. And unfortunately... unfortunately, that's not taking place in our schools today, that's #1. Number two, it's already mandated that we, the country, have health care. So, why do I need the schools to dictate when... if I so choose to, I have health insurance and I could choose what doctor if I think that my child has some type of development... I don't... development or social or emotional issue. It could be a detachment or something that may be going on in the house. It could be the child is having a bad day and everybody know that... Well, what... what is the purpose of this? 'Cause I don't understand who's going to set the rules and the guidelines as to the standards of who would deem that a child is socially and emotionally having developmental problems?"

Lilly: "There is not a standard. This is a screening, merely a screening."

Flowers: "But under what... but there has to be a standard..."

Lilly: "Illinois Department of Public Health..."

Flowers: "...for the screening?"

Lilly: "...the Illinois Department..."

Flowers: "There has to be a protocol?"

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Lilly: "The Illinois Department of Public Health has a number of screening tools that they have already been using. And you are absolutely right. The State of Illinois, our country, already has certain screenings in place for special children of special needs. I did learn while I was doing this Bill that many of the schools are not even doing those forms. What we want to make sure is that the family has an option to know what's happening with their child in a screening format, where they have the ability to opt out if they do not want a screening or for developmental issues and social issues or social/emotional issues. They do not have to have them. Right now, young parents are not knowing what to ask their pediatrician for when they're noticing certain things about their child. This screening alerts and bring that parent to that awareness, so that they can make sure that the parent... that the child is getting the services that they're need. This is an educational, informational tool that helps the parents meet the needs and address the needs of their... their child."

Flowers: "So, Representative, when this was House Bill 1493, it is my understanding that that Bill failed because the protocol was not properly outlined?"

Lilly: "This is not that Bill. This is SB565."

Flowers: "I understand that."

Lilly: "In order to..."

Flowers: "And so, I'm asking you, where is the protocol in this legislation?"

Lilly: "The... the Bill that you have before you is an agreed Bill of all parties and we had designed it so that we would have

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

no opposition. So, the Illinois Department of Public Health can establish a tool, a screening tool that will be accompanied by a statewide organization, Department of Children and Family Service, a number of groups to establish a tool that the parent can have screening at the time of physical examination for the young students."

Flowers: "Well, let me ask you this, can the parent go to these same people and tell them about the inadequacy of the education that they're children is getting? Can they tell them about the inadequacy of the food that they're getting? Can they tell them about the inadequacy of the community in which they're living in? And then, if so, what is the protocol for that? What will these people do and who are these people? Are they doctors? Or are they lawyers or physiatrists or are they somebody just looking for a job?"

Lilly: "Yes. Many... many parents who are just really involved in their child's academics will ask those questions regardless. When it comes to this screening it can be done by a pediatrician, a social worker, a psychologist, a number of individuals can provide a screening of this nature. Any of the issues that a parent would have about their child's education, health and wellness, I pray... and I'll continue to pray, they can ask anyone, myself and/or you, to direct them to make sure that their child is being met. This particular piece of legislation is only about identifying an opportunity for a young person to get needs met and services that may go undetected."

Flowers: "Representative, I'm sure that you have good intentions, but this legislation... this legislation, as a mother and a

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

grandmother, I think this is probably one of the worst pieces of legislation that I've seen in a very long time, in my personal opinion, in regards to what I know that... that has been done to our children, specifically. Because I know about the prescription drug that was given, the psychotropic drug that was given to our children that has caused them harm. And so, because I am the parent or the adult or the one that's responsible for my child, I don't need anyone else to tell me in the school. I can choose to go to whatever doctor I may choose to go to and I'll take my child. I do that when she has a fever or a cold or whatever. And I just want to say to you, respectfully, I think this is a very bad piece of legislation. And I don't see the protocol, I don't know the people that you're talking about. And the Department of Public Health no one in the... first of all, the department is not big enough, it's not staffed well enough. And this is a large state and this applicable to all the schools, the public schools and the private schools? Is... this is applicable to the public schools and the ... "

Lilly: "This is an option."

Flowers: "...private schools, am I correct?"

Lilly: "This is an option. It's an option for public and private schools. It is an option."

Flowers: "No. According to what I've read..."

Lilly: "This is a.m. respectfully, Leader..."

Flowers: "...the charter schools..."

Lilly: "...Leader Flowers, respectfully, I believe that this type of legislation, if it was around when I was coming up, it would have helped me. We must understand that not every child

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

is getting all the needs and support of service for them to gain the education that's due them, for whatever reason. This particular piece of legislation addresses an opportunity. We have to start somewhere to address those unmet needs of youth that are in our educational system across the state. This is a screening tool only that we're working in collaboration with many organizations, departments that are concerned about the future of our youth, the future of our students. It detects and allows our parents to be more aware of the needs of their child and refer them to services when needed. They can or cannot receive the screenings. This is... it has... it has an opportunity to establish probably some of the best protocols here in our great state. But I really truly appreciate your opinion and your thoughts. And I truly, truly would love to talk to you offline, if you wouldn't mind."

Flowers: "Representative, I..."

Lilly: "Thank you."

Flowers: "...my doors are always open and I can appreciate your hard work and your efforts. And like I said, I know you have good intentions, but as far as I am concerned I have not seen any standards. I have not seen any protocols. I do know that the tea... the kids in the northern suburbs is different from the kids on the south or west side of the City of Chicago. So, I'm not looking to create an institution or a job or a pipe line for no other institution like we did back in the '60s, back in the '70s and back in the '80s. I'm not interested in creating jobs for anyone. So, with all due respect, I will not be supporting your legislation. Thank you."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Ives: "Representative Lilly, I... I'm a little bit confused as to
 exactly who can do these screenings? Is it doctors, social
 workers, psychologists? And where will the screenings be
 done?"
- Lilly: "Thank you, Representative. All of those professionals can do the screenings. The screenings can be done in a doctor's office, the screenings can be in a social worker's office. It is a screening. And we have a number of screening tools that are available to conduct the screenings."
- Ives: "What are those screening tools? Are there... is there a set of questions that will be asked maybe about practices in the home, discipline, anything else? How do we know what the questions will be asked?"
- Lilly: "There's a number of... there's a number of questions that are asked and they're varied based on age appropriate. They're age appropriate questions for each of the children in the grades."
- Ives: "Are these... are this... is this screening required like other physicals at first, sixth and ninth grade?"
- Lilly: "It is not... at this time, it is not, but it is our intention as one of the Representatives indicated that was to have it no more than 4 times in their elementary, secondary life span."
- Ives: "So, it is screening that's going to go through puberty into the problematic teenage years and all the way through?

 It's going to be from K through 12th grade. Is that correct?"

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Lilly: "No, it's for... as far as their elementary and secondary time, we're only looking, if appropriate, to do it 4 times in that time span."

Ives: "Yeah. So, you're going to look at them some... 4 times between K and 12th grade, correct?"

Lilly: "It could be, yes."

Ives: "It could be, okay."

Lilly: "Yes."

Ives: "And these people that are looking at them, is it more than likely that the person screening them will have never met that child or may meet them once a year for an annual physical?"

Lilly: "Most parents when they're going to do the physical for their child will go to their pediatrician, hopefully they have a primary doctor. So more than likely that... they're going to know the individual that cares for their par... for their child."

Ives: "Okay. So... so currently, when you go to the doctor at least in our area it's a... it's for an annual physical for the child, a complete physical that does not even include this. It's a \$500 cost. Now who's going to pick up the cost for the additional screening that's going to be done?"

Lilly: "This screening is covered under the Medicaid/Medicare.

It's also covered under the Affordable Health Care Act and it's also covered under private insurance."

Ives: "So now, our insurance companies are going to have to pick up a bitter… bigger costs which could lead to higher premiums for every single… over the 2 million school children in the State of Illinois to do this multiple times. Is that correct?"

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Lilly: "That is not correct. This particular... that is not correct."

Ives: "Somebody's got to pay for this screening. Who's going to pay for this screening? If it's Medicaid, it's the taxpayers."

Lilly: "The insurance companies already cover this screening under their insurance plan. Actually, they give you..."

Ives: "Sure."

Lilly: "...actually, it is a bonus that they provide this service.

So..."

Ives: "I... actually, honestly, I think you're completely 100 percent wrong 'cause that's not how it works."

Lilly: "Well..."

Ives: "Today in private sector health care..."

Lilly: "...Representative..."

Ives: "...most of us have huge deductibles that we must meet..."

Lilly: "...Representative, you are incorrect."

Ives: "...before they pick up anything."

Lilly: "And it's okay. You are incorrect. Your analysis must... is not correct."

Ives: "Is there a billable code associated with the cost... with the social/emotional screening, the health screening... the mental screening... mental health screening? Is there a billable code that's going to go?"

Lilly: "Excuse me? I'm sorry."

Ives: "Will there be a billable code attached to this screening for that health professional?"

Lilly: "I will not... I do not know that billable code."

Ives: "Well, I'm telling you there's going to... somebody's going to be paying for this and it's going to be..."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Lilly: "I'm not... I'm not saying..."

Ives: "...taxpayers..."

Lilly: "...they're not paying for it."

Ives: "...and individuals."

Lilly: "I'm saying it's covered. I am not saying it's... I think it should be covered."

Ives: "Okay."

Lilly: "And it has been and it's... and it is billable. This is a screening that permits a parent, a family, to know more about the needs and services of their child. And it's covered by..."

Ives: "Okay. Mr. Speaker..."

Lilly: "...by their insurances..."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Lilly: "...Medicaid, Medicare and ACA and private insurance. Have it... no opposition to this Bill, not one bit of opposition to this screening form. Not one bit of opposition, not one."

Ives: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I'll tell you what, I stand strongly with Representative Flowers in real opposition to this Bill. I would agree with her. This is one of the worst Bills I've ever seen. And as a mother of 5, I guarantee you that if somebody tried to socially/emotionally screen my children I would be up in arms 'cause I know exactly what happens with that information. It goes into the student's file and it can be used against them in the future. And you're talking about screening children... you are talking about screening children with somebody who has met them one time for maybe 20 minutes and they're going to make a basis of judgment on that person's social/emotional learning. You know what's happened in schools? Is if your child has an issue or

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

a problem you've got a teacher, you've usually got an assistant teacher, you've got a principal, an assistant principal, you've got coaches, you've got a psychologist, and a plethora of other individuals that surround... are surrounded by that child and can readily pick up looking at a span of the child's behavior over a much broader time frame and make a real decision on whether that child has an issue. And I guarantee you if that child has an issue, the first person they're going to contact is the parent. The teachers are going to contact the parent and say, we think your child should be screened. That's how it happens. That is exactly how it happens; that's how it should happen. And to... and I will tell you, if this Bill passes you will have parents across the United... across the State of Illinois revolting over... over this overreach by State Government into their personal, private lives of their children marking them for the rest of their school history. This is a terrible Bill, terrible piece of legislation. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Representative Lilly, first off thank you for bringing the Bill. There is... there's been an earlier question about whether this is mandatory or not. Our... our analysis says specifically that Floor Amendment #1 removes the mandate and allows parents to decide if their child will go through the screening. Is that correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct, Representative."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Andersson: "Yes and I... I agree because when I read the Floor Amendment, page 7, lines 23 through 25, it says that qualified school support personnel may with a parent or guardian's consent offer the developmental screening. Is that correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct, Representative."

Andersson: "Thank you, I appreciate that. Also, can you tell me is a screening a diagnosis of mental illness?"

Lilly: "It is not."

Andersson: "Absolutely it's not. What it does is it gives parents a chance to identify something that might be a problem. Isn't that right?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

Andersson: "Okay. And typically, this sort of a screening is going to take place with your pediatrician. Typically, right?"

Lilly: "Typically, yes."

Andersson: "Okay. So, they'll get it at... you know, when they enter school at fourth grade at... when they get into high school, right?"

Lilly: "Correct."

Andersson: "Okay. So, I'm hearing fear, number one, but I'm also hearing questions about expense. But, this could be incorporated into that checkup that you do with your normal pediatrician, correct?"

Lilly: "Correct. And it is."

Andersson: "Okay. And when we talk about standards, the... the Bill contemplates those standards... validated standards being incorporated through the American Academy of Pediatricians, correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Andersson: "So, this is not somebody making up questions. This is not someone with some subjective idea of what might screen.

This is going to be based upon medical science, correct?"

Lilly: "That is correct, Representative."

"Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Number one, I Andersson: think it's important for us to recognize that mental illness is real; it's real. It's not subjective. It's not people feeling bad and nothing more than that. And in fact, one in five children under the age of 18 right now, one in five, 20 percent have or will have in that time period a serious mental illness. But here's the more important factor, the delay... the average delay between onset and diagnosis is 10 years. Ten years of time that goes by without assistance. So, what does this Bill do? This Bill gives a shot to parents, if they want it, at early intervention. Nothing more. Imagine that little girl or that little boy who's been traumatized... traumatized by someone else's bad act and they can't process it. They don't understand it. And also imagine parents of that little girl or that little boy who are good, conscientious parents, but honestly don't see the signs because they don't know. And I can tell you that that can happen. This would give that family a shot early on at correcting what could otherwise be a lifetime curse for that little boy or that little girl. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a great piece of legislation, not a horrible piece of legislation, a great piece of legislation. It gives families a right, not an obligation and it gives everyone a shot at curing mental illness before it becomes a real problem. I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. For the last Leitch: almost 16 years I've met most Monday mornings with communitybased providers and one of our most important goals is to attempt to get into schools and be able to have some kind of testing accomplished, specifically, because we all see how many suicides are showing up among young people specifically. And it's such a tragedy when those events unfold. In the course of these meetings and efforts, groups for example like the National Alliance on Mental Illness have a very, very excellent screening tool. And those screening tools I think are the appropriate tool to use. As I review who would be making the decisions about what the tests should look like or what the conversation should look like, frankly, the last people I want making those decisions are the State Board of Education or the Department of Public Health. The people who I do want included in sensitive and who are in that... engaged in this would be people from the National Alliance of Mental Illness and community-based health care professionals. The other critical distinction in implementing this... a program of this kind is the fact that we are not necessarily talking about mental health; we're talking about behavioral health. And behavioral health is one of the most significant problems that is universally acknowledged to be happening in the schools. So, if a parent or others say, do you want to have the young person examined for some of his behavioral health issues, everyone's all on board. If you present this in a way that we're going to examine you for your mental health issues, people will storm the ramparts and be opposed to it, be worried about labeling, be worried about stigma, be worried

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

about all the things that parents get upset about when their young person may be identified as being mentally ill. I think this issue is too important to pass this Bill right now. I would like to work with the Sponsor to do this because this effort is critically important, it would save all kinds of lives. It would prevent a lot of suicides that are so tragic. But I think this needs more of a bottoms-up approach, one that is sensitive to the realities of parents and schools and the circumstances in our communities rather than coming out with a statewide program that's ginned up by the Department of Public Health and the State Board of Education, whom I do not believe are remotely close enough to being what... being in... in contact with what actually occurs within the class... classrooms that our teachers have to be in every day. I think theories are one thing, scientific papers are a nice thing, but the answer to resolving any of these very human problems relate to the actual interaction between the people who are involved. So, I plan to vote 'no' right now, but I would love this to come back and do a program... a bottoms-up program focused on behavioral health that incentivizes schools to work with community-based providers and not impose a more top-down program on schools. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Thank you, Representative Lilly. I just... I somehow missed the answer to whether parents can opt out of this testing?"

Lilly: "They can opt out."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

- Ammons: "They can opt out. And the screening... the screening right now that you're recommending, there's no particular screening that has been adopted? There is... it has to be established. Is that my understanding?"
- Lilly: "That is correct."
- Ammons: "And who, again, is going to be involved in the establishment of this screening?"
- Lilly: "It will be the Illinois Department of Health, the Illinois Statewide Education... Statewide Organization, Department of Children and Family Services and any one of the other departments that would like to be included."
- Ammons: "And in the development of the screenings, I haven't seen them, but I've read a lot on social/emotional learning, but I haven't seen the tools used and if those tools incorporate within them the cultural sensitivities and the social framework for which children come out of. Is... is that... how do we get to that point because that's really... I have similar concerns as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle."
- Lilly: "A screening is basically a document that allows you to be aware of what's happening. This document is not a diagnosis. It alerts the parent, the individual, that there may be something that you want to look at. And then it refers you to possible services that you... that are billable."
- Ammons: "I... I really..."
- Lilly: "It's not... just to clarify, this document is not in the files of the children's educational file. That's not where this document..."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

- Ammons: "So... so where does it go? Where would the information go after? Because apparently you're not doing it just once; you do it several times through K-12."
- Lilly: "To the parent. The parent receives and the physician or the professional that conducts the screening. Those are the only two entities that receive the information from the screening."
- Ammons: "So, it doesn't go into the records; it doesn't go to the school social worker or the teacher."
- Lilly: "Correct."
- Ammons: "And once it's completed the only receipt so to speak of what these psychologists... I would assume these are psychologists that's doing this?"
- Lilly: "It could be, yes. A physician as well."
- Ammons: "So, I guess that's... that's... that's part of the question 'cause to me it's... it's unclear. As I take my son to the doctor, my doctor is going to give him his physical, his sports physical and he may even talk to him about, as he's an adolescent at this point, some social things that's going on with him and adolescence and how he changes. And that's between him and at this point the doctor. In this case, it may be the school social worker that may be administering this social tool, right?"
- Lilly: "If that's what the parent would like to have done. It is a screening form that can be administered by a social worker, that's approved by the rules of the Illinois Department of Public Health that a parent can opt out of. And once it is done, the only indication that would appear is that a screening was done and that's it. No results are placed in

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

the student's file at no time. And the only entities that receive the knowledge of... the results of the screening is the parent."

Ammons: "And how does the parent know... often when they get these results back, what if the parent can't really translate what services they may need as a result of this screening?"

Lilly: "Great question. That's what screenings do. Screenings are by professionals that can refer individuals who are screened to their services that are needed. So, there is a list of services that you can refer a family, an individual after a screening. It's making that individual aware of what they may need; that is it."

Ammons: "So, the parent then would have some review with whomever did this screening and they will go through the results of the screening and as a result of that they may or may not opt to be referred to..."

Lilly: "Correct."

Ammons: "...whatever services they may need?"

Lilly: "Correct. The... the screening is conducted by a professional, the parent will... will review it with the professional and the child and they will have referrals... the professional will have referrals if that is what the parent would like to take advantage of. We are alerting the parent that there may or may not be some additional services or some needs that their child may have."

Ammons: "So..."

Lilly: "Right now that is something as the Lady from Chicago indicated that things are not even being done within the school systems now. This screening is only a beginning to

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

make sure that we are addressing and identifying the needs of a child that a parent can be aware of."

Ammons: "So the, I... I really appreciate you Representative Lilly on all the work that you do. This particular Bill though gives me great pause. Simply because no single screening can be adapted to everybody, right?"

Lilly: "That's why there's..."

Ammons: "There's tools have to vary in some way..."

Lilly: "...that's why I... I..."

Ammons: "...and I don't see this in the legislation."

Lilly: "I'm sorry, Representative, that's why I indicated early on in my... my presentation that this is age appropriate, age specific and there is a number of tools, not just one. And what's really important is that we're involving and engaging our Illinois Department of Public Health and this is a public health issue once... if... if these needs go unaddressed. What we want to do is make sure that it's age appropriate, grade specific and at specific times in the development of an individual, a development of a young mind, a development of an individual or a student in our society today. That is it. Once people understand... Information is powerful. Once you understand as a parent, and a parent can opt out of this piece of legislation or this particular screening, but once a parent knows what their child needs, they tend to seek... they tend to want to get those things addressed. If they do not know ... if they have no understanding of what the needs when it comes to their child's developmental growth they will not be able to accommodate or make sure that those child... those children get those needs met."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Ammons: "Can you just clarify how a parent would know that they can opt out?"

Lilly: "Correct."

Ammons: "How... can you just clarify that? How will they know that they can opt out?"

Lilly: "Oh, okay. Correct. Thank you. Upon the evaluation of when they get their regular screenings of physicals, at that time they do not have to have any of those screenings done. At the time of October 15 if there... if it's not... that's when they have to have all those deadlines in, they opt out. They do not have to... they're not penalized if they are screened, if they are not screened. So, the physician... if you go to your pediatrician and they utilize this particular form, it could... it could be opt out there if they do not want that screening. So, it is many, many ways that a parent who do not wish to have the knowledge of what's going on with their child for themselves, this information does not go to the academic school system, it does not go in the child file. This information is for the parent themselves. If you do want to screen your child, which you have every right to do so, you do not have to. If you don't want to know about what's going on with your child, you don't have to. This is just a tool that a pro... allows you that option to know more about your child on a developmental and a social/emotional level. That is it."

Ammons: "So… so, I would be hard-pressed… and I appreciate it… to the Bill… that… that parents would not want to know what's happening with their children. I don't believe that that's the case. I think the concern… the greater concern for me as

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

a parent and a grandmother is that I would be and I am leery of tests that supposed to measure standards. When you have those kind of things, the question is what the standard is that you're measuring it to and how you set the bar for which a child is either socially or emotionally behind schedule? And that's really the greatest concern about this legislation. Now, I understand the need for certain things. I don't know if this legislation clarifies it enough to protect the families who may not understand what the social/emotional tool is, how to adequately use it, how to opt out because as many people that will be involved in deciding whether you do it or not. So, those are some of the concerns by which I've read this that I'm... I'm quite hesitant around it and I appreciate the work that you've done on it. And I appreciate you answering my questions. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andrade: "I'm reading the Bill and I'm just... have some confusion.

I see a lot of the word 'shall' and 'must' in the language.

On page 4, you know, line 15-20, the Department of Public Health 'shall' promulgate rules. Line 17, which 'shall' include an age appropriate development screening and social/emotional screening. And then further down it also says that an emotional screening and line 4 the Department of Public Health 'must' develop rules and appropriate provisions to the child's health examination form. And then it even goes down... the other confusion I have it says here, line 19 it says in addition to physician's licensed to practice medicine

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

in all of its branches, licensed advanced practice nurses and licensed physician assistants, other professionals may conduct the screening. So, now it seems just... a physician assistant who is not a psychologist or does anything may provide the screening? The other... the rules 'shall' take into consideration? Then further down on page 7 it also says in line 16, with respect to development screening and the social/emotional screening portion of the health examination each child 'shall' present proof of having been screened in accordance with this Section and the rules adopted. Now, it says here if the child fails to present proof of a development screening or social/emotional screening portion of the health examinations, you know, the personnel may say that this offering they could do it at the school. But then further down the line it says, once a development screening or social/emotional screening is completed and proof has been presented to the school, the school 'may' with a person's or quardian's consent make available appropriate personnel to work with the parent. So, after I read this, am I giving this report to... to them because if they see that ... that's something been suggested that now my... my child has been labeled as emotional... might have emotional problems. And so, now the school says I think your kid 'may' ... might benefit from some of the services we have. It just... it's not clear to me that, you know, with so many 'shalls' and 'musts' in there I just don't read where it says that... that... you know, I would feel comfortable it said each child 'may' present proof, but it says each child 'shall' present proof. So, I'm just... I'm just confused on... on the Bill. If you can clarify for me?"

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Lilly: "The way the Bill is drafted is actually in conjunction with a number of social workers, Department of Public Health which gives them the opportunity to create the rules. That's how it's drafted. This is a start to make sure that we have this opportunity to screen young people for developmental and social/emotional screenings. The... the way it's written only gives you that opportunity to create the rules around that. This particular piece of legislation is not a piece of legislation that goes into the schools' files or presented to the schools. If the parent want to present it... present it to their physician or who the referral if something is found, if you will, through the screening it would be presented to the referring institution, not the schools."

Andrade: "So, but... according to here, so am I correct or not saying that a physician's assistant may do the screening?"

Lilly: "No. A professional can do the screenings. Social workers..."

Andrade: "I mean, I'm... I'm reading right here. I just..."

Lilly: "Oh, now, there is a career, a professional physician... a physician's assistant, that's a profession as well. That's... that's a title of a... a professional."

Andrade: "On page..."

Lilly: "Is that what you're speaking to? I don't... I don't have that in front of me."

Andrade: "On page 5 line 21 it says, and licensed physician assistants may conduct the screenings."

Lilly: "I'm getting there, hold on. Where is this? Which number?"

Andrade: "Page 5... page 5 line..."

Lilly: "Which line? I'm sorry, Representative."

Andrade: "...line 21."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Lilly: "Twenty-one. It's on page 5, are you sure?"

Andrade: "Yeah."

Lilly: "Oh, licensed... licensed physician's assistant. That is a... that is a career."

Andrade: "A career that has training in..."

Lilly: "Correct."

Andrade: "...psychologists... in psychology?"

Lilly: "No. No. To the provide the... to provide the screening.

This is a profession licensed physician assistant. That's a profession and they have the..."

Andrade: "So, licensed... licensed physician assistants have the authority to say someone is emotionally disturbed or emotionally... has emotional issues?"

Lilly: "This is all professionals. This is a professional individual."

Andrade: "I just... with all due respect to the Sponsor, I just, you know, with the word 'shall'"

Lilly: "We..."

Andrade: "...is in here four or five times and it's... where it says a child 'shall' present... I'm not an attorney, I don't pretend to be one, but... but when it says a child 'shall' present, I just don't understand. Thank you very much."

Lilly: "It's a parent shall present. I'm not too sure where you're speaking to, Representative, I apologize."

Andrade: "You see, it says..."

Lilly: "Your child is not required to undergo. I'm not sure where you are speaking to, but the point is professionals have the opportunity and there's a range of professionals can conduct the screening. But once again, I would like to state that

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Illinois Department of Public Health along with statewide organizations, Department of Children and Family Services, all of those entities will work to make sure that the rules will cover all of the... this establishes the baseline of how to. And you have to start somewhere. This is where we would start."

Andrade: "So, on page..."

Lilly: "In a screening format."

Andrade: "...on page 7 line 18, each... each child 'shall' present proof of having been screened in accordance. And the other question I have, does this apply to just public schools or all private schools also? I just want to clarify that for the intent of the Bill. Is it for private and public?"

Lilly: "Okay. The physician, licensed physician assistant, advanced nurses assistants are all professionals who can provide the screening. The parents can opt out of these screenings."

Andrade: "All right. Thank... thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Lilly: "There is no repercussions of these screenings. The child continues to go to school and they're not being set out of school because this screening is not done. Professionals has the ability to present the screenings."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I do just want to follow up on what Representative Andrade said and just... just on this language. What... what Representative Andrade is saying is that the Bill as written on page 7 line 18 it says that each child 'shall' present proof of having been screened. And so, for that reason... and I guess I should and I apologize, Mr.

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker. I'd ask for the Sponsor to yield, if that's all right?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. And so, Representative, I mean, we... I think most of us are in favor of screening the children, the problem is when you're saying there's an opt out it looks like... it's not that there's an opt out of the screening requirements, it's that the school doesn't have to provide the screening to the parent. So, the parent still and every child... it says here, every child 'shall' present proof of having been screened for mental health. So, I mean, that... that does look like that is a mandate. Just so we're clear on what is a mandate and what... what is not as part of this Bill."

Lilly: "I'm... I'm sorry, Representative. If that is... needs to be clear, we can actually makes those changes 'cause that is... it is... this is not meant for the child to present anything."

Breen: "See and that... that is the issue because it says... So, I mean, and Representative, I don't... I don't know... I've never asked anyone to take anything out of the record. And I'm not... I'm not asking you that, but boy. It appears that on lines 18, 19 on page 7, each child 'shall' present proof of having been screened. And then down on line 26 it says, you know, it applies each public, private and parochial school. And so, this... this does look like it is a new mandate on parents to provide the screening. And I... I understand why the schools went neutral on this because there's still a mandate on the parents to get the screening, but there's no longer a mandate for the schools to provide it. So, that... that's... that's the reason the schools went neutral. They said, hey, we don't

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

have to provide this unless we want to, but the parents are still stuck there. And I think that's the point that the prior speaker was trying to get at. There are a lot of 'shalls' in here and this one... this one is the... I mean, that's the real problem."

Lilly: "Yeah. I do see the question and it is a 'may', we made the corrections to the Bill to make sure that this is not a mandate."

Breen: "Right. I think..."

Lilly: "And if that is a concern in reference to removing those 'shalls' where they should be 'mays', then I will... Hold on for one second. Okay. With that recommendation, I'll agree 'cause we have what I would call an agreed Bill. What I will do is take the legislation out of the record to make those changes, so that it will read 'may'. Because this is not a Bill where the individual or parent 'must'. It is an opt option."

Breen: "I... I think... I think this Bill should pass 118-0 once you make those changes. Thank you."

Lilly: "Okay. Thank you."

Breen: "Thank you."

Lilly: "I will take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, out of the record. A spirited debate.

Mr. Clerk, for an announcement."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: recommends be adopted a, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5720."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 440, Mr. Burke. Please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 440, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill... Senate Bill 440 would deal with benefits to firefighters, Chicago policemen. This is strictly Chicago. It would correct some inequities that had occurred previously in previous legislation putting Chicago on par with the rest of the state when we are considering benefits to those who lost their life in the line of duty, their spousal benefits and a number of other considerations. But very fair with respect to the entire State of Illinois for those who serve us every day and put their lives in jeopardy as firefighters and police officers. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sandack: "Representative, could you walk through some of the changes in the benefits that your Bill would provide?"

Burke, D.: "As you might imagine, Representative, the somewhat lengthy..."

Sandack: "Can you... No, can you just encapsulate them and give us kind of the short script for these benefit changes?"

Burke, D.: "Very basically, it would provide for a Tier 2 death benefit and spousal benefit, child and dependent parents benefit, line of duty death benefit, and I think that is clarifying language that would provide for those stated."

137th Legislative Day

- Sandack: "So, I see... my analysis says that one changes the Tier 2 Survivor's Annuity for a surviving beneficiary to mirror the Tier 1 benefit, but subject to the 2 Tier... Tier 2 salary cap. Is that correct? One of the items? I can repeat it if I need to."
- Burke, D.: "As we understand, you know, these things can be very technical and quite confusing with respect to, you know, technicalities. But what I'm saying to you and this Body is that it would put Chicago firefighters and police officers on par with whatever the rest of the state is doing. This was overlooked years ago. This should never have occurred and there have been individuals who have suffered as a result of an error in the legislation previously. This is just a correction in language."
- Sandack: "My analysis says that the City of Chicago and the Chicago Fire Fund are opponents. Is that because it would be a financial impact upon the Chicago Fire Fund and/or the City of Chicago?"
- Burke, D.: "I think... it's my understanding that they are opposed just strictly on the financial impact, but the fact is when you extend this cost in perpetuity it's a very minor impact."
- Sandack: "Do you know what that minor impact is, Dan? I mean, is it... can you put something around it?"
- Burke, D.: "Would you like to hear the .06 percent..."
- Sandack: "Oh nice. Is that... is that we're talking about?"
- Burke, D.: "...for the next year?"
- Sandack: "If that's what it is, I... that helps me."
- Burke, D.: "We're talking in perpetuity."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Sandack: "Thank you for answering the questions. To the Gentleman's Bill. I... I certainly would not criticize benefits being given to fire and survivors of the police and fire department who have lost their lives in the line of duty and/or to... in other way to their family. And if this does actually bring benefits to par, I don't think there's any good reason not to support it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Morrison: "Representative Burke, which... which committee did this Bill go through?"

Burke, D.: "Labor and Commerce."

Morrison: "Just out of curiosity, why didn't it go through the Personnel and Pensions Committee?"

Burke, D.: "I haven't the faintest idea."

Morrison: "All right. One more question. What is the current funding level of the Chicago Fire Fund?"

Burke, D.: "Twenty five point one four... 25.41 percent."

Morrison: "Twenty point four one percent? Okay. I... I think there might be a discrepancy there. I guess in the... in the committee, a different number was cited."

Burke, D.: "What's your number?"

Morrison: "So, perhaps you could ask staff..."

Burke, D.: "What number do you have?"

Morrison: "I just... No, maybe you could ask your staff 'cause I..."

Burke, D.: "I just did."

Morrison: "And your staff, he did not know?"

Burke, D.: "Twenty five point four one percent."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Morrison: "Okay. To the Bill. We all know that we have a serious public sector pension crisis, perhaps the most... the greatest in the country and it's not just at the state level. It's also with our local units of government. To Representative Sandack's point, we... we do greatly appreciate those who put on the uniform, who... who run into harms way and we absolutely want to honor them. But the financial realities are so bleak we have to do things differently and sometimes that means making hard choices. And so, that's why I would ask the Body to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Representative, what will this add to the Chicago Firefighters Pension Fund liability? How much..."

Burke, D.: "The figure that I'm given is 165 million over the life of the annuity."

Wehrli: "So, an additional liability of 165 million to the Chicago Firefighters Pension Fund. How much of that will be picked up by the State of Illinois?"

Burke, D.: "Zero."

Wehrli: "No cost to the State?"

Burke, D.: "None."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, I sit on both the Pension Committee and the Labor and Commerce Committee and it is very curious that this Pension Bill went through Labor and Commerce and not the Pension Committee. And the truth is is

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

the testimony in committee by John McCabe who's with the Fire Fund, you know, nobody is opposed to the enhancement on the duty benefits or the death benefits in... from the Tier 2 moving it to Tier 1, nobody was opposed to that. In fact, there was an additional Bill that allowed for all of that. We've already looked at that Bill. We've seen that Bill in Pensions, we're no... no problem. The only concern here was the increase in the COLA. And the Chicago Fire Fund, that's how they testified that the COLA was their concern 'cause it is a benefit enhancement to pensions for which they did not pay an additional amount per year. So, the deal they had was a one and half percent simple; that's just simply how it was set up. This moves it to a three percent simple for those Tier 1 certain retirees. And it did overall become an increase of about \$165 million, which is small potatoes to their \$3.5 billion unfunded mandate. However, I believe the testimony in Labor and Commerce was that the fund is currently at 18 percent funded. He said that in committee. So, as I want to say again, you know, the reason I'm going 'no' is that there was a previous Bill that dealt with specifically the survivor's having a stronger annuity. It's simply the COLA change that we're opposed to because it's not paid for. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McAuliffe: "Representative, we're talking about some of the police officers and... that are getting a COLA. These are people that were born between what year was that, 1966?"

137th Legislative Day

- Burke, D.: "Nineteen fifty five through 1966."
- McAuliffe: "So, I would gather there's probably not a lot of them that's... that are there? This is just fair. This is what we're doing for other members of law enforcement throughout the state?"
- Burke, D.: "Absolutely. It's parity with the entire rest of the State of Illinois. And a previous speaker was absolutely wrong. These officers, firefighters do contribute to the fund in order to gain the benefit."
- McAuliffe: "And on the widow's benefit, when we say widow's... I would say most of these are all... are all females because of being a widow?"
- Burke, D.: "I would imagine the... the great majority, but in our new age there might very well be men who would be the spouse that survives in the event of a death of an officer."
- McAuliffe: "Well, I would say..."
- Burke, D.: "It could occur."
- McAuliffe: "...and also another point I'd like to bring up, if you're a Chicago police officer or a fireman where do you have to live?"
- Burke, D.: "In the City of Chicago."
- McAuliffe: "So, if you would become a widow, where would you probably still be living right now?"
- Burke, D.: "In the City of Chicago."
- McAuliffe: "Correct. So, if they're only getting about... I believe it's \$12 thousand a year, how much would this upgrade them per year for the widows?"
- Burke, D.: "This legislation would tie it to the federal poverty level and that's 125 percent of the... \$1,226 annually."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

McAuliffe: "Okay."

Burke, D.: "About... excuse me, \$1,226 a month."

McAuliffe: "Which most of them probably living in... in the City of Chicago it'll be helpful, you know, it's helpful for them, but you know, to make their ends meet. And I would assume a lot of these people still live in the districts, live in the City of Chicago and have lived there, their husbands or wives committed to the job, had to live in the job. And they just want to live in the home that they were married, raised their children, and then want to live there the rest of their life. So, I think this is actually a good benefit for them."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Representative. And I would imagine this little minor increase would not provide them the opportunity to begin to suck on margaritas on a beach in Puerto Vallarta."

McAuliffe: "Correct. Thank you. And to all of my colleagues, I hope that you can support this excellent piece of legislation.

Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke to close."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think this is a very fair initiative. It gives individuals who have risked their lives and safety for our benefit in the City of Chicago. It's asking nothing more than what we provide individuals that serve us throughout this entire state. It's fair; it's equitable; it's overdue. And I would encourage this Body to support those that risk their lives daily on our behalf. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

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 86 voting 'yes', 24 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 805, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 805, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation..."
- Speaker Lang: "There is an Amendment, Mr. Clerk. Let's move the Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. And please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 805, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. What the Amendment does is to correct an anomaly in the two Sections of the Code dealing with investigators for the Secretary of State. Tier 1... Tier 2 employees must retire at the age 60. Unfortunately, a different statute specifies that their pensions can't begin at age 60. So, what this measure would do would be to fix the glitch and say that the mandatory retirement for Secretary of State Capitol Office security detail would be 65. So, they can retire up to age 65; at 65, they would be guaranteed the pension that they have earned. I'd appreciate your 'aye' votes."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment... Mr. Sandack on the Amendment."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Sandack: "I was delayed, sorry about that."

Speaker Lang: "No problem."

Sandack: "A few questions of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, I'm quickly looking through the analysis. I know it went through the Senate, I think, unanimously?"

Currie: "It was a different Bill. This is an Amendment... a House Amendment to a Senate Bill. Recently the discovery appeared that there was this glitch. You have to retire at age 60; you can't begin earning a pension before the age of 62. So, what we're doing here is fixing it so the mandatory retirement is higher. You have to work longer."

Sandack: "So, it's... all right. So, that's actually a good thing."

Currie: "Yes."

Sandack: "From a financial perspective, at least."

Currie: "Yeah."

Sandack: "Thank you for the clarification. I appreciate it."

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: "Senate Bill 805, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you. You've heard the Bill; that's all it does. It makes sure that those 20 people who serve us in the Capitol for the Secretary of State's Office will be able to begin

137th Legislative Day

- collecting a pension benefit at the point at which they decide to retire."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Barbara Wheeler."
- Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was my intention to vote for Senate Bill 42 as a 'yes' vote. I'd like the record to indicate that."
- Speaker Lang: "Record will indicate your intention. Thank you very much. Senate Bill 1059, Mr. Mitchell. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1059, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1059, it gives State Group Health Insurance access to SERS employees who took a lump sum distribution in their self-managed plan and terminated participation with SERS, but then returned to service in the... with a SERS employer. I had a situation and a constituent in my district. She was an employee at the University of Illinois. She left with her husband to Missouri, I believe and then he was deceased. And she came back and she... this Bill is very... it would only allow her to participate in the... she is an employee at the University of Illinois, but she's

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

not allowed to participate in the State Employees Group Insurance. This would allow this type... this person to participate in the group insurance program."

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. There are 97 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2186, Mr. Tryon. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2186, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill... Senate Bill 2186 Tryon: actually codifies a Supreme Court ruling that was issued last year that had to do with a school district in my area that built a set of bleachers on a property line without obtaining any kind of approval from the city. So, they got legal advice and said they didn't have to do that. The neighbors were upset went to court and of course, I think we would all agree that when it comes to land use and zoning compliance that even school districts would have to comply with things like entrance and exit, setbacks and construction that might throw shadows off the property or affect nearby properties. And that's codified. So, this Bill really does two... three things. It codifies the Supreme Court decision. It says that a municipality has to actually grant the... the decision within 90 days. It limits what can be charged to a school district. And I think it will be good public policy for future decisions

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

of the State of Illinois. So, with that I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sente: "Mike, I just want to clarify a few questions with you, if I can. So, when a local government is... are they able to go back when there is an existing school or structure and make comments on an existing school building?"

Tryon: "It's... it's... the intent of this Bill is... is to deal with the future. We're talking about zoning applications that would occur in the future. I think it's important to note that when it comes to the building itself, that that's a function of the... not the city government, but a function of the Regional Superintendent and the Capital Development Board. So, you know, if they wanted to make changes to their property... change things like an entrance on a road... they would then have to seek zoning, but that would be a future case not something that would have happened in the past."

Sente: "Thank you for that. And so, we're talking in this Bill strictly about zoning Codes and not about building Codes. Is that correct?"

Tryon: "That is correct."

Sente: "Okay. And then, when we do have a project coming up how does a school district know which municipality to go to for those zoning decisions based on which... because there could be a school district that's in multiple local governmental jurisdictions."

137th Legislative Day

- Tryon: "Yeah. That... that can happen and we have had that case in the past. And it would be the... the jurisdiction where the building was going to be built where that would apply."
- Sente: "So, that would be the one jurisdiction that is responsible for meeting with the entity, right?"
- Tryon: "That would be correct. And I think it's also to point out, for the record, in this Bill it... it also addresses the fact that the zoning conditions cannot affect the curriculum. So, if, in fact, a school district wanted to build an auto shop that would be usual and customary curriculum for a school district and that would be something that would be approved by the Regional Superintendent as well as the Capital Development Board, not require zoning."
- Sente: "Thank you. And the last question, and I know you're very passionate about this and I appreciate you working diligently with everyone to try and meet everyone's needs. In terms of the fees 'cause we're looking at one governmental entity and another and so the fees charged for zoning applications, et cetera. Our goal in this Bill... your goal is to try and minimize the fees charged between one entity to another. Is that correct?"
- Tryon: "That is correct. And that... and to be reasonable to both units of government so. And cities, and many times waive fees for private projects, such as factories or economic development projects and stuff like that, but here we just wanted to make sure that... that the fees that were charged by the city were related to the direct cost of the... just the zoning or the lowest fee applicable. So, that's what the Bill would say."

137th Legislative Day

- Sente: "Thank you. To the Bill. Just to summarize, I think both parties have worked together. This is a good piece of legislation. There is a real issue that needed to be fixed. Building Codes are different than zoning Codes for schools. They are issued separately. The building permits by the Regional Office of Superintendent, so we don't want to mix those two together. And so, I think we're attempting to clarify that in this Bill. And I wholeheartedly support it."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2196. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2216, Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2306, Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2306, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill addresses auto assignments in the managed care program from HFS. For clients who do not choose a provider, the department will assign people to managed care based on an algorithm that prioritizes quality and takes into consideration existing provider beneficiary relationships. There's no known opponents to this Bill. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- 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

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2321, Mr. Welch. Mr. Welch. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2357, Mr. Sullivan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2370, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2370, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Brain research and human development specialists increasingly discover that children are in no way miniature adults. They understand the world differently. They tend to act rashly. They tend not to understand things that the rest of us take for granted. This measure is one that comes to us from the United Communities of Faith and the Juvenile Justice Initiative. And what it does is provide that for youngsters between the ages of 13 and 15 charged with murder or some kind of sex assault crime, they will have access to a lawyer before they are interrogated in the police station. It also simplifies the Miranda warning for people up to the age of 18 since a lot of research shows that young people don't understand the right to waive their opportunity to have a lawyer or waive their opportunity to speak. They often think that if they do anything like that the judge will hold it against them. So, I know of no opposition to the Bill. It has strong support from the Cook County Public Defender's Office as well as the Association Statewide of Public Defenders. And I would appreciate your support for a measure that will make

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

it clearer to young people who are involved in the criminal justice system what their rights and what their options are."

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 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2407, Leader Gordon-Booth. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2407, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2407 simply establishes the Teen Reach grant line. This is a very bipartisan Bill. It came out of committee unanimously. I ask for your 'aye' vote and I'm open for 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? Jackson, Phillips. Please take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2468, Representative Gordon-Booth. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2468, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Again, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2468 is an initiative of the Peoria County Board. It

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

would establish an exemption from the general requirement that a jurisdiction using direct recording electronic system totals for all candidates would be allowed. This exemption was created because the software used to count votes in precincts cannot be programmed to tabulate fractional cumulative voting. The exemption only applies to the Peoria County Board of Election and Commissioners during a Peoria City Council at large contest. This has been extended multiple times. There is no opposition. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2610, Leader Durkin. Please read the Bill. Mr... the Clerk advises there's an Amendment. Please put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2610, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Durkin."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin on the Amendment."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment... this is the Misericordia Bill, which creates the license for continuum care. The Amendment is at the request of the administration... of their departments, IDPH and also... This is at the request of the Public Health and Health and Family Services. And I would ask that we adopt the Amendment."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

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: "Senate Bill 2610, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. We've debated this Bill before. And as I just stated earlier, this is a Bill which we've seen. It's the continuum of care license that we are going to extend to facilities for individuals with developmental disabilities, otherwise known as the Misericordia Bill. I request a favorable 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 108 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2746, Mr. Guzzardi. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2746, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2746 is a Bill addressing the following problem. It is expensive to be a woman in the State of Illinois. It's not only the matter of the pay gap in our state, as Leader Currie reminds us every year it takes until

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

April of the following year for a woman to make the same pay as her male counterpart made in the year prior. But it's also costs more to make basic consumer purchases. Dry cleaning for instance. A study from the State of New York showed that the average cost of cleaning a men's shirt was \$2.86, the average cost of cleaning a woman's shirt was \$4.95. Car repair, according to a study from Northwestern University mechanics upcharge their female clients almost 90 percent more than they upcharge men. And it's especially bad in the drug store. Deodorant, shaving cream, razors, products marketed to women cost more than their male equivalents even when it's the exact same product. This is an example that I find sort of striking. Excedrin Complete Menstrual cost an average of 50 cents more than Excedrin Extra Strength despite the fact that those two products contain the exact same ingredients in the exact same quantities. It's the same product: it just has a different name. It's marketed to women and it costs more. It is expensive to be a woman in the State of Illinois. And unfortunately, government is complicit in this as well. And this is information that I didn't know before I worked on this Bill; I find it fascinating. I think it's worth reading into the record. The Federal Government has import tariffs on different products. Women's sneakers when they're imported to this country are taxed at 10 percent. Men's sneakers are taxed at 8.5 percent. Women's suits are taxed at 8.5 percent, men's suits are taxed at 0 percent. And here in Illinois we participate in this complicity of making life more expensive for women by applying the regular 6 percent sales tax to feminine hygiene products. We have a lower sales tax rate for

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

medical necessities, but until this moment, we have not considered these products as such despite them of course being regular monthly necessities for almost every woman between the ages of say 13 and 50. I believe that not only should we not be complicit in making it more expensive to be a woman, we should in fact being working to combat that, which is why Senate Bill 2746 exempts feminine hygiene products from the sales tax entirely. As we know the sales tax is regressive, so this exemption will be especially helpful to low-income women who are struggling to make ends meet and because this demographic of women is most likely to be making consumer purchases, the odds are this money is coming right back to the Illinois economy. Just as a brief aside, many in the chamber have asked why I have chosen to carry this Bill. The fact remains that government at every level is overwhelmingly the province of white men. I'm aware, of course, that my election to this chamber didn't help matters in that regard. As long as this remains the case, I think that we have a responsibility to stand with underrepresented communities. We have a response... we can't just leave women's issues to the women. We can't just leave black folk issues to the black Legislators and Latino issues to the Latino Legislators. We have an obligation, all of us in this chamber, to fight to make things a little more equal for our brothers and sisters of color, to make things a little more equal for our sister and mothers and daughters and wives. This Bill's a small step; I acknowledge that. It probably amounts to a few dollars a month for the women of the State of Illinois. I would say

137th Legislative Day

- it's the least we can do to make it a little less expensive to be a woman here in Illinois. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, it's a little noisy in the chamber. Settle down, please. Representative Wallace."
- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Wallace: "I'm wondering, with this piece of legislation was it going down to what roughly 1 percent?"
- Guzzardi: "The... the products would be exempted from the sales tax entirely."
- Wallace: "Exempted. So, would this make these products eligible for purchase with perhaps SNAP benefits?"
- Guzzardi: "Say again, Representative? I'm sorry."
- Wallace: "Would this make these products purchasable with the SNAP or a LINK card?"
- Guzzardi: "This Bill doesn't address that question, Representative."
- Wallace: "Okay. I think it may set us up to do that though. So,

 I want to say thank you for that. Are there... what are some
 other things that are taxed roughly around or exempted from
 this tax? It's pretty interesting the list that's part of
 this full Act, isn't it?"
- Guzzardi: "Why don't you go ahead and share with us, Representative."
- Wallace: "We had some things like horses and interest on horses, personal property delivered to a purchaser. There's even the purchase of semen for artificial insemination for livestock.

 There's any number of, oh, close to three dozen things and

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

we're just going to add feminine hygiene products to that list, correct?"

Guzzardi: "I would say so, Representative."

Wallace: "I want to say thank you. I want to say thank you for all of the low-income women in the State of Illinois. Every year this is an issue that my office tries to address through donations and then distribution to shelters, particularly domestic violence shelters. And what you said was so key, that this is a collective effort. It's not just a women's issue; it's about the household and the dollars that are being spent out of that household. So, thank you for allowing me to chief co with you and thank you for bringing this Bill."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really more than anything else want to thank the Sponsor for his most excellent mansplanation of this issue. In reality, this is a great Bill and you've clearly did a lot of research. And I learned some things about the price differences, so thank you for doing that and sharing that with the Body. This is a good Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Guzzardi, is this your first tax decrease
Bill you've ever ran?"

Guzzardi: "I appreciate the question, Representative. And in the spirit of bipartisan compromise which I hope can move this chamber forward, indeed this is a tax increase... tax decrease.

137th Legislative Day

- See, I'm so used to saying it, right? It's a tax decrease particularly for lower income working women in the State of Illinois, but for all of our families who need it."
- Ives: "Well, if it's a tax decrease, I support your Bill. Thank
 you."
- Guzzardi: "My pleasure, Representative."
- Speaker Lang: "I don't even know what to say. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "Page 5 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 2612.

 No. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2216. Representative Hoffman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2216, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 2321, Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2321, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2321 is an agreed Bill. It provides a path for after school programs to request and receive exemption from day care licensing if they meet clearly defined health and safety requirements as well as quality program guidelines. The Bill also establishes a process at DCFS for review of all after school programs that received

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

CCAP funds. This is a negotiated Bill with the YMCAs, the Boys & Girls Clubs, DCFS, DHS, Illinois Action for Children, Illinois Day Care Providers Association, the Jewish Federation, Catholic Charities and many others. There is no opposition to the Bill that I am aware of. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2321 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 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2321, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 574, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 574, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. And Floor Amendment #3 what it does, it changes the makeup of the council. And I think it was an even number and now it's an odd number. And I would move for the... I would move for the adoption of the Bill... of the Amendment. I'm sorry."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 574. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed

137th Legislative Day

- say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2227, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2227, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Fortner? Thank you. Senate Bill 2300, Representative Gabel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2300, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment 1. It is... it makes some modest changes to the... the Bill that takes away the opposition of the Realtors Association."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Leitch on the Amendment."
- Leitch: "No. Excuse me."
- Speaker Turner: "All right. Can I adopt the Amendment first and come back to you, Sir?"
- Leitch: "Yes, please do."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2300. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

137th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Leitch for what reason do you rise?"
- Leitch: "I would appreciate it if the Journal would reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' on 2321. My switch wasn't working very well. Thanks."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Sir. The Journal will reflect your request. Senate Bill 2882, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2882, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2989, Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3162. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3162, Representative Cassidy. Would you like to move this Bill to Third Reading? There's a Floor Amendment. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3162, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Cassidy."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."
- Cassidy: "Actually I... I filed a Motion to Table Amendment 2 and I'd like to adopt Amendment 3."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Floor Amendment #2 from Senate Bill 3162."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment... Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Cassidy."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 3162 addresses some concerns that were raised. This Bill... the underlying Bill is an initiative of the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts to create an opportunity to modernize our court systems and bring e-filing into our civil system. This would create a \$7 fee. Floor Amendment 3 creates an offset to that fee and other fees so that it's... it is... it comes out on balance. It's not a net increase fee. And it addresses the concerns of the various parties that were raised."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt, do you have a question on Floor Amendment #3? Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 3162. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Moffitt, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Moffitt: "Are we going to consider that... that now on Third?"

Speaker Turner: "No, Sir."

Moffitt: "When it... when it does come up, I do have a question then. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Senate Bill 3163, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3163, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #4 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

137th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2861, Representative David Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2861, a Bill for an Act concerning military justice. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative David Harris."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment dresses...
 addresses some requests that were made to make some minor
 changes to the Bill. Do you want a full explanation of what
 all the changes are?"
- Speaker Turner: "Maybe the abbreviated version?"
- Harris, D.: "I'd be happy to. There's a technical change just to clarify intent. It requires the Adjutant General to submit rules for non-judicial punishment through JCAR, which was the biggest change that... the JCAR requirement. It also allows the Department of Military Affairs to file emergency rules with JCAR. It makes changes to identify the Adjutant General as the appellate government counsel in case there is an appeal under the military judicial process. And then it reinserts some language that the Attorney General wanted in to clarify that the Attorney General has the responsibility to act as defense counsel in case a service member commits a crime while on active duty and state duty."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2861. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Sandack, for what reason do you rise?"

Sandack: "Thank you. Just an inquiry of the Chair, perhaps."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Sandack: "Maybe you don't know this now, but it'd be nice if we made... perhaps had a schedule for what's going on this weekend?

It'd be nice to know if we're going to be in Saturday and Sunday?"

Speaker Turner: "We'll get back to you with that, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you."

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

Williams: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Williams: "There'll be a very brief Green Caucus meeting after Session today in Room 300, which is back in the Senate offices. It's just a quick update on budget items related to environmental concerns."

Speaker Turner: "Senate Bill 2585, Representative Fine. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2600, Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2600, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2600 is a companion Bill similar to a Bill that we debated thoroughly last night, Senate Bill 2531. But this Bill specifically again is an initiative of the AFL-CIO that provides when a commission is created under certain Acts and receives any public funds, the

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

board must include at least two members of a Labor Council or a Labor Council's and at least two members from two separate minority groups. This particular Bill amends other Acts different from Acts amended yesterday. Specifically, this Bill would amend the Economic Development Area Tax Increment Allocation Act, the County Economic Development Project Area Property Tax Allocation Act, Illinois Municipal Code, Economic Development Project Area Tax Increment Allocation Act of 1995 and other Acts. And I ask for approval."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Sandack: "Representative, I... we had a lengthy debate on the companion Bill and I don't want to rehash all that. Just a couple questions."

Welch: "Yes."

Sandack: "Does this Bill... do you expect a trailer Bill on this Bill of any kind?"

Welch: "No."

Sandack: "So, this is it?"

Welch: "This is it."

Sandack: "Okay. That's a good thing. What... can you just compare and contrast the differences between what we did yesterday and how this Bill and what laws and commissions your Bill affects?"

Welch: "Yesterday we talked about economic development corporation councils, specifically. This Bill here goes to the Acts that I just listed. That... that's it."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Sandack: "My analysis says it amends the Economic Development Area Tax Increment Allocation Act..."

Welch: "Correct."

Sandack: "...County Economic Development Project Area... Property Tax
Allocation Act..."

Welch: "Correct."

Sandack: "...County Economic Development Project Area Tax Increment..."

Welch: "I think I... I think I missed that one when I read them, but yes."

Sandack: "Yes. Increment Allocation Act of 1991, the Illinois Municipal Code, Economic Development Project Area Tax Increment Allocation Act of 1995. Did I... do I have them all?"

Welch: "That... that should cover it."

Sandack: "Okay. And so the Bill that we did yesterday was not implicated by any of these statutes?"

Welch: "No."

Sandack: "Okay."

Welch: "Yesterday's Bill was a separate statute."

Sandack: "A singular statute and today's Bill covers what I just read?"

Welch: "Correct."

Sandack: "All right. So, give me an example. Give me an illustrative example of what this Bill would do to a hypothetical organization under one of these Acts?"

Welch: "Well, if the City of Effingham authorizes \$50 thousand to the Effingham County Economic Development Board because it's public money..."

Sandack: "This Bill is implicated?"

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Welch: "This Bill is implicated."

Sandack: "Yesterday's Bill would not have been implicated? 'Cause
I swear we were talking about economic development
corporations and I swear we used cities as an example. And
I'm wondering if there's an overlap component here?"

Welch: "Well, I believe that happens frequently in... in our laws.

We're..."

Sandack: "It shouldn't though, should it?"

Welch: "It ... it shouldn't."

Sandack: "Okay. So, that's one of my points. What I'm trying to figure out is what this Bill does distinctly different than what yesterday's Bill does?"

Welch: "Nothing."

Sandack: "Okay. So, it does nothing. Are we going to have another Bill tomorrow that does the same thing? Why are we doing this?"

Welch: "Because there's different Codes. We want to make sure the Codes are..."

Sandack: "But I asked you for an example..."

Welch: "...consistent."

Sandack: "...and you gave me an example. And it was the example from yesterday. So, give me an example separate from yesterday's Bill that implicates this Bill. And Mr. Guzzardi, take the nose off. Sorry. It's distracting."

Welch: "Gives us a moment."

Sandack: "Sure."

Welch: "So Representative Sandack, specifically, if you look at the Economic Development Area Tax Increment Allocation Act..."

Sandack: "I'm sorry?"

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Welch: "...yes... yesterday's..."

Sandack: "Pardon me, Chris? Can you repeat that? I was getting... left and right. Say it again, yet."

Welch: "I didn't say much anyway. Yesterday's Bill dealt specifically with Economic Development Corporations."

Sandack: "Okay."

Welch: "We spent a great deal of time on that."

Sandack: "Right."

Welch: "We didn't talk about anything regarding TIF Districts."

Sandack: "Aha."

Welch: "And we all know that TIF Districts have joint review boards..."

Sandack: "They do."

Welch: "...pursuant to the Economic Development Tax Increment Allocation Act. And this... this Bill, if passed, would cover joint review boards."

Sandack: "So, if I have..."

Welch: "Yesterday's Bill would not."

Sandack: "Okay. So, let's talk about that. Is this prospective only or is it retrospective, too?"

Welch: "It... it doesn't specify, but it's intended to be prospective."

Sandack: "Well, okay. So, you... it doesn't specify so it's your intention... so if we're making a record here and if this should pass, it's your intention that we would not have to reconstitute and allocate members to a joint review TIF Act or TIF Board that would comply with your Bill. Is that your intention at least?"

Welch: "Yes."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Sandack: "I'm sorry?"

Welch: "Yes. This is a prospective law."

Sandack: "Okay. So, it does not require any TIF Tax Increment Joint Review Boards to go back and... and be in compliance with your Bill?"

Welch: "Give me a moment. Let me just make sure."

Sandack: "Okay."

Welch: "Representative, actually I... Let me clarify."

Sandack: "Yes, Sir."

Welch: "The Bill does not specifically state whether it's prospective or not. So, technically, they would have to go back and comply with the law."

Sandack: "Yeah. And that's pretty onerous. Especially if you have a TIF District that's 21 years old and about to mature or you're a 7-or 10-year TIF District that's been running well... or maybe not, I don't know... but there... that's probably a problematic issue from a logistic standpoint. I don't know if that's your intent, but I would humbly suggest, you know, as we go on through this debate that's going to be a real problem in implementation and have some unforeseeable, but I guess we can foresee some of them, negative consequences. And I think that's something that should cause you some pause. But even if it isn't retrospective, which I think it is, Chris, how... what do these joint review boards do? What are they charged with doing on behalf of Tax Increment Financing Districts?"

Welch: "Well Representative, you're a former mayor..."

Sandack: "I am."

137th Legislative Day

- Welch: "...you know that each of the taxing bodies in a proposed TIF or TIF area has a representative that attends the joint review board and you know it basically oversees and governs the TIF."
- Sandack: "Right. But what does a labor person have to do with...
 what is labor going to bring to the table on a TIF that's
 already been constituted? I mean, what... what's their
 interest? I mean, I know what a taxing body's interests are,
 but what's labor's interest in a joint review board?"
- Welch: "Well, with... without rehashing yesterday's debate completely..."
- Sandack: "But it's a different Bill, young man. So, I want to know about this Bill."
- Welch: "It's very similar. But I... the issue... the underlying issue is the same. TIF areas specifically are designed and set up to develop blighted areas. And what labor is seeing is that a lot of the intent is not being followed through on. They're... they're... they're doing things in nonblighted areas."
- Sandack: "The TIF boards are or the underlying economic development isn't being undertaken? So, remember, these joint review boards have a different perspective. They're not making decisions on economic... I mean, they're just making sure the TIF is being administered correctly and it gives numbers on where things are from a perspective of a taxpayer as to what this TIF is doing. They're not making decisions on let's build this, let's not build that at that level, right? So, what I'm asking you at the joint review level what exactly is labor bringing to the table?"
- Welch: "Well, I... I think labor will give a... labor and don't forget our two separate minority groups."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Sandack: "Right."

Welch: "It's very important."

Sandack: "I knew... I knew..."

Welch: "You know..."

Sandack: "...look if this were just about under... minority groups representation, we'd be having a different discussion. I'm focusing on the labor component right now because, well, it's in your Bill. And I'm not sure how it relates to what it is you're trying to accomplish?"

Welch: "Well, I also think it's important that, you know, to know that joint review boards also decide what to do with surplus."

Sandack: "But those are taxing bodies, Chris. What's labor have to do with that? They're not responsible to a taxing body within a TIF District."

Welch: "Labor is just bringing a perspective, Ron."

Sandack: "I know, but what's the perspective? They do… if… if we're talking about economic development, I guess I get it, but on the tax review side… I don't understand what they're going to do. No one elected them there and they don't respond to a school board, a park district, a city so."

Welch: "I... I think labor sitting at the table with all of these entities involved would... would clearly..."

Sandack: "Clearly."

Welch: "...send a signal to all of these entities that they should consider and whatever's going on in these TIF Districts, labor has a role. Prevailing wage is... is being paid. Fair wages are being paid. Labor... labor always has an important perspective to offer at these tables."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Sandack: "Thank you for answering the questions, Representative. I... I do think this Bill is unnecessary... And to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman's difficulties... yesterday's Bill, we had a spirited debate, I'm still waiting to figure out what that trailer Bill is because we passed something... we basically negotiated and debated something that wasn't on the board. Notwithstanding, I know what the Gentleman was trying to do. This Bill, however, is different. And I don't understand the policy-driven initiative and what it really seeks to do. I don't. And there is going to be an unintended consequence here, folks. This is retrospective as well as prospective. There are hundreds, thousands maybe, of TIF... TIFs in Chicago, the suburbs and throughout the state that would all of the sudden, if this gets put into law, have to reconstitute boards. And I don't think this has been thought through. So, I think we ought to... the Gentleman can withdraw the Bill, I would be pleased. If he doesn't, we're going to have a problem if this passes. Please think through your vote. I encourage a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan is recognized."
Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Chris, so... the people... when you want to have labor or minority participation and I... I meant to ask this yesterday and it so actually applies today as well. What... what if you have a region that doesn't have a high labor force... labor union force? Where they... and they might not be able to... to get the people to... beyond these boards, to comply with the Act. I mean, generally you want people from the region or

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

from that specific economic development area to represent that area. And so, if you don't have either a high union membership or a high minority membership in certain areas of our state, how do they comply with the Act then?"

Welch: "Well, again, we talked about this issue yesterday as well.

One, the... the legislation does not have any penalties in the Bill, you know."

Sullivan: "If they don't comply?"

Welch: "If they don't comply."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Welch: "The goal is compliance..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Welch: "...but if they don't comply there's no penalties."

Sullivan: "Right."

Welch: "Certainly, the goal is at a minimum there's an effort to have this type of representation on these boards. I find it hard to believe that you can't find hardworking men and women all across the state in every corner of the state..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Welch: "...that... that would be available to serve on these commissions and boards."

Sullivan: "The... the idea might not be you don't have them, you might not have them that actually want to participate is... is the bigger issue."

Welch: "Well, and if there's been a search for them and they don't..."

Sullivan: "And then it... and then it's limited even more in certain areas that don't have high labor union force or you know, high minority force. I mean, we do have state... areas of the

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

state's like that. Okay. But you said there's no... So, it's... so, theoretically, if you wanted to find someone from a different part of the state you could bring them in to do this even though that wouldn't be as advantageous."

Welch: "The... the... again, it's not stated in the Bill I mean, I think it's common sense and..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Welch: "...intended that it comes from local..."

Sullivan: "No, I understand."

Welch: "...but if you can't, the compliance..."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Welch: "...would be members of two labor councils or a council. And if they have to come from out of the area, you still have compliance."

Sullivan: "So, with these economic development projects, under law presently they are authorized 5 to 15 members. And... and we also now run into a potential conflict of interest. You know, let's say we have 7 members and... and 4 of them are up here. Or let's say there's just 5 and 2 of them are labor and it's constituted correctly under you legislation, 2 of them are labor folks and now you have folks that maybe now there's a development going on that this union is going to be doing some of that development. They're going to have to recuse themselves, I'm assuming. Is that correct? What I'm..."

Welch: "Again, everything would have to be looked at on a case by case basis, but..."

Sullivan: "Certainly."

Welch: "...certainly, if a conflict arises I would expect members to recuse themselves on an issue."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Sullivan: "And I quess where I'm going with this is I think we're setting ourselves up to seeing more conflicts. Because when I look at the statutes and what they're allowed to do, acquire land and personal property, clear any areas of a project area, that would be a labor issue, make any infrastructure improvements, that's a labor issue, renovate existing structures, that's a labor issue, install structures, that's a labor issue. You know, so we have a lot of what these economic development projects do is related to potentially having labor unions in there, where then they're going to have a conflict. And so, I think we're building in a problem into your Bill that I'm... I'm sure you obviously don't want, but that's the net effect of what's going to happen if you're going to build into some problems where you're not going to have potential members to actually vote on some of these things and it's going to bog the process down. In some of these areas in these rural townships you're probably not going to get 15 members. So, they're probably going to be on the lower end of 5 because you just don't have a lot of folks that are going to want to do this type of work or the time away from their families. And so, if you're now going to have, say, we've got a 5 member group 'cause that's all we can get as a quorum and now 4 of those are going to have be appointed under your Bill, I think we're defeating the whole purpose of the locals setting up their own economic development corp... or group and it's being kind of run from afar. And so, that's some of my... my problems I have with the Bill. I... I do thank you for your... your comments. And at this point, I certainly do not support the Bill. Thank you."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay is recognized."

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

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

Kay: "Chris, I'm curious. By definition, does a union qualify as
 an economic development corporation?"

Welch: "You know, I did file a trailer Bill today. And the definition that I read at length yesterday, I do not believe, Representative Kay, that a union would qualify as an EDC."

Kay: "Why not?"

Welch: "You want to tell me why they... they do?"

Kay: "No, I... I'm... It's your Bill, Chris. I... Why not? They fall... they fall, in fact, they fall into the same categories as all others on that board that yesterday and today we're speaking of. So, why not? What separates them?"

Welch: "I don't believe a union is set up as a corporation to do economic development and in corporate any, but unions are set up to protect employees. Unions are set up to protect employees from people that want to take advantage of them and not pay them fair wages, put them in dangerous working conditions. That's what you're calling an economic development corporation?"

Kay: "I'm just asking."

Welch: "Come on. Don't insult hardworking union people across this state and country."

Kay: "Well, I didn't meant to insult anybody. I was just asking a question and if that's insulting, I... I ask for your apology. But I think it's a relevant question because I think now you've got a legal matter on your hand. Thank you for your

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

answers. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm... I'm a little bit confused about not only yesterday, but today. And I didn't get any clarification today that's useful. But I certainly will pursue this from a legal aspect to find out just where we are on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Nekritz."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Nekritz: "So, Representative, I'm... I just want to... I know some of this has been covered, but I want to make sure that I understand. So, this would cover TIFs?"

Welch: "This would also cover TIFs, Representative."

Nekritz: "So, who... who sits on... who's on the joint review board that's created under the TIF Act?"

Welch: "My understanding of joint review boards, they are made up of each entity... governmental entity that a TIF covers. So, a school board would have a representative on the joint review board, the municipality, any school board that's in the TIF, park boards. So, whatever governmental entity the TIF touches would have a representative on a joint review board."

Nekritz: "So, it's all the taxing bodies?"

Welch: "Correct."

Nekritz: "We don't have any private entities, and no other interest groups. It's taxing bodies."

Welch: "Correct."

Nekritz: "And do... do they make any decisions about how the tax... how the TIF dollars are allocated?"

Welch: "One moment. Give us one moment, Representative. We just want to verify."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Nekritz: "Okay. Well, so, I... Here let me, 'cause my understanding and I'm... I'm no TIF expert, but my understanding is that once the TIF is created the village board votes on whether or... on whether or not to pursue a development and work with the developer on whether or not those TIF... they're entitled to the TIF dollars within the TIF. So, it's really only the village board that's making that decision. Those other taxing bodies have not say over whether a developer comes in and... and has access to those TIF dollars. So, I'm not sure what role... I mean, the joint review board has very little input at all over the TIF, much less how those dollars are flowing. And so, now we're going to add 4 more people to a body that doesn't really do anything. I'm just really struggling with that."

Welch: "Well, I think the most important thing a joint review board does is at the time their surplus is created, you make sure surpluses go back to where they're supposed to go and are being spent the way they're supposed to be spent. And I think..."

Nekritz: "But... but the joint review board..."

Welch: "...having... having minority..."

Nekritz: "...doesn't do that. The village board does that. I mean, if we want to add people on to a village board, I guess we could do that."

Welch: "That's not what we're trying to do."

Nekritz: "I understand. I'm just really struggling with the… the purpose of this. And there… I don't know enough about these other entities to know kind of what they do and who sits on those and what they're role are… role is. But I… for a TIF

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

this seems completely... I don't know... I'm just really not understanding the purpose of those... of adding these particular individuals to... to that kind of a body that has the responsibilities that are... that a review board does. I appreciate the... the information. Thank you."

Welch: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates that he will."

Ives: "Representative Welch, have your participated in a Joint
 TIF Review Board?"

Welch: "I served 12 years on a high school board and I did serve on a joint review board."

Ives: "You did serve on a joint review board. Okay. So, then..."

Welch: "It's been awhile, but I did."

Ives: "So, then you would understand that as... just as the Representative Nekritz explained the Joint TIF Review Board does not allocate the dollars in any way. They simply sit there as... as the reports are read about how much money was taken in on the TIF, how much is left, what other debts the TIF may have, but they actually make no decisions whatsoever on what happens with that money. In fact, in my own city of Wheaton the folks that are a part of that Joint TIF Review Board are those taxing entities. So, the county, the park district, the school district would... would come in and review the documents... the final reports for that year. Actually, about every 6 months they do this or as needed. So, I don't understand what the benefit at all would be to have somebody else sitting in there. Now, occasionally you will have public

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

members be on a Joint TIF Review Board, but the qualification there is that they actually reside in the TIF. They're a resident in that TIF. So, they have a vested interest in how that money's being spent and what's going on. So, I mean, I understand what you're trying to do. I just think that it's completely inappropriate for... for them to be on the Joint TIF Review Board because that's not what the purpose of the board is. It's not to have minority representation necessarily. In fact, you probably couldn't even get it in some places because you know the school... you can't decide who the school superintendent's going to be, who shows up."

Welch: "So..."

Ives: "You can't decide who the... if it's going to be the finance guy instead. You can't pick who's the park district director. So... and those are the people that the city has decided, through their elected representatives that are going to be... well, they're actually on the Joint TIF Review Board. So, you can't make this determination by State Law. Can't do it."

Welch: "So, let... let me do something as a point of clarification that I think's going to address your concern, the last speaker's concern and maybe a couple other speaker's concerns because Senate Bill 2600 provides that when a commission is created under these Acts. So, sometimes municipalities delegate under the TIF Act to a commission the entire process. And so, when a commission, not the joint review board, has been created, this Bill would be triggered. So, you all are talking about the joint review board..."

Ives: "Well, that's... because that's what you said."

Welch: "Well, then that's why I'm clarifying."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Ives: "...in your beginning testimony."

Welch: "And when I... when I opened up the discussion, I specifically said that this was a Bill that provided for when a commission was created. Somehow we got dragged into the joint review discussion and it's not about the joint review board. It's about when this work is delegated to a commission. And if it's delegated to a commission and public moneys are being spent, we believe that labor and minorities should have a voice."

Ives: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I just... I find the testimony somewhat confusing and now a little bit of backtracking being done on testimony that was previously made. And I also think even if it were on a commission you'd be hard-pressed to find the right type of representation that he desires in certain parts of the state. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch to close."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2600, again, I want to underscore is an initiative of the Illinois AFL-CIO. This is a companion Bill to legislation that we acted on yesterday that cover... covers other statutes. This Bill was specifically introduced because labor leaders across this state are beginning to get priced out of numerous economic development opportunities. The AFL-CIO believes that economic development specifically in TIF areas are supposed to help blighted communities, but in many cases this is not happening. The proponents of this Bill feel that if public dollars are being infused into these commissions, then workers and minorities should have a voice and I do too. I'm hoping that you will

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

join me in supporting minorities and our labor members and support Senate Bill 2600."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2600 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 59 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present... Representative Welch."

Welch: "Mr. Speaker, can we place this on the Order of Postponement?"

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill to the Order of Postponed Consideration. Representative Ford, for what reason do you rise?"

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Ford: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today is a proud day for me because one of my students that I used to teach is here. His name is Johnathan Tate. And I think he's single, I'm not sure, but he is a Air Force veteran, he is an Army veteran, he's currently enlisted as a National Guardsman. And he acts as a veteran coordinator for my district office. He found me on Facebook and he volunteered in our office for three years with no pay. And now, he's making very little pay for the district office. Please welcome Johnathan... Sergeant Johnathan Tate on the Democrat side. Give him a big round of applause and a standing ovation."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you for your service and welcome to your Capitol. Representative Williams, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Williams: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Williams: "I apologize. I restated... I stated wrongly the location for the Green Caucus meeting. It's actually in Room 300... no, Room 100 on the south hallway of the Capitol by 115. Green Caucus, right after Session. Sorry about that."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Senate Bill 2612, Representative Demmer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2612, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2612 simply extends the sunset on a Uniform Assessment Code for wind installations. It's supported by county assessment officers, Farm Bureau and Department of Revenue. And I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2612 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 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2612, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2613, Representative Manley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2613, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2016 (sic-Senate Bill 2613) is the... it creates the Child Bereavement Leave Act. This Bill would provide two weeks of unpaid bereavement leave to employees in the event of a child's death. You can use the bereavement leave for whatever you think is necessary. I wanted to point out a few things quickly, and I take any questions that the membership might have, but in the gallery I have Mr. Dixon who has been the driving force behind this. He is been the President of Bereaved Parents of Springfield for 23 years now. And the important thing to know is he got involved because 25 years ago today his son, tragically killed in a car accident, which started his journey as a bereaved parent. Can we all recognize Mr. Dixon up in the gallery here? On behalf of the Dixon family and in memory of Todd Dixon we bring Senate Bill 2613. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I... I just wanted to point out that most of us can't even imagine what it would be like to lose a child. And I think this is the very least that we can do for families that are going through this. So, my condolences to anyone who has ever had to go through this. It must just be awful. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ammons is recognized."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. First, I want to thank Representative for bringing this Bill forward. There was a young lady that many of us may have read about just recently, unfortunate death in Champaign, where the young lady was ultimately... she ultimately died and was dismembered

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

and her body was tragically dumped in Clinton. Her family, her mother as distraught as a mother would be at the loss of her young daughter, unfortunately had to return to work the Monday after the... the Tuesday after the funeral. And she worked unfortunately for Champaign County Jail where the young men who were implicated in this heinous crime were also going to be held. And it's tragedy on top of tragedy in that case because she didn't have any time that she could use to truly bereave her daughter's death. This Bill is not just for my good friend, who... that you spoke about in the gallery, it's about many other mothers and families who tragically lose their children for many reasons, for them to have the appropriate time to mourn the loss of that child. And so, I stand in support of Representative's Bill and I hope you all will support this too. This is a very difficult time in the family, the loss of a child. We don't wish it on anyone, but we do know that when it does happen, the family needs adequate time to mourn the loss. Thank you for this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley to close."

Manley: "Briefly, I just want to say thank you to Mr. Dixon for sharing his story with us and I want to compliment the Members in this House, especially the business owners, that told me that they couldn't imagine a business owner not being responsive to a parent that worked for them that... that went through this. And so, I commend them on their sensitivities to that and thank you all for your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2613 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2613, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2677, Representative Tryon. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2677, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Actually, Senate Bill 2677... the Bill will actually require that all lis pendens filings, which is simply just a notice of a legal action or lawsuit filed on a piece of real estate, under the predatory lending database program which includes Cook, Kane, Peoria, Will Counties as mandated by statute will be filed electronically with the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulations. This allows them to become more efficient. It's about 85 percent of those that are filed now are filed electronically. And this was an initiative that IDPFR has been trying to do for some time. So, any questions I'd be glad to answer them."

Speaker Turner: "See... seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2677 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 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2677, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2739, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2739, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 2739 just extends the financial reporting standard sunset extension. There were still some reports that the department was still working on and they were just asking for an extension."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2739 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 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2739, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2797, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2797, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk. The Clerk please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2797, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."
- Lang: "Pardon my confusion, Mr. Speaker. I didn't realize we had adopted the Amendment. This is an agreement between craft distilleries and the wine and spirits distributors and the beer distributors regarding various things. Craft distillers, tasting permits, permit holder licenses, gallonage maximums.

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

They've worked on this a very long period of time. Mr. Zalewski, who's not on the floor today, did most of the heavy lifting. There are no known opponents to this Bill. I ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2797 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 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2797, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 2805, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2805, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2805 would simply amend the Uniform Real Property Electronic Recording Act by adding two additional members to the current 15-member board. This Illinois Electronic Recording Commission is a commission that makes sure that we have adequate... the rules in place regarding electronic filing of real estate... real estate deeds, et cetera. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. An inquiry of the Gentleman."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

- Sandack: "Thank you. Would Mr. Welch's Bill be implicated in
 yours? Would we have to have two labor members in your board?"
 Hoffman: "I don't believe this is an economic development board."
 Sandack: "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? Martwick. Please take the record. There are 109 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2819, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2819, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The... this deals with the Cook County Pension Fund and their ability... and the ability of the employer, Cook County, to make payments into the Pension Fund. Right now, the statute is very clear that there is... this is where the moneys are supposed to come from and how much those moneys are and that has led to some underfunding. So, this would allow the county to make some additional payments into the Pension Fund which would be a good thing in order to avoid further underfunding."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 10 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 3162, Representative Cassidy. Please

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

- read the Bill. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. On page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 1016, Representative Willis. Please read the Bill. Out of the record. Chair recognizes Representative Winger. For what reason do you rise?"
- Winger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you could please have the record reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 2613."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Mr. Clerk,
 Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 956, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell. House Resolution 1285, offered by Representative Butler. House Resolution 1286, offered by Representative Ives. House Resolution 1288, offered by Representative Reis. House Resolution 1290, offered by Representative Scherer. House Resolution 1291, offered by Representative Moeller. House Resolution 1292, offered by Representative Moeller."
- 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. Mr. Clerk, committee announcement."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately following session: Cities & Villages is meeting in Room 115, the Executive is meeting in Room 118, Health Care Licenses in 122, Judiciary-Criminal in C-1, Judiciary-Civil in D-1, Revenue & Finance in 114. Meeting a half hour after Session is Labor & Commerce in 413, Personnel and Pensions in 122."

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there is a goldenrod sheet coming around. You will note that Session tomorrow is at 9 a.m. Session on Saturday has been canceled and Session on Sunday will be at 3:00. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk... Pardon me. Representative Reis."

- Reis: "Said yesterday a lot that we were going to pass a Bill for an insurance policy that we would have a budget come next Tuesday at midnight, that we were going to continue to work on things, but we're going home. The people of Illinois expect us to get this done. The working groups are meeting, both sides of the aisle feel that progress has been made. We should stay here through the weekend and work on the budget and get something done. Otherwise, we'll have another crisis. We passed a budget; we're going to send it to the Governor and nothing will get done. So, Mr. Speaker, do you want to run it by the home office in the back? Our side of the aisle is willing to stay here and work on getting a balanced budget with reforms that the people of Illinois sent us here to do."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 27 at the hour of 9 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5668. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

committee action taken on May 26, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2156. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2049, Senate Bill 2932; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2989. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2585. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5781. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3336. Representative DeLuca, Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5611, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5711."

Clerk Bolin: "Second Reading of House Bills to be held on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading. House Bill 2736, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5167, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5168, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5169, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5170, a Bill for an Act

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

concerning revenue. House Bill 5171, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5172, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5173, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5174, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5175, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5176, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5177, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5178, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5179, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5180, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5181, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5182, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5183, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5184, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5185, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5186, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5187, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5188, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 6418, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of these Second Reading of this House Bills."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Sims, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2016: do pass Short Debate Senate Bill 1120; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #6 to House Bill 1016, Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 6266. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 10, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 235, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

240, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 321, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 467, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 807, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1120, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1582, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2049, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2241, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2294, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2340, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 2397, a Bill for an Act concerning the lottery. Senate Bill 2427, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2435, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2443, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2562, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2609, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2701, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2787, a Bill for concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2813, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2822, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2824, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Senate Bill 2896, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2899, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2908, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2912, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2920, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 2921, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2924, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2932, a Bill for an Act

137th Legislative Day

5/26/2016

concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3047, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3096, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3112, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3149, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3284, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3319, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3336, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3337, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 346, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 2051, offered Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. First Reading of these Senate Bills."

Clerk Bolin: "Second Reading of Senate Bills on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading to be held on such Order. Senate Bill 2814, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."