140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- 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 30, 2016: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 10, Floor Amendment #2 Senate Bill 250; recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4517, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5010, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5948, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6041, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6041, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6083."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and Holy God, who is sovereign in all of Your ways, God omnipotent, God omniscient, God omnipresent. God, we ask and pray Your blessings upon this august Assembly, upon the Speaker of this House, upon all of its Members. Most gracious God, may You impress upon them and upon their hearts to do that which honors You the most. To do that that brings You glory. God, as they deliberate this day, may You grant them wisdom, may You grant them strength. God, may You give them insight into this Your perfect plan. God, will You forever lead them and direct them with Your most precious spirit, that this day they would dream new dreams, this day they would see new possibilities. This

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

day they will look forward with great hope. And find rest in Your blessed promises and Your calm assurances. This we pray and ask in Your Son's name, Amen."

Speaker Lang: "Be led in the pledge today by Mr. Morrison."

Morrison - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Monique Davis is excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that all Republicans are present this afternoon. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk.

There are 117 Members answering the roll, we do have a quorum.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before it gets too busy could I just ask for just a moment of attention in the House? Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I know we did a Memorial Service last week. But this is Memorial Day and I think it's worthwhile to put into the record that a sort of a recounting of the service men and women that have lost them... their lives serving this great country. And going back to the Civil War, 561 thousand people lost their lives; the Spanish-American War, 2800; World War I, 116 thousand service members died; World War II, 408,306 people... service members were killed; the Korean War, 54,246; Vietnam, 58,219; the Marines killed at Beirut, Lebanon, 241. And certainly most recently in memory

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

both Iraqi-Freedom with 4500 and Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan of 2300. These men and women lost their lives in service to our country and while those may have happened in combat, think of those individuals that simply because they wore the uniform of the United States and were in the service of our great country, such as those men and women on board the U.S.S Cole when it was simply at dock and 17 service members lost their lives simply because of their service to this country. They paid the ultimate price. I ask that for just a brief moment, since it's Memorial Day, we take a second and have a moment of silence in their memory and thank them for everything that they have done."

Speaker Lang: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you,
Mr. Harris. Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Ives: "This morning I took my own field trip to Camp Butler. If you've never been there, I highly recommend it. It's on the National Registry of Historic Places and it dates back to 1861 when the War Department dispatched General William Tecumseh Sherman to Springfield to select a site for Military Training Camp. Illinois Governor Yates tasked the State Treasurer, William Butler with assisting General Sherman. The men selected the area outside Springfield because of its high ground for camping, and a lower more level area for drills and training as well as a space for a cemetery. The first troops arrived at Camp Butler in August 1861 and numbered 5 thousand within a month. Camp Butler was also a POW Camp

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

housing 2 thousand Confederate Soldiers captured when Fort Donaldson was surrendered. Almost immediately because of little food, smallpox, typhus and pneumonia, POWs died at a rapid rate. Many of them are buried there. Along with soldiers who fought for both the Union and the Confederate sides during the Civil War, veterans who lost their lives in the Spanish-American War, the two World Wars, the Korean War and Vietnam War are buried at Camp Butler National Cemetery. All the men and women who died in service to our country are notable, but the Camp Butler website mentions two that are unique in other ways. One is John Hugh Catherword... Catherwood, who was awarded a Medal of Honor for his bravery as a seaman with the U.S. Navy during the action against Philippine outlaws in 1911. Part of the citation for his Medal of Honor says he charged 20 enemy coming out from concealed positions. He was struck down instantly by outlaws' deadly fire. Unable to rise, he still came to the defense of his leader and fought desperately to beat off the hostile attack. He actually lived through that attack and died 19 years later. His son, Alfred, who also served in the Navy is buried next to him at Camp Butler. Also buried at Camp Butler is Lt. Col. Otis Duncan. He is the highest-ranking African American to serve in the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe in World War I. Duncan came from a prominent black family in Springfield. His father was Abraham Lincoln's barber and friend. He joined the Illinois National Guard as an infantry officer and served with his regiment during the U.S.-Mexican expedition against Pancho Villa in 1916. In a letter to his mother during World War I he wrote, we had a fine time Thanksgiving Day. Held services

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

at regimental headquarters. Singing, preaching and prayer, and I tell you mother we had much to be thankful for. To have survived this war in which we have been engaged is nothing else but a blessing from God and we realize it fully. General Vincendon, French commander of our division, was present and after the religious services we presented him with our regimental colors. And I made the presentation speech. Will tell you about that when I get home. In addition to Duncan's military service, he worked for more than 20 years in the office of Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction. He was also active in Republican politics in Springfield, running twice for alderman in the 1st Ward. These two men, while they did not give their life during time of conflict, they certainly served the military. But also at Camp Butler, it was impossible to walk... not walk across graves. With the date of death being June 6, 1944, and one does not need to wonder how those men died, they certainly died in the invasion at Normandy when we went to take over against the Germans... take back France from the Germans. So, I encourage all of you on days like this to visit the cemeteries and remember those who gave the ultimate sacrifice. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Costello: "Ladies and Gentlemen, with all due respect to all religions. In my eyes there are two people who have died on this earth who have given us freedom. Number one is Jesus Christ who gave us religious freedom and spiritual freedom. Number two is the American soldier who gave us our earthly

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- freedom. They both deserve our respect and remembrance every single day of our lives. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Brown. You may be seated, Members."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 118 for one hour. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie is recognized."
- Currie: "Thank you. Just a scheduling announcement, that Members of the Democratic Caucus that would like briefings on what's been happening in discussions about budgets and other kinds of items, our meetings this afternoon begin at 2, not in 300, but in Room 402-A. I look forward to seeing you, there's a 2:00 briefing, a 3:00 and a 4:00."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leader. Leader Currie for another announcement."
- Currie: "Well, to change the announcement. New information. The budget briefings begin at 1:15 p.m. not 2:00, 402-A. That's just behind the Bill room. See you there."
- Speaker Lang: "The Republicans have requested immediate caucus in Room 118. The House will be in recess 'til the call of the Chair. The House will be in order. Page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 2427, Mr. Riley. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2427, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."
- Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2427, does a number of things and essentially what it does is it deals with the general homestead exemption. When this

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

exemption is granted, the person has to be occupying the house. If they are not occupying the residence, they are supposed to notify the county assessor that they do not occupy the house and that they should not get the exemption. There are times where they have done this and the person is still charged with having an erroneous homestead exemption. So, what 2427 does is it states that the person did notify the county assessor that they do not live in the house, and they did it on a date certain, that they would not be subject to the penalties which are part of having an erroneous homestead exemption which are paying that back and then penalties and fees that are assessed. This is an agreed upon Bill. I explained Amendment #2 just yesterday. Amendment #2 took opposition off of the Bill and this is a good Bill for taxpayers. I'll answer any questions you may have and request 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, this may be a good Bill for taxpayers, but is it only for Cook County taxpayers?"

Riley: "It is just for Cook County."

Sandack: "Well, why is it only a good Bill for Cook County taxpayers and isn't the principles enunciated in your Bill applicable other than Cook County?"

Riley: "Well, I mean, I think that it would be. When the Bill was first crafted, the people came to me basically to deal with Cook County and Cook County properties. This may be something

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- that we might want to expand in a trailer Bill going forward.

 But right now it's just for Cook County."
- Sandack: "And explain to me who the suggestion... my analysis says, this Bill was suggested by... I don't want to mispronunciate the name, Tran... T-R-A-E-N Inc. Who are they and what do they do?"
- Riley: "They're an organization... an organization that deals with providing information about taxes and tax collection and that type of thing to taxpayers."
- Sandack: "So, do they have some type of... Would something benefit them and or would their... I mean, how is it that they came to give you this? I'm just wondering. Is their involvement in the system, they saw these improvements could be made?"
- Riley: "Well, frankly... well, yes. I mean, I think they're a good government and a fair taxation type organization. We talk to these organizations all the time."

Sandack: "Oh, I wasn't trying to imply anything on toward."

Riley: "No, no, no. No, no."

Sandack: "Okay."

- Riley: "I know you weren't. But I'm just explaining, I've dealt with them before. They've written a lot of articles that you might have seen in the newspapers and so."
- Sandack: "But do they... but they don't exclusively undertake their work and findings just for Cook? I'm trying to figure out why something like this isn't applicable... and I mean, I don't think this is a task force, this isn't a sunset provision, so let's just see how it goes. This looks like it's a good tax Bill for property taxpayers in Cook. And right now with some of the other issues we have, Representative, some of which

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

pits citizens against citizens, unfortunately and regrettably, I would be thinking at some point in time we would start running legislation that, if it's all possible, would be a little more uniform in its application. That's all I'm meaning to suggest."

Riley: "I get you, Representative Sandack. But one thing that I am saying, often when any Bill comes before one of us, when the genesis starts, you're thinking about that particular Bill or that particular jurisdiction. As time goes on and like you're pointing out now although you know we've got to get this thing passed, you do see that it would have benefits for other jurisdictions. There are some things that we were dealing with in negotiations on that Amendment. There were a few ideas that we had that might make this Bill better, but you know, you don't want the perfect to get in the way of the good. So, let's pass this and then we can talk about those other issues at another point. That's the way I sort of view some of these issues that you're even talking about."

Sandack: "All right. Thank you and I always appreciate a Voltaire reference. So that's wonderful, thank you. To the Bill. The Gentleman's Bill, I agree with him in his assessment when he says this is a good Bill for taxpayers. Except I would put the word 'Cook County tax... words 'Cook County taxpayers' in there. And I just worry that we continually do these things and again, no disparagement or untoward things whatsoever. I think it's a good Bill and I understand why the Gentleman brings it. I just wish we would be doing these things more uniformally and in better application because invariably, later down the line, we're going to start saying, well, you

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

can't do that because you have this benefit, we don't have it. And we're seeing that play out on a larger platform with respect to budget negotiations, particularly education reform. So, I just would caution the Body to once in a while, when we can, make something uniform, let's stop and do it for goodness' sake. And let's not wait 'til we have, you know, chits on both sides of the ledger and we're negotiating good taxpayer initiatives when we should be applying them for everyone as we can. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley to close."

Riley: "Thank you very much. I think you've read the Bill. And this is a good Bill for taxpayers. Please vote 'aye'."

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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted House Joint Resolution 153. Representative Kelly Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5729 and House Resolution 1223. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted House Resolution

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

1206, and House Resolution 1217. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted Senate Joint Resolution 45, and Senate Joint Resolution 54. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted House Joint Resolution 97, and Senate Joint Resolution 55. Representative Fine, Chairperson from the Committee on Youth & Young Adults reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted Joint Resolution 150. Representative Hernandez, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 2804. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted as amended House Resolution 1205. Representative Costello, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4318. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2469. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4678."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz is recognized."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of information. Some of my colleagues walked into this chamber very, very cold. And I just want to inform the Body that I have a collection of coats and sweaters and hoods and scarves that they... I'm happy to share with both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Mr. Speaker, order of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please, Sir."

Ford: "Members of the House and Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce some... to some of you and reintroduce to many of you my Page for today Taylor Langston an eighth-grader. She is a House and Senate brat. She's been raised here in Springfield. She's the daughter of former Representative Annazette Collins. And so, would you guys give her a big round of applause."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for being here today with us. Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 2340, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2340, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This particular Bill is a Bill that will allow for the pass-through of more child support dollars to families receiving TANF. We're increasing it from \$50 to 100 for one child and to 200 for two children. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Actually, may I make an inquiry of the Chair first?"

Speaker Lang: "You may, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you. Was there a Floor Amendment yet to come on this Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, are there..."

Wallace: "We adopted it yesterday."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor can answer."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Wallace: "We adopted the Amendment yesterday."

Sandack: "Thank you. All right. So, Representative, can you just walk through the Bill a little bit with a little more explanation so those who just walked on the floor and maybe should be paying closer attention can so they know what they're voting for?"

Wallace: "Okay. Again, this Bill will increase the dollars that are passed through to families who receive TANF."

Sandack: "What was it before your Bill?"

Wallace: "So, it's \$50 now. What we're asking is for \$100 for the first child, \$200 for the second and other children thereafter."

Sandack: "How would this work logistically?"

Wallace: "Logistically? So the noncustodial... custodial parent is paying child support."

Sandack: "Right."

Wallace: "The state keeps a portion of it and passes through the rest."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Sandack: "And so, now it just changes the pass-through amount..."

Wallace: "Yes."

Sandack: "...first, second, child, et cetera?"

Wallace: "Yes."

Sandack: "All right. Are there any oppo… with your Amendment that I… I apologize…"

Wallace: "There are no opponents."

Sandack: "...there are no opponents?"

Wallace: "It's an agreed upon Bill."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Wallace: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Representative, is DHS okay with this Bill now?"

Wallace: "Yes. The Floor Amendment changing the effective date to January of 2017 removed all opposition. And they are okay with this Bill."

Bellock: "Okay. It's a little bit quieter now, so can you tell what it is now? It raises it from \$50 to \$100. Is that correct?"

Wallace: "Yes, for one child. If there are two children, it raises it to \$200."

Bellock: "But can you just briefly explain how that comes out of the child support payment?"

Wallace: "Correct."

Bellock: "I don't think a lot of people..."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Wallace: "So, if there is a custodial parent receiving TANF and there's a noncustodial parent paying child support, the state at this point keeps all of the child support except for \$50 and gives that \$50 to the family. We're simply asking that instead of only giving the \$50, we raise it to 100 and 200, respectively."

Bellock: "Thank you. And what... what was your estimate of the cost?

I think it was a little bit less than what we had on our analysis."

Wallace: "It's \$1.5 million."

Bellock: "Thank you very much."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 72 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Martwick is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Martwick: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today with me I have a special guest here in the chamber. Kiley Marron is a constituent of mine. She's acting as a Page for a day. She attends Jones College Preparatory High School in Chicago, serves as her class vice-president. She's active in a variety of extra-curricular and service activities. She helped start a Girls Who Code Club, and High School Democrats of America Club at her high school. She also spent a month abroad in the

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Dominican Republic where she facilitated a community initiative and led a youth day camp focused on promoting children's rights. This past spring she was recognized for her leadership and service by the United States Senate Youth Program, where she was one of only two Illinois delegates. So, Kiley will be attending college in the fall of 2017; we're hoping for Stanford. And she plans to pursue a career in the law with a focus on intellectual property. She's a very impressive young lady; she's joined us here today. Please welcome her to the House."

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you for joining us, a pleasure to have you with us today. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1380, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 6167, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6333, and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 124."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 2227, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2227, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a result of the Governor's Task Force on Local Government Consolidation. It amends the state Mandates Act and requires the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity to submit two reviews and

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

reports on state mandates to the General Assembly and the Governor. One every 2 years and one every 10 years. The 10 years is a comprehensive report."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, I know we had a lot of discussion in committee. And afterwards, there were some concerns from the department that there might be some duplication. Is it... it's my understanding that if we find that there is some duplication that we really don't need to have the department doing it over and over again, you'd be in favor for trailer to correct that, if we find that to be the case?"

Kifowit: "Correct."

Fortner: "I thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Leader Currie for a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirement so that Senate Bill 2051 can be heard in the Executive Committee, Senate Bill 3011 in House Human Services, Senate Bill 2359 in Judiciary-Civil, 2604 in Labor, 2261 in Revenue, Senate Bill 346 in Substance Abuse, Senate Joint Resolution 48 in Transportation Regulation."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie, is Senate Bill 1047 on that list? I don't think you said that."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Currie: "I'm happy to put it on the list. Senate Bill 1047 on its way to..."

Speaker Lang: "Judiciary."

Currie: "...Judiciary-Civil."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack on the Motion."

Sandack: "Would you mind having the Sponsor reread the number of Bills 'cause I don't know how many you want to suspend the Rules on. And I may object to one and I don't want to object to all of them."

Speaker Lang: "I believe there are eight. Let's go through them, Leader, in one Motion."

Currie: "Eight. There are eight."

Sandack: "Then you know what, we needn't do that. If you're not going to separate them out, then I will object and ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Lang: "So, those in favor of Leader Currie's Motion to suspend will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Welch. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion prevails. Senate Bill 2825, Representative Mayfield. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2872, Mr. Sims. Mr. Sims. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3005, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3005, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3005 actually represents the third leg of a stool of

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

criminal justice reform work that we've done together quite well. Earlier this week we passed Representative Lilly's Bill addressing lifetime barriers to employment for ex-offenders... certain ex-offenders in health care. Earlier this year, with great bipartisanship as well, we passed an identical Bill to this one that addresses employment in school systems. This one is related to employment for certain low-level exoffenders in parks... park districts. When we began this process several years ago, we were... I was carrying both the school and the parks Bill. And the parks folks basically said they would be very comfortable with anything the schools agreed to. So, we worked very closely with the school systems and came up with a Bill that you guys accepted wholeheartedly that has gone to the Governor's desk. And this is the next version related to employment for low-level offenders, employment or volunteer basically. And the bottom line this is that this is not about making sure that someone has to be employed. It is allowing someone to apply for a job. We actually have laws on our books that prevent someone from applying for a job because they have a drug offense in their past. This takes away that barrier to applying for the job. Let me be as clear as I can be. The local park district will have all of the information about the applicant's background and will get to make an informed decision about their history, about their life since the offense that is discussed, what they have done with their life and gets to decide if they are the best candidate for the job. And in many cases, their history and their background will make them an even better candidate for the job. Their ability to come back from

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

difficulty might make them the best possible candidate for the job. So I ask you, just as you did join with me on the Bill relating to school systems and as you joined with Representative Lilly on the Bill related to working in health care, let us take away this barrier to re-entry and give people a path away from recidivism. I look forward to your questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Sir. Will the Lady yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Lang: "Of course she does."

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative, you used the term low-level offenders a couple times. Can you please define that for us?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely. So these are... these are nonviolent offenses.

These are low-level drug felonies. These are... these are not folks that present a danger to anyone. These are not folks with a..."

Sandack: "So there's no felonies in this Bill?"

Cassidy: "They're low-level... low-level drug felonies. They're fine."

Sandack: "Drug felonies?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Sandack: "So, let me ask kind of a sensitive question. Because park districts... by the way, the Association is neutral on this Bill."

Cassidy: "Absolutely. They are neutral."

Sandack: "What about offenses that occurred on park district property in the past? If it's drugs or something like that, that's okay, right?"

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Cassidy: "Again, the park district, when they get the... they are required to do very extensive criminal background checks. They get all of the history... they get the entire story. Even... they even get if it was originally charged at a higher level and it's pled down to a lower level. They'll have the whole story in front of them and will be able to determine whether or not what this person did presents a risk to the people they serve or not."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen."

Cassidy: "Again, what I was saying is that they will..."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Cassidy: "...they will get the full story. Including whether it was... it was charged at a higher level and pled down, they'll be able to make the decision whether this person presents a risk what the... what they're..."

Sandack: "And I think that's good and I agree with you that we don't want things prohibitively bad. And of course, this does not require any type of determination, meaning these... jobs are jobs and they can use whatever, this just doesn't stop them from being able to apply. This permits them to apply, it doesn't require anyone to hire anybody."

Cassidy: "Absolutely and in fact, they currently use that discretion with... with even more serious offenses that aren't enumerated in here. I mean, you..."

Sandack: "Two more questions."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Sandack: "Two more questions. Sex offenses? Is that within the realm of this Bill?"

Cassidy: "No."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Sandack: "And is this similar to the previous Bills we've been talking about with respect to permissiveness?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely."

Sandack: "Meaning all this is is offering people a chance to staying out of the system, no longer being recidivists, but it doesn't guarantee anything other than an opportunity?"

Cassidy: "It literally... when I talk about this and I talk about it being a chance to apply for a job, it is nothing more than a chance to apply for a job."

Sandack: "Thank you for answering my questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Representative, thank you for bringing this legislation to the General Assembly. My question to you is, how long is a person barred from working with the parks as it stands now?"

Cassidy: "Currently, with these cases it is a lifetime barrier. So, you could have a drug offense 30 years ago, have been in recovery and really put your life fully back together and be an outstanding example for our youth and not be permitted to apply for a job."

Ford: "So, a lifetime meaning forever?"

Cassidy: "Lifetime. Forever."

Ford: "All right. I just wanted to make sure that we all knew that."

Cassidy: "So, we're taking that forever off the table. We are... we are allowing for redemption with this Bill."

Ford: "Thank you."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2989, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2989, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 2824, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2824, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2824 would allow the SIU system at non-student events to be able to sell alcoholic beverages. It gives the criteria for the written policy that has to be followed. This is identical to what we currently have for the University of Illinois, Illinois State University, Northern Illinois University and Chicago State University."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Bill 2357, Mr. Sullivan. Please read the Bill. Please read the Bill. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, please put this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2357, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

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

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

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 makes this an agreed Bill. It has to do with minority contracting and a provision that is going to be removed to equal what happens within the gamings, casino gaming Section to match the riverboat licensing gaming Section. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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 2357, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "I just previously explained the Amendment. The Amendment is the Bill. This removes a provision that is errant... onus in regard to minority reporting. It's, in essence, hindering the reports that we're trying to get. And so, I would ask for this favorable adoption."

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

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3336, Mr. McAuliffe. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3336, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3336 is a department Bill for the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulations to help follow the HIPPA rules dealing with pharmacists. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Evans. Please take the record. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 185, Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative Gordon-Booth. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 185, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 185, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 185 is a technical Bill that allows the tenth Judicial Circuit to have the amount of associate judges that it should rightfully based on their population. I'm open for any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, as I understand this, this will be increasing the amount of judges from 10 to 11 in the Tenth Circuit, correct?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes."

Franks: "Is there an overload of cases right now? Is there some reason why there's an additional judge that's necessary?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes, there is."

Franks: "Can you tell us about that backlog? I mean, is there… is it delaying justice because there's so many… so many lawsuits that are outstanding that the 10 judges that are there right now can't get to it?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes. There's actually a significant backlog. The backlog is worse in the Tenth Circuit than it is anywhere in the state. Beyond that, the Tenth Circuit used to have 11 judges, but when they... not in this last census but in the census going into the new century, there was a number of judicial circuits that saw some significant changes. But the way that those changes were made it was done in such a way so that each circuit would be specifically identified. And so what ended up happening when that reappropriation... when that reappropriation was dealt with and legislation passed like in the early 2000s, there was an estimation on what the

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

population was going to be and so the population was going to be from like 329 to 335 at the high end. But we actually came in a bit over. So, technically we were supposed to get the 11th judge by fitting in between that 329 to 335. And so we're not... we're not under what we should be, we're over."

Franks: "So, you're... you're over."

Gordon-Booth: "Yes."

Franks: "You're fixing a problem..."

Gordon-Booth: "Yes."

Franks: "...that should have been fixed at the last census?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes."

Franks: "So, the Tenth Circuit has not had enough judges during that time and you're just trying to right... just trying to correct that?"

Gordon-Booth: "Absolutely."

Franks: "Sounds... sounds reasonable."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the Lady just explained this very well. We are not trying to add another judge. We are trying to get a judge back that shouldn't have been dropped to begin with. And I would ask Members to support the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Harper is recognized."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like the record to reflect that I should have been a 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 2824."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention, Representative. Senate Bill 250, Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 250, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Gabel."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, this Amendment brought the State Board of Elections to support the Bill. It has just three small changes. It changes the implementation date to 1/1/18. It allows people to opt out of being registered at any time and eliminates the requirement that the Secretary of State do a match. Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Just want to make an inquiry of the Chair, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Sandack: "I believe there are notes filed on this. Does the record so reflect?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Notes have been requested on the Bill as amended have not yet been filed."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cloonen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Cloonen: "I'm sorry I could not hear, Representative. Does this take away the opposition from the state facilities such as Shapiro Developmental Center in my area which, in that case, the state is the guardian and some of the people don't have a high enough IQ to understand whether or not they can opt out. Does this take away that opposition?"

Gabel: "This is an Amendment for the State Board of Election."

Cloonen: "Right. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, my recollection in Executive Committee yesterday was that there was going to be an Amendment on this Bill and I asked specifically for this Bill to come back to committee. And the chair of the committee indicated that it, in fact, would."

Gabel: "And I was prepared to do that. I looked on the board and they had... the Rules Committee had already passed it. I was looking for you to come and talk to you about this before the Bill came up. I'm sorry, I didn't find you."

Hays: "I mean, could I ask that this be pulled from the record?

Not only did the chair of the committee indicate that it would
be coming back to committee, the Speaker's staff indicated
that it, in fact, would come back to committee to me
personally as a Minority Spokesperson."

Gabel: "Are there any specific questions about it that you had concerns?"

Hays: "Well, yeah. I mean, that's the purpose of committee."

Gabel: "Okay."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Hays: "I mean, we have a lot of questions. And I certainly take everybody involved at their word."

Gabel: "That's fine. That's fine, Representative. I'll take the Bill out of the record."

Hays: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be taken from the record. Senate Bill 345, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 345, a Bill for an Act concerning health. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 345, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 345 deals with the issue of Autism. And I would like to apologize, to I believe, Representative Bellock, Soto, Flowers, Golar, Ammons, and Will Davis. I need to add them as cosponsors and I will as soon as the, and Soto as soon as the Bill is complete. I had promised them in committee. What this Bill would do is it would, 1) encourage doctors to look at secondary illnesses that so many individuals with Autism have. Those illnesses, secondary illnesses are things like seizures, G.I. disease, and immune dysfunction. Many times the doctors don't look at that... those secondary illnesses and just treat the incident of Autism and not the secondary illness. So, this would encourage doctors to look at these secondary illnesses. The Bill would also

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

prohibit insurers from discontinuing, delaying, or interrupting provisions of immune gamaglobin when prescribed by a physician as medically necessary. That is used to treat Immune Deficiency Dysfunction. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Thank you very much, Representative, for bringing this Bill forward. We had quite a bit of discussion on it yesterday in committee. I think it passed out unanimously and I think it passed unanimously out of the Senate. And just to raise the awareness besides everything else of Autism, the person who did the Bill testified that it is now 1 out of 50 children will now have Autism in the United States. So, I think that this Bill will help all of those children. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 571, Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative Gordon-Booth. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 571, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 571, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation that would allow a number of counties to extend their enterprise zone. It goes through 2017. I'm open for any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, my analysis says that DCEO is an opponent of this Bill. Is that remain the case and if so what is their main opposition?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yes. So this... so, when the Bill came to committee yesterday, they sent me a text message about 30 minutes before the committee started and they had some concerns that there were some other enterprise zone dates that could potentially come in conflict because of the date of this. I told them that I would be more than willing to work with them moving forward in the future to ensure that that doesn't happen. Many of the questions that they raised were just questions. They weren't... they weren't quite sure what could happen, but they were just raising some concerns. But their opposition wasn't strong. They just wanted to let it be known that they had some concerns about some of the other communities that had some dates coming up. Again, I let them know that I would work with them on that."

Sandack: "So, certainly, because we're in the 11th hour of this Session, or presumably the 11th hour of this Session. It obviously doesn't surprise anyone on a late Bill for someone to have questions. So, is it your commitment to continue to work with them, should something unforeseen occur. And if a

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- trailer is necessary to clean up any dates that don't jive or make sure there's no unintended consequences?"
- Gordon-Booth: "Yes. I expressed that to the agencies, to the committee chairman, as well as to the Members of the committee."
- 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? Please take the record. 117 vote 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 730, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 730, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 A fiscal note has been requested on the Bill as amended by #2. It has not been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "This Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading pending the note. Senate Bill 2431, Mr. McAuliffe. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2431, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2431, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2431 would allow for the Chicago Police Memorial License Plates. Currently now they're only on cars. This would allow them to go on to motorcycles. Be happy to answer any questions. And ask..."
- 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. 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2397, Mr. Jones. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2397, a Bill for an Act concerning the lottery. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2397, a Bill for an Act concerning the lottery. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones."
- Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2397 extends the sunset on lottery, quality of life special scratch off game. The proceeds benefit the HIV/AIDS and prevention and education programs. It goes to organizations that not only do HIV/AIDS education and awareness. I know no opponents of this Bill. I take that back, I see one opponent to this Bill. But I would ask for your 'aye' vote and take any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 90 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2469, Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2469, a Bill for an Act concerning education. 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 Chapa LaVia."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia on the Amendment."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. There were a couple issues that we needed to corporate and Representative Soto was so kind to do this. And let me briefly go through the Amendment because it's pretty lengthy. What it does it provides the following debt limit exemptions, Bureau Valley Community School District 304, which was House Bill 4472 for Representative Demmer, provides a debt limit exemption of 25 million if the bond assurance is approved by the voters. In each and every one of these they have to go to the voters for approval, please understand that. Next we have Brookfield Public Library, House Bill 4679 Representative Z., exempts 11 million bond assurance from being counted towards any statutory debt limit if bond assurance is approved by the voters. We have Paxton-Buckley-Loda Community School District 10, Senate Bill 3367 by Barickman... Senator Barickman, provides a debt limit exemption up to 28.5 million if the bond assurance is approved, once again, by the voters. We have Hillsboro Community School District 3 which is Senate Bill 2274 in the Senate that was

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Senator Manar's, provides a debt limit exemption of 34.5 million if the bond assurance, once again, is approved by the voters. And last but not least, that would allow the schools that receive the federal dollars up to 500 million that was spread throughout the State of Illinois that was non... not connected to any interest would... any bonds issued to school districts as federal QSCBs to mature over 25 years rather than the current statutory limit of 20 years. This would allow short-term. And it also allows the taxpayers some breathing room and so they don't have to pay for it right away. And once again, it goes right back to a vote. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Is it possible to run a referendum instead to the taxpayers of those districts that essentially says we want the authorization to exceed our statutory debt limit? Do you think that that should be said instead prior to them also running a referendum for the increased amount of debt?"

Chapa LaVia: "No, not at this time due to the fact on the timely measure. Especially the dollars that were awarded by our Governor to those different school districts. They actually need this language for the November elections."

Ives: "So, with this... if these referendums were to pass, is it then... is it true whether or not they would actually exceed their debt limitation?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, what happens, especially for the QSCB schools, extending it from 25 years from 20, so it's 5 years. This

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- would allow for short-term payment to be kept lower and keep costs consistent with the taxpayers what they're currently paying. So, there'd be a low to no interest bond for rehabilitation construction of the school facilities."
- Ives: "So are you telling us then that this debt is backloaded?" Chapa LaVia: "Well, five years, yes."
- Ives: "So, it is backloaded? Okay. The other question then, is does it exceed... if they take on this debt, will it exceed their current statutory debt limit?"
- Chapa LaVia: "That's why we're doing a last one, not to go over...

 If the school districts have 20 right now, Representative,
 we're just raising it 5. That's all they get in this Bill."
- Ives: "You're talking about years though, I'm talking about the 13.8 percent of EAV, that is your limitation. Will they exceed that 13.8 percent EAV on debt limit?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Yes. We're allowing them to succeed... exceed that up to this amount, but no higher than that in this legislation."
- Ives: "Okay. So, this is the equivalent... Do you know has the EAV been increasing or decreasing?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Well, it's throughout... There's quite a few school districts in here. So, to go through all of them, I don't have those numbers. I can share them with you when we've completed."
- Ives: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This is exactly the type of trouble that you can find yourself in, that Lincoln-Way 210 has found themselves in where they've accumulated \$500 million of debt, way over their statutory limit. This... We set in statute debt limitations for a reason so that taxpayers were protected in some measure against burdensome debt in the

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

future. This debt is going to be backloaded; it's going to be extended for a number of years. The taxpayers I quarantee you do not understand the nuances of this language or this Bill. It's just a bad idea to basically extend your credit limit when you could be under a situation where you have decreasing income. That's why we set in statute the EAV limitation because that shows your ability to have the property wealth that you need to support a certain amount of debt. So, this is really... it's a terrible idea for taxpayers to vote for this Bill. Terrible idea. And if you really wanted to do it, you would do something where it said in a referendum where it flat out said, are you... do the taxpayers agree to allow the school district to statutorily go past their debt limit? If you... if you read it that way, then fine; if you had a referendum like that first, fine. But this is just leaving taxpayers on the hook for a massive amount of debt that later down the road is going to accumulate and build up. Please vote 'no' on this Bill. This is what's getting school districts in trouble all the time. Over 60 percent of our school districts currently deficit spend, currently deficit spend. They don't have enough revenue to even provide for operations. This takes on more debt for other things. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, regarding this. I truly appreciate the Representative Chapa LaVia bringing this to the floor. This impacts one of the schools in my district; they had asked for help on this. This vote will... this Bill won't settle down for the people in that district, the voters

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

that live there and breathe there and work there, to make the final call on this. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd like to also Representative Bennett's comments and Representative Chapa LaVia for bringing this. One of the school districts that is involved here is Bureau Valley School District. Representative Leitch and I have worked together on this Bill. This is a great example of a school district where they were proactive in consolidation. They brought together I believe seven different school districts into one. It covers a huge geographic area, provides a lot of communities who previously had struggling school districts. Now they have opportunity to send their kids to a good school. This is a positive step, and again, it's subject to voter approval. It's a positive step in local control and allows those communities to still maintain a school. I'd encourage a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phillips."

Phillips: "Mr. Speaker, may I yield my time to Jeanne Ives, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you. One final point about this Bill. I don't know why we then put into statute debt limitations that are set to protect taxpayers. Why do we... why do we always ignore the statute that we put in place to protect taxpayers? If you actually did have the consolidation of a number of schools, then you should have an expanded EAV that should be able to support the current debt limitation of 13.8 percent, that's

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

the truth. Instead, if you pass this Bill, you are extending the credit limit on probably what is really a declining EAV, a declining income. That is a terrible, terrible deal for the taxpayers. Let's just abide by our current rules. Let's try that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative, I just thank you for advancing this. You know one area you really haven't mentioned much is the jobs that it would create. In addition to safer buildings, safer schools, we hear from time to time about students going to attendance centers that are in some cases even unsafe. Very old, some of these would be in that case. So, there's an opportunity where the people there are saying by referendum we want to do this. And we're simply empowering them to have the local control that we say that we're for. So, jobs, quality of life, better attendance center, safety of our students; it's the kind of legis... it's a very good Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. There's a piece of this Bill that's from my district. It's the Brookfield Library concern. And I would just say the alternative to passing this Bill is for the Brookfield Library to go and create a separate unit of local government. So, a vote against this Bill is a vote to create more government. I agree debt extensions aren't ideal, but the alternative for a lot of these communities is to just go do it another way and find a way to create a unit of local government. So, I would

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

encourage an 'aye' vote, if your goal in this chamber is to consolidate government. Thank you."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2469, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto. Representative Soto on Third Reading."

Soto: "Yes. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "We had a lot of debate, but it would be nice to know what the Bill is a little bit. So, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Soto: "Yes."

Sandack: "Thank you. Could you elaborate a little bit on the request of an 'aye' vote?"

Soto: "Well, after we heard from Linda, I figured she had mentioned..."

Sandack: "Is there any other part of the Bill or is it the entirety? Is there any portion of the original Bill that remains that Representative Chapa LaVia did not explain?"

Soto: "Right, no."

Sandack: "So the entire Bill was explained on Second Reading?"

Soto: "Yes, yes it was."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Soto: "Thank you."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- 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 73 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2450, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2450, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2450, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm having a little trouble with my computer. But this is a Bill dealing with mechanics liens. Back, I believe, in the 97th General Assembly, we passed some legislation to modify how the reporting would go. And it had a sunset date in it and this extends the sunset date by five years."
- 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? Chapa LaVia. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2989, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2989, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill deals with the transportation of alcoholic beverages, particularly wines, when it would require wine shippers licensing applications include relevant information so that we can make sure that they are complying with the Illinois laws concerning out of state shippers. We believe that these changes in the shipping laws would allow us to bring in as much as \$50 million a year to the Illinois state budget. In addition, in order to enforce the provisions of the underlying Bill, added to this Bill is an initiative of the administration. Particularly the Illinois Liquor Control Commission, in that it would adjust the amount of retail licensing fees to bring them in compliance with the surrounding states. And in addition, it would increase other like distributor's fees and other fees regarding liquor control commission fees. And it would... those haven't been raised since 1993, the retail liquor since 2003. Almost all of these will still be less than would have been under inflation. And what this would do it was ... would allow the Liquor Control Commission to increase the Liquor Control age and headcount contract with more law enforcement agencies for the purpose of assisting in underage drinking compliance, increase training and equipment expenses for investigative division and approve online application services. We will encourage and you get a cheaper fee for

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

renewal if you do it online. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair.

Representative Sandack is recognized."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Jay, we had a little chance to talk about this. Is the Governor's Office and Liquor Control Commission opposed still to this Bill?"

Hoffman: "No."

Sandack: "They were originally, but with... it was an Amendment or just you worked on the Bill."

Hoffman: "What we did is we amended, put the language that they wanted regarding the ability to fund the Illinois Liquor Control Commission. Then they will have the resources necessary to enforce the provisions on the underlying Bill, as well as do other things they're unable to do. So, this is their initiative, half of it is their initiative, the other half came over from the Senate and is initiative of the wine industry."

Sandack: "See we're working together. You're running part of the administration's Bill. I think that's a good thing. Thank you."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2989 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 104 voting 'yes', 9 voting '0' 9 voting 'no',

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2989, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 10, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 10, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Please withdraw Amendment #2, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you, Representative."

Lang: "Please withdraw Amendment 2."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Amendment #2 from Senate Bill 10. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Amendment 3 becomes the Bill. I would just recommend adopting the Amendment and debating on Third."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 10. 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. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill #10."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 10, a Bill for an Act concerning State

Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Lou Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill concerns the Medical Cannabis Pilot Program. As many of you know, there have been efforts to extend this program longer because the program sunsets next year. There have been also efforts to add new conditions under which a person could qualify for medical cannabis. After some conversation, particularly with Leader Durkin and the Governor's Office, this... this is a proposal that's been agreed with both of them. And we've had help from a lot of people here. I'll get into that in a minute. This is what the changes would be in the Medical Cannabis Pilot Program. First, it would extend the program to July 1, 2020. It would add PTSD and terminal illness as qualifying conditions. It would allow the patients and caregivers cards to be for three years rather than one year before renewal. It would say that upon renewal no further fingerprinting or background checks are required as patients. It would allow that instead of requiring doctors to recommend cannabis to a patient, it would simply create a situation where doctors would certify that a patient would have a bona fide doctor/patient relationship with that patient and that the patient has a given qualifying condition that would be permissible under the statute. It would also subject patients to the prescription monitoring program. It would further allow that minors who are patients may have two caregivers because they can't get into a car and drive and pick up the product themselves. It would also reconstitute the Medical

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Cannabis Advisory Board at the Governor's request. This... these are the items the Bill does. It is pared down substantially from some requests that we've had previously. In fact, pared down substantially from Amendment 1 on this Bill. But in the best interest of the patients, the caregivers, the licensees and the continual viability of the program, I would recommend an 'aye' vote for this agreement."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Turner: "He will."

Sandack: "Representative, you may have mentioned one aspect and I thought this was pretty important. This type of medical use may elimin... lessen the prescription of opiates... opioids and which is a good thing because obviously we've talked about the heroin problem and opioid addiction problem. This extended use for other afflictions may lessen opioid prescription use in other medical conditions?"

Lang: "The answer to your question, Sir is unfortunately both yes and no. But let me deal with the no first. In Amendment 1 to this Bill, we had listed opioid dependence as an actual medical condition..."

Sandack: "Right."

Lang: "...for which a person could qualify for medical cannabis. We did so because in states that have a robust medical cannabis program we... there are 25 percent reduction in deaths due to opioids. Unfortunately, in the working through the negotiation on this Bill, we've decided to leave that for another time. But the yes part of the answer to your question is, that there are many veterans who have PTSD who have been

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

committing suicide, the list goes on and on and on, and many of them have been into opioids. And if we can keep them off of opioids, off of heroin, it would be better for them and better for their families certainly."

Sandack: "Thank you for bringing the Bill. Thank you for your continued hard work on this. I stand in strong support."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tryon is recognized."

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

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

Tryon: "To the Bill. Many of us have been in this chamber for the last eight, nine years as we've debated the issues surrounding the use of cannabis as an alternative medical therapy. And the first Bill that was ever presented before this chamber wasn't a Bill I could support, nor was the second Bill that came to this chamber a Bill I could support, or the third Bill. But when Representative Lang sat down and worked on our Compassionate Cannabis Use Control Act, it became a Bill that was unlike any other Bill in the country. With controls that were put in place to ensure that only people that had qualifying conditions would receive cannabis an alternative medical therapy. And what we're seeing today, is we're seeing more and more research that actually points in the direction that there are other uses and other illnesses that this has promise in treating. Right now as we speak there is continuing studies that are being done by the Veteran's Administration because so many of our returning soldiers who suffer from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder have found relief in the use of cannabis. This certainly makes sense to be able

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

to allow that as an alternative therapy for those who are willing and feel that they have benefit from that. To have an industry come in Illinois and make an investment based upon the laws that we passed and for our process that takes so long that we weren't able to get the industry established in such a time that we might be able to see the benefits of this and just as we speak now, the industry is really becoming an industry that is beginning to get patients and people and delivery of medicines to individuals that can benefit from it. So, extending it and adding these conditions, I think is appropriate for us to do. It doesn't sunset away 'til 2020 and I think this will be a benefit for that industry and the people who choose this alternative therapy as a way to enhance their life. So with that, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. It must be good fortune that it's Memorial Day and we bring this Bill forth. Because of one of the components that the previous speaker talked about is Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. And today is a great day to pass a Bill that will honor them and the sacrifices they made for us to be here today. It's a real issue. You know, during the 98th General Assembly, many of us... I was a Sponsor of HJR91, Illinois Vet Suicide Task Force. Part of that Resolution reads, Whereas, between 2005 and 2011 the veteran's suicide rate in Illinois was more than twice the rate of civilians. Whereas, 17.72 percent of all suicide deaths in Illinois are veterans. That Resolution passed unanimously so we all thought that was a good idea to help our veterans and figure out what is causing the high suicide

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

rate. During this GA, we had HJR4 and the title of that is Vet's Suicide Task Force Extend, where we want to continue to look at what are the causes and what are the reasons why our veterans are committing suicide. Twenty-two veterans commit suicide a day. Nobody has ever died from medical marijuana. Folks, this is something that we need to do today and we need to do it now. The second part of this Bill, and it hits home to me a little bit, is those that are terminally ill and they're going to pass away in the next six months, trying to bring them some form of comfort. I have a father-in-law that is on hospice and we've been trying to get him into the Medical Marijuana Program. It's been difficult to get him into the program. We know it works. My wife is a nurse practitioner that specializes in oncology and specializes in pain management. We know this medicine will help people at the end of their life and help them have comfort before they pass. And so, for those two reasons, aside from all the other good provisions in here, now is the day to do this. Now is the day to pass this. We have bipartisan support. We have a Sponsor that has worked with our side of the aisle, worked with the Governor, showing that we can actually pass good, meaningful legislation. So, let's do that today. Let's pass this Bill. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Representative Lang, when you originally passed HB1 was

this not a pilot program for four years?"

Lang: "Yes, it was a pilot program for four years."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Ives: "And when was it its end date at that time?"

Lang: "December 31, 2017, Representative."

Ives: "Okay. So, we still have about 18 months left to go on that
 pilot program. Is that true?"

Lang: "That is true."

Ives: "Okay. Also, when you originally passed HB1 how many medical conditions were authorized in that original Bill?"

Lang: "Something in the 30s; I don't remember the exact number."

Ives: "I think it's 33. Does that sound right to you?"

Lang: "Could be, yes."

Ives: "Okay. And currently, how many folks in the State of Illinois have a medical marijuana card?"

Lang: "Something over 6 thousand."

Ives: "And what was the expectation when you passed the Bill?

What was the projection of how many would have a card by now?"

Lang: "I had no expectation, Representative."

Ives: "You had no expectation?"

Lang: "My goal... let me just finish my answer, please. My goal was to simply create a program where very ill people in the State of Illinois could get a product that would improve their quality of life. Whether it was 1 person or 50 thousand people was not my point."

Ives: "Okay. And when you passed the original legislation, at that point the original legislation required that the physician actually recommend for the condition being treated, recommend that medical marijuana was actually going to be something that they should use. There was a physician recommendation specifically for medical marijuana. Is that correct?"

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- Lang: "That's correct and the reason that provision is changed in this Bill is that working with the Medical Society they believe that this is a better provision for, not only the medical community, but also for the patients."
- Ives: "Is that because it basically releases physicians from any liability for prescribing medical marijuana and its effects?"
- Lang: "So, I'm not certain physicians even had liability under House Bill 1; however, some physicians were concerned about that. So, this creates a situation where they no longer have to worry about it."
- Ives: "And does your current Bill, as amended, does it then allow simply a patient who has been certified to have a certain condition, if the doctor refuses to specifically recommend medical marijuana what is the procedure for that patient then to get a card and be able to use medical marijuana? What's that in the current..."
- Lang: "You sort of mixed two things together, Representative. Is your question what will happen if the doctor refuses to certify that the patient has a qualifying condition?"
- Ives: "No, my question is if they don't recommend, they're going...
 they still have to decide whether or not they have a condition
 that medical marijuana can be used for, correct?"
- Lang: "That's correct."
- Ives: "They do not have to recommend specifically the use of
 medical marijuana, when they don't that patient can then do
 what to get that prescription?"
- Lang: "It... under this Bill a patient would simply have to get their doctor to sign a form certifying that the patient has

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

one of the thirty-some-odd qualifying conditions under the statute."

Ives: "And then they would take it to the Department of Health then..."

Lang: "Department of Public Health then takes all the application.

A patient has to be fingerprinted, there has to be a background check, they have to pay a fee."

Ives: "Okay. So, why is it that we cannot just simply see through to the end of the pilot program before making all these dramatic changes to a Bill that's supposed to be a pilot program?"

Lang: "Representative, you may recall that a year ago I passed a Bill that would have extended the pilot program two years from that point. And that Bill got 81 votes. And the reason we wanted to do that was if you'll recall, that although we passed this Bill over two years ago, almost three years ago now, it was not until November of 2015 that the first patient was able to buy the first product. In essence, two years of the four-year pilot program was gone before the program went into effect. And all I was trying to do at that time was to create a program long enough to do a good study. And I think that's what we're accomplishing in this Bill today."

Ives: "And when did HB1 originally pass and get signed into law?"

Lang: "Three years ago this August, I believe."

Ives: "So, August of 2013?"

Lang: "Yes, sometime in the middle of 2013."

Ives: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. So, originally when this Bill was passed remember it was supposed to be a pilot program, a pilot program. And the remarks on the floor when

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

HB1 was originally passed were from Representative Lang himself saying, look, I already know it's going to take at least 18 months to implement this. He knew ahead of time that of the four years 18 months was going to be eaten up with implementation. So, we need to let this pilot program work its way out the way that a pilot program supposed to under the original conditions, then collect all the data and all the information and decide what changes need to be made. But what you have found is that every single year since this was passed there's been a tweak here or there for medical marijuana to expand. And in fact, when we come to it, with this Bill it looks as if there will now be 37 conditions for which medical marijuana is now appropriate in Illinois. And it's important to note that New Mexico is the next closest state for these conditions with 20, 20 conditions. So, this is an expansive program. It is no longer a pilot program. It is an expansive program. The other important thing that he's doing is he's essentially taking the doctor out of the ... out of the recommendation authority. It was very specific in HB1 that the doctor must specifically recommend that medical marijuana is going to help the patient. Now we've heard a lot of talk on the floor today about the Veteran's Suicide Task Force... Suicide Task Force, which I actually sit on. And I will tell you this right now, we are not talking about medical marijuana as the reason to help dissipate 22 suicides among veterans a day. That's not what we're talking about. We're talking about other sorts of help that we can get these veterans. It's not medical marijuana. Now PTSD, specifically to PTSD, I think it's important that we look at Illinois

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

experts, Illinois experts. And this is a letter written last year and signed by James MacKenzie who was the President of the Illinois Psychiatric Society at that time, and Jeffrey Bennett another doctor who was the President-elect of the Illinois Psychiatric Society at that time."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative, one second. I'm sorry to interrupt. Members, thank you. Can we please bring the noise level down in the chamber so those interested parties can hear the debates. Representative Ives."

"So, as a veteran, as the mother of a Ranger and now a mother who is going to be a fighter pilot... of another son who's going to be a fighter pilot, if you don't think that PTSD matters to me, you're darn right it does matter to me. So, why don't we get the facts straight. Let's listen to what these two psychiatrists said, Illinois experts in this area, about medical marijuana and its ethicacy for PTSD. They specifically say in their letter, marijuana has not been demonstrated in scientific studies to be effective in the treatment of PTSD. The American Psychiatric Association published the following position. Because of the lack of any credible studies demonstrating clinical effectiveness, the APA cannot endorse the use of medical marijuana for the treatment of PTSD. The Council on Research and Quality Care reviewed available evidence regarding marijuana and the treatment of PTSD. Include that no published evidence of sufficient quality exists in medical literature to support the practice. But here's what's more important, the second point they make, medical marijuana may worsen PTSD symptoms

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

and increase violence. Can I have a little bit of quiet in the chamber, again? I think this is important."

Speaker Turner: "Shhh. Thank you, Members."

Ives: "They're basing their entire Bill on the fact that it helps veterans and I question that. A recent study of 2,276 participants who were admitted to specialized Veteran's Administration treatment programs for PTSD showed that those who never used marijuana had significantly lower symptom severity four months later than those who continue or started use after treatment. Veterans who were using marijuana at treatment admission, but quit after discharge, also had significantly lower levels of PTSD symptoms at follow-up. So, when they quit the marijuana they had better sum... better results. On the other hand, the highest levels of violent behavior were found in those who were not using the substance at admission but who started using it after discharge. Results showed that use of marijuana would significantly associated with higher PTSD symptoms severity as well as higher levels of violent behavior and alcohol and drug use. These are Illinois experts and you guys are just randomly quoting from people that say that PTSD helps. These are two Illinois experts and to disregard their testimony is really an affront. So, I encourage you guys to let the pilot program play out as originally designed by the Sponsor and then let's have another discussion. Perhaps there's more studies that will be done in two years' time. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Members, there are many people seeking recognition on this Bill. Can we please keep the noise level down in the chamber so that everyone interested in listening

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

to the debate can hear the debate? Thank you very much. Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. Have you ever looked at WebMD and searched for Post Traumatic Stress and medications to treat PTSD? The results in the findings might alarm you. According to the WebMD there are 22 prescription drugs listed. What is alarming, only three of those medications Zoloft, Paxil, and generic Sertraline have went through the FDA approval process and have been approved for treating Post Traumatic Stress. The other medications are all off label use, meaning there is no scientific to prove... no scientific results to prove the medication can treat Post Traumatic Stress. Instead, I think it might be safe to say that those medications might be treating the side effects of those three other medications. So, if you ever look at the warning labels for those three approved medications, they come with a black box warning like you find on cigarettes. A warning stating may cause suicidal thoughts or behaviors. But if you look at the FDA website and do your homework, you will find that when Pfizer did the time lapse Post Traumatic Stress study on Zoloft in 2000, the study was 48 percent women in a treatment group and 62 percent had the placebo group. And the most common traumatic event was physical or sexual assault, which occurred in 64 percent of the females. Thirty-four percent of the males group and 58 of the subjects in the placebo group. Did you hear me once mention combat? No. Post Traumatic Stress also effects a lot of different walks of life, not just in the veteran world. It also is affected on the streets of Chicago when children see young people murdered

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

and gunned down; it happens when young children see their mother and father in domestic violence. It happens throughout our state. And if we can actually add a medication there that is given to us by God's green earth, I think we should do it and help as many people as we can. I support the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a question of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, as you know, I voted for House Bill 1, the original legislation authorizing the use of medical marijuana in the State of Illinois. And I'm familiar with the process and how it works and I really do just have a couple of questions, if you would. We initially set out a list of ailments for which medical marijuana could be used, correct?"

Lang: "Yes, Sir."

Harris, D.: "And then we gave the board the authority to recommend additional conditions which would qualify for medical marijuana, correct?"

Lang: "So, the way that process worked was a Medical Cannabis Advisory Board was set up to take petitions in from folks in Illinois that wanted to add a condition. They listened to a lot of testimony, then they made recommendations to the Director of Public Health."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Lang: "And unfortunately, the Director of Public Health has rejected, for whatever reason, all of those requests."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Harris, D.: "Well, and that's really where I'm leading up to. One of the recommendations that the board made was for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, if I'm not mistaken?"

Lang: "That is correct. I think two or three times."

Harris, D.: "Yet, the director said... said no, I don't think that should be on the list. Yet, here we are saying we're putting it by statute rather than by board recommendation... we're putting it by statute on the list?"

Lang: "That is correct."

Harris, D.: "And how do you address the previous... one of the previous... speaker's comments that the Illinois Psychiatric Society has a concern about whether or not it's effective for PTSD?"

Lang: "Well, I guess I would say a couple of things. First of all, there's plenty of people in that are in the mental health field that think this is a good idea. You can pick out a couple that don't. Secondly, despite the fact that some would say that this is not a good thing, I didn't hear any testimony that it's going to hurt anybody either. So, shouldn't we error on the side of helping people who want a product that can't hurt them? There's no evidence and there was no evidence, either of the two full hearings they had at the Medical Mariju... Medical Cannabis Advisory Board, that there was any negativity to the use of medical cannabis, not just for PTSD, but for a wide array of recommended conditions. So, there was zero evidence on the record at that board who had two several-hour hearings on many different proposed conditions. Zero evidence that cannabis hurt anybody at anytime."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Harris, D.: "Well, and I hear you. I will say that going to this letter, that was written by the Illinois Psychiatric Society, the board may want to look at whether or not medical marijuana does help or potentially worsen as they intimate here in the letter. Well, let me ask you that question then about the board. You're replacing... or this legislation establishes a new board, correct?"

Lang: "The answer is yes."

Harris, D.: "And is it... and why? What was wrong with the old one that we have put up a new one?"

Lang: "I'll just be honest with you, Representative. In the negotiations on this legislation, it was the Governor's opinion that this board should be reconstituted. And so, in the process of negotiation, in the process of compromise I agreed to make this change. And I should tell you this 'cause this is important. I have followed the work of that board and they've done a stellar job. They listened to a lot of testimony; they read a lot of documents. Three in particular who I've become friendly with: gentleman named Jim Champion who has MS, he's a war veteran. You met him down here."

Harris, D.: "We know Jim Champion."

Lang: "He's on that board. Michael Fine is on that board. And the chairman of that board has been Dr. Leslie Mendoza Temple. Before I made my final agreement to move this Bill in this way, I called each of them. And I told them what the proposal was and each of them said to me, we think this board does good work. And I said, yes, in fact you've moved the ball forward in great measure. But each of them said if what we have to do to lengthen and strengthen the program and make it

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

better for patients and for licensees and for doctors and everyone in the pipeline, is what... if what we have to do is agree to reconstitute this board, then count us in."

- Harris, D.: "Okay. And tell me then, and I'm looking at the language and I see how the board is... would be constituted. Are there more members, less members, different fields, do you know generally what the difference is?"
- Lang: "I don't... I think it's more members and a wider array of maybe doctors that are on this panel. Certainly, the director of Public Health will have a greater level of input as to how this board works. And I'm not certain what the results will be. I'm not certain they'll be any different than they've been though. So whether the board is the way it is today or whether the board is the way it will be under this Bill, it appears unlikely the Director is going to be approving any conditions. We'll have to do them statutorily."
- Harris, D.: "Thank... thank you for the directness of your answers. While I do have a concern about the PTSD issue, it is somewhat unsettled. There are other good parts of the Bill which I think outweigh what might be a question. And I intend to vote 'yes' and hope my colleagues will do the same."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Fortner: "I want to address some of the questions about the changed doctor's role in your Bill. As we know, the Federal Government has continued to leave marijuana as a Schedule 1 substance even though there have been petitions and other requests to move it to Schedule 2 including requests by the

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

American Medical Association that it ought to be a Schedule 2 substance. Isn't that correct?"

Lang: "That is correct, Sir."

Fortner: "And one of the things that because it is still Schedule 1 and not Schedule 2, there aren't the kind of clinical studies, FDA approvals, that might make some doctors uncomfortable as to whether or not they should recommend. And I can imagine that some doctors would be uncomfortable if placed in the role of having to make a specific recommendation on something that they don't have any guidance from the FDA on. Is... could you..."

Lang: "That's an excellent point, Representative. And because of the Federal Government's attitude toward cannabis, there has been limited research done that doctors can look to to decide how they feel about it. And because of that, many doctors will not sign the recommendation form and because of that hundreds of potential patients, maybe thousands of potential patients who could be helped by this product, under the current law have no opportunity to get that product. This Bill will allow them to do that."

Fortner: "And I agree. In fact, I would go a step further. You might even have some patients in a position torn about staying with their doctor that knows their condition or trying to find some other doctor who doesn't have the same reticence to deal with the recommendation. And your language here clarifies that and puts the doctor in the role where they're going to become... will say, I treat this patient. I know they have this condition and I will certify that."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Lang: "And it... and it puts the doctors in a position where they know their patient's not going to go out and buy this on the illegal market. And with patients now being subjected to the prescription monitoring program, under this Bill, they'll be able to see whatever interactions there are between cannabis and anything else the patient may be taking."

Fortner: "I appreciate that. And I think this is a great clarification improvement to the process. I'll be supporting your Bill."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Bellock."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. Representative, I can't even see where you are. Oh. I just wanted to ask. I'm not clear on the Amendment what and I... it may have been asked before, but it's been so noisy, about the role of the physician now. Has that role been changed that it will now allow Public Health to give referrals for this or is that in a different Amendment?"

Lang: "Well, you might be confusing this Amendment with a different Amendment, Representative. Under this Bill, rather than the plan in the current law where a doctor would have to formally recommend cannabis, this Bill would say that a patient merely gets a... a piece of paper from a doctor where the doctor would verify that a patient has a qualifying condition."

Bellock: "And why is that? Why did you feel that that needed to be changed?"

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Lang: "Well, for reasons I've given previously and I know it's noisy..."

Bellock: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear."

Lang: "That's all right. I know it's noisy in here. There are a couple. First, a lot of doctors won't do the recommending because of the Federal Government's..."

Bellock: "Okay."

Lang: "...attitude toward cannabis. Second, a lot of doctors just don't want to deal with what they feel might be a liability issue, making a recommendation for a product. And third, I worked together with the Illinois State Medical Society in crafting this language."

Bellock: "And so, does this Bill change the... the Advisory Board and their role?"

Lang: "Yes. Under the current law, the Advisory Board which was appointed by the Governor... some by Governor Quinn, some by Governor Rauner... they were to take petitions from those who have other medical conditions that are not listed in the statute, take evidence and testimony, make recommendations to the Director of Public Health, who would either accept or reject them. And he's rejected like 20 or 22 of them to date and not accepted any. Under the new proposal in Senate Bill 10, there would be a different board created that would be more under the auspices of the Director of Public Health, so that he personally would have a hand in the reviewing of those applications, the reviewing of those petitions. And it would still be up to him to decide what to do, but that board would handle these in a slightly different way."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Bellock: "So, then the role of Public Health is going to be in charge of that Advisory Board?"

Lang: "Yeah. I do want to add that the Public Health has already been in charge of the Advisory Board, but under the current law, the Advisory Board works independently of the director and then the director accepts or rejects a recommended condition. Under this Bill, the director will be more involved on the frontend and help shape what the board is doing as it goes through its process."

Bellock: "Thank you for answering the questions."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I was not here when this program was started, but what I did is I came into a district that has two cannabis cultivation centers located in it. So, I've become extremely aware of this program and what it's doing for the citizens of the State of Illinois. And a little bit was mentioned earlier about the financial impacts of what these facilities have meant to our state. And in my district, in a community like Delavan where a facility has been... has been started and has been built from ground up, a \$20 million facility that is now employing... well, now employing about 30 people because they've already laid off 40 people because of the questions surrounding the future of this program... it's become a vitally important part of the economy. We have a lot of... a lot of downstate areas to be honest with you. And when I talk to people from Farm Bureaus who are interested in learning more about cannabis and these production facilities... these cultivation centers... and when I go to a groundbreaking of the facility in Lincoln and when I

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

see a bunch of ... I'll quote my friend from the other side of the aisle... a bunch of old white guys standing around supporting this, breaking the ground, conservative gentlemen and women from my district, I understand that there's been a change in thinking in this state about this. According to the Simon Public Policy Institute, 82 percent of Illinoisans support Medical Marijuana Program, 75 percent of Republicans support the Medical Marijuana Program. It's got great support around the state. And it's... it is... in my district it's helping to create jobs in a small, small community at a time when it is certainly needed. Something was mentioned earlier about the number of... the number of medical cards that have been given out already, somewhere just a little bit north of 6 thousand. And in my discussions with the ... with the people who run these facilities, when they put their proformas together, they based it off the numbers that the state had given them, that the state had developed as to how many people who would be in the program right now. Upwards of 100 thousand people they projected. Those were the numbers that the state gave the people who are putting these facilities together. And right now, we have 6 thousand people in this program. We haven't done our job from the state side to allow a new business to take off. But the real reason I support this legislation... I support this program... is what it does for the patients and what it can potentially do for the patients that use this medicine. And let me just give you a story about someone who's already benefited from this program right here in Springfield, who's used the dispensary in Springfield. A woman named Donna was the second person to visit this facility

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

when it opened in February. She had MS for over 20 years. She could barely walk and the staff had to help her fill out her patient intake form because she could not hold a pen due to the pain. After the intake process, she consulted with a patient care technician for almost an hour describing her situation and learning about medical cannabis 'cause she had never used it before and was hopeful this would provide the pain relief that so many other medications had not provided over the years. Donna purchased her product and returned home. A few weeks later she came back to purchase more. She walked through the door on her own, filled out her own information on her own and was able to open the doors on her own. After a week of medical cannabis use, Donna was able to do many of the things she had not been able to do in over 15 years. The most amazing thing was that she was able to get on a train, go to Chicago and see her parents without any assistance. Something that she had not been able to do in those... over 15 years again. When the staff saw her in the waiting room, she broke down in tears of joy because the medication helped her get back her mobility and parts of her life that had been missing for far too long. That's why we're doing this program for stories like that to help the citizens of Illinois with diseases that impact them. I would urge an 'aye' vote. I would urge an 'aye' vote from my Republican colleagues on this side as well and from the Democrats. This is a good, good program. Thank you to Leader Lang for your leadership on this. Thank you to the Republican Leader for his leadership. And thank you to the Governor for his leadership on this as well. I urge an 'aye' vote."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fine."

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

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

"Representative Lang, I want to thank you, sincerely from the bottom of my heart for everything you've done with this program because I have an unscientific study to talk about to tell you how successful this program has been. My husband, who suffers from chronic debilitating pain, was one of the first people to get a medicinal marijuana license. His experience with this license in his dispensary has been overwhelming. Because at first, when we didn't know what it was going to be like, there was still sort of a cloud over the program. You were going somewhere to buy drugs, but that's not the case. You go to your dispensary you are treated with respect. You are met with pharmacists and experts who know exactly how to treat your symptoms for the chronic illness that you suffer from. My family's life has changed tremendously as a result of medicinal marijuana. The reason is my husband, who would have periods where he could hardly move or breathe because of his debilitating pain, would be forced to either take narcotics or suffer. And the result of both was not something your family members want to watch you go through. With medicinal marijuana, he can function. He can get through those times that are so difficult that I could not understand what it would be like to experience this type of pain from an amputation. I am so thrilled right now that in the State of Illinois we are compassionate enough to spread the program because not only has this helped my family and others I've talked to as well, but now we're going to be able

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

to see patients who suffer from terminal illness be able to get their cards in a more speedy fashion so their families don't have to see them suffer. Because as a spouse, as a child, as a friend, the worst thing you could do is watch somebody suffer. So, again, I want to thank Leader Lang. I know Leader Durkin worked with you as well. This is something we could all vote for and be proud of helping the citizens of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers is recognized."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Lang, I want to preface my remarks by saying that I am going to support this Bill. But I just need to remind people of ... and I know this is not about the legalization of marijuana, but I also know that there are some young people who are incarcerated. And it wasn't called medical cannabis or legal marijuana, but they, too, were in pain. They didn't have access to doctors and nobody would ever believe that the marijuana that they were smoking helped them ease the pain or helped them deal with the intractable pain of just living life, being poor, being... being African American, living in the ghetto, having to deal with all the nuance that comes with that. That, too, was a pain for them. And they're locked up and now that they're locked up they still have the pain. So, what I need to know from you, Sir, is if I don't have the money to purchase this medical marijuana and I still need the medicine to help ease the pain, can... can I get it while I'm incarcerated? Because I'm incarcerated for selling what we're selling now, but it wasn't called cannabis. It wasn't called... it was called cannabis, but it was marijuana. It was illegal. And it's still

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

illegal. People are still being locked up. We are still costing people their lives, their livelihoods and their families because they, too, wanted to create a job for themselves. They, too, wanted to provide a home for their families, a roof over their head, again, to help other people who did not have access to health care to deal with the pain because they could not afford to be on prescription drugs or did not have the qualification to get the health care that they need. So, what do we tell these people who are locked up for using illegal marijuana that helps them to ease their intractable pain? And I... I just want to say that one day soon, and I know this is not your Bill and maybe one day you will help me introduce a Bill because see I can't do it by myself because I'm an African-American woman. For some reason, all the Bills that we did 20 years ago, Bills that I tried to eradicate in regards to the crime and the pain that we cause other people. Every time one of us tried to undo what was done, it's not possible for us to do it. So, I'm going to elicit your help in helping me to help eradicate what was and is still illegal for some and legal for others that is profitable for some and was profitable for others and as a result of their profitability all their profits was taken including their life, their liberty and their pursuit of happiness. So, can you please help me some kind of way to articulate to let these people know that help is on the way for them as well? Thank you very much. And at the proper time, I will be voting 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I appreciate the comments both pro and con. I think this is a, for some, a difficult issue. Let me just simply thank you for the consideration of taking a program that's been working well and try to make it work better for patients, for licensees, for caregivers, for doctors, for even the state agencies that have to administer this. This is a good and well-thought-out piece of legislation. I need to again thank the Governor for coming to the table. Leader Durkin for working so hard on this. So many advocates that have called me with ideas. Many people have been involved in this. Certainly the Medical Cannabis Advisory Board, the one that will be disbanded under this Bill, deserves a debt of gratitude for its hard work and for alerting us to the fact that there are many, many conditions out there for which medical cannabis can be helpful. This is a Bill that needs to pass today to go over to the Senate. I appreciate all of your comments and ask for your 'aye' votes."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 10 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 86 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no', 1 voting
 'present', Senate Bill 10, having received the Constitutional
 Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 6084."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Dunkin: standing here to address an issue that some of us are reading regarding some recent statements regarding a lobbyist and allegations towards and a... a lobbyist who's been here for about 10 years. I'm also sitting here befuddled at Members or at least one particular Member assassinating the character of an individual and tying in some sort of queer pro quo scenario. And I think I'd be remiss because I've known this individual, this lobbyist, for over 10 years and since it was said on the record that this person tried to do some things that were unethical to obtain votes. Now, because this has been all on the local political gossip rags and media, I talked with particular individual and asked what's going on and actually saw some of those e-mails. And from my discernment, there was no impropriety, no promises made, no bribes or anything remotely close to my discernment of those e-mails. So, you know, I think when someone is wrong, whether they're a Member, whether they're constituents or whether they're a lobbyists, they should not be aggrieved on the record or have their character assassinated just because a Member can. So, if that was any one of you, I would hope that someone who understands and had a better sense of the facts would give voice here. This is not a bullying pit for Legislators to accuse and assassinate other Members even if they're lobbyists. So, I just want to put that on the record

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

and make sure that Members take heed and be careful what... what it is that we say when we are talking about people who works and enforce us or tries to educate us on various issues. Now, I've never spoken in this vein before about any lobbyist, but right is right and wrong is wrong especially if you don't have the facts, but more importantly if you try to tie in an ethics officer or if you call for a criminal investigation, you'd better be damn sure and clear that you have facts... your facts in order before you try to cast negative aspersions on any person here, be they Member, be they lobbyist or anyone, especially if you say it on the record. So, I just wanted to express that, that particular disposition only because I've known the individual for about 10 years since I've been here longer than that. And so, I'm on the record in saying I looked at some of this... some of the allegations and the talk that's in these... these papers and I think we're better than that. And no one should be held to a standard that puts them, their career, their character and their professionalism in jeopardy or on the spot, especially if you don't have all the facts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you. I'd like to represent... I'd like to thank the Representative who brought up the situation that was dealing on the House for the last week or two. I stand in support of the lobbyist mentioned. I've worked with him for years and he's been nothing but a great man of integrity and

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

certainly above board. So, thank you, Representative, for bringing it up."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Chapa LaVia: "I'd also like to think of my last two colleagues.

I've worked with this young man for a while, at least the last 10 and a half years, and we started off with Bible studies and the integrity of this institute that's here and what we stand for and how we should always be forthright and honest at all time without cost. Now, putting that aside, each and every one of you needs to understand how powerful you are. How powerful you are and how words can be taken in context or out of context. And I'm a great example of that, everybody. And... and I love my brothers over there and I love my sisters. I love everybody here. I work really hard for you and I've learned a lot through the years. And I've had to humble myself, but I think right is right and wrong is wrong. And it's... if you have all the facts, I think what you'll find is this gentleman didn't ... did ... did not do what he's being accused of. And we ought to protect each other 'cause we don't have anybody outside here that understands what we go through here, but your... your words are very powerful and if you say you're going to do something, you need to do something. Bill Black taught us that a long time ago. Your integrity and your words are everything. If... if people can't trust us, then they have really nowhere else to go and who are we and who's going to believe in us if we jeopardize that. So, I want to stand and thank both of my colleagues for standing up. Sometimes

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

it's hard to get on the House Floor and... and make sure that you humble yourself, but in this case, I find no issue and I really do hope that we come to resolve because this is a person's livelihood. Thank you, Speaker and Members."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. Mr. Anthony."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Anthony: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I just simply want to say this.

The person in question has been a friend for me from day one.

I've known him to be a person of character and integrity from the moment that I met him. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Kay: "I'm not going to reiterate many of the comments that have already been made, but one of the things that sometimes happens in this Body and probably shouldn't is that there is a lot of overstatement and innuendo and sometimes just misrepresentations and unfortunately, they're picked up and they're carried and repeated. I think we all know the old story, you know, if you repeat one story three times it becomes 10 different versions and then 20 different versions and then 30 different versions and pretty soon you have accused somebody wrongly. And I think the people here today that have previously spoken have been talking about a lobbyist who we all hold in very high esteem, at least I do. He's a credible man. He does a good job. His integrity is above and beyond repute and I think to be attacked in the manner that he has really is to me beyond or below what we should be doing

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

here in this Body. I'm not sure about statements on the floor, if it was made on the floor. I guess that needs to be corrected. But I think... above and beyond that I think we need to hold this gentleman in high esteem for what he's done for us because he's always been a fair bargainer with me. He's come to me never asking for anything, but providing information and he's always come back to me with the information I've asked for. He'd never ask for anything. He'd never done anything wrong. He'd never been in an in... an illegal bargainer. And I hear all of these things and it So, I'm going to join with the other disturbs me. Representatives and say, let's stop this. And if it was said on the floor, let's get that statement corrected because he's a good man. His living's at stake. And I don't think anyone here wants to have something negative happen because of or statement or innuendo or misrepresentation of fact. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I really didn't think we were ever going to be talking about this, at least this Session, but I think in light of all the comments that have been made, regardless of what the facts are, I think everybody needs to take a look at how we got to this point and the culture underlying this Bill and the companies that were pushing this legislation. And it started back in November when there was going to be an opinion from the Attorney General and then there was some... some rumors of no one wanted the opinion from the Attorney General about what was underlying this Bill. Is this conduct legal or is it not? So,

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

it really got started off back last year on a bad footing with some rumors and innuendo about what was going on. So, it was me who decided, you know what, we should get this opinion and on December 9 of 2015, I decided to ask the Attorney General, hey, what is this conduct? Is it legal; is it illegal? And we finally got the opinion. Who knew that it would spiral into what it spiraled into? We have the comments that were made on the floor... made in committee. It's unclear what the truth is, what actually happened, what the e-mails were partly because the e-mails haven't been released, but partly because the organization that hired this lobbyist has not come forward with any of the facts. There were tweets made by... his name was Jeremy Kudon... he's a lobbyist, a head lobbyist or a lawyer in New York. He made a press statement about what happened. But I saw his name and so, I e-mailed ... I actually called him. I called him last Friday because I wanted to know the facts. I wanted to know what was going on and I said here's my personal cellphone number, please call me so that we can get to the bottom of this. I didn't hear back from him, so Friday night I e-mailed him and I said again, I am available all weekend. I invite you to come to our hearing. We're going to have a hearing on Sunday. Let's hear what happened. I didn't hear back from him. And so, the rumors continued. Now, last night after everything was settled I finally heard back. He said he was busy with family. It may be true; it may be not. I don't know. What I know is this could have been put to rest if the company that was pursuing this culture of 'win at all costs' had just taken a step back and listened to some of the comments, listened to

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

what was going on. It wasn't all about Rivers versus daily fantasy. There's some real issues with that legislation, but if you came, we're going to win... kind of the way they came into the state, we're going to win and no one's going to stop us. I hope, if nothing else, the pause that we're taking will make people realize that just because someone doesn't like a Bill and someone makes some legitimate comments about a Bill that's going to let minors engage in gambling that maybe those are real and it's not some lobbyist pushing up on the other side. It's a legitimate concern for our kids in this state. And instead of making statements and making lobbyists think they have to win at all costs and making Legislators believe they have to win at all costs, we can start looking at the facts and looking at what happened because the facts got totally lost in this debate and there were some real good points on both sides. And it was the culture of the companies pushing the legislation that caused this situation to happen and I hope we all just remember that as this goes forward. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Supplemental Calendar #2, under Total Vetoes, appears Senate Bill 777. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is the measure that was adopted by us last year at the behest of the City of Chicago and the police and fire pensioners in the City of Chicago and the active workers as well. It does three things. It increases slightly the minimum annuity for firefighters and police people. It guarantees funding to the pension system and it smooths out the ramp so that the Chicago taxpayers are not hit with an additional \$300 million property

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

tax bill this year. It sets a schedule for paying the pension funds that is similar to the police and fire downstate ramp that we ourselves have approved. I would appreciate your support for this Veto override. I don't think it's fair to the taxpayers of Chicago to say we're going to double your property tax bill this year. I think that Senate Bill 777 is a responsible approach to funding pension problems. And I would be happy to answer your questions and I need your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. Will the Majority Leader yield for some questions?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sandack: "Representative, would you refresh the recollection of the collective Body because I think this is an older Bill? When did this House pass SB777?"

Currie: "Oh, sorry. May 30, 2015."

Sandack: "And then, when did the Senate pick up the Bill and pass it?"

Currie: "They had passed it before we did. It is a Senate Bill."

Sandack: "And so, why... why did it take so long to get to the Governor?"

Currie: "Life's like that. I'm sometimes slow myself,

Representative."

Sandack: "Well, I'm not going to take the bait on that, Madam and I would instead let's confine our comments to the process itself. Why did it take so long to get to the Governor?"

Currie: "It was not in my control. And I cannot answer the question."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Sandack: "Well, I think it wasn't in your control, but I think you can..."

Currie: "No. It was in..."

Sandack: "...answer the question."

Currie: "It went back to the Senate for Concurrence. It's a Senate Bill. It was in control of the Senate."

Sandack: "Right. The Senate Sponsor was whom?"

Currie: "I believe it says Senator Cullerton. It would be the Senate President."

Sandack: "President... Senate President Cullerton. Because I remember when the Bill passed and I remember when we passed it and I remember at least reading some public comments about why it was held. And so, it's been a while since this Bill had been debated. Did you look at the Governor's Veto Message?"

Currie: "I did."

Sandack: "Okay. And... and what is your impre... impression of why the Governor vetoed the Bill?"

Currie: "You know, I could not make it out. This Governor who says we ought to have property tax freezes, that we ought not to be burdening the people of the State of Illinois with higher property taxes, with the stroke of his pen he has said to me and the other people who live in the City of Chicago, okay, you're now responsible for double... double the property tax payment for these pension funds this year than you were last. I think it's an outrage."

Sandack: "Well..."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Currie: "I think it's an outrage also for the Governor to say that what's good for downstate fire and police is not good enough for the City of Chicago."

Sandack: "Well, we can talk about what's good for other sections of the... of the state versus CPS. We've had a... or City of Chicago, excuse me... we've had so many Bills where disparate treatment, favoritism and/or carveouts for Chicago has occurred in this Body. I wish we would make a collective decision going forward to try and be and engage in some legislative parity. But I would direct your attention to a portion of the Governor's Message that he says, if this Bill continues the irresponsible practice of deferring funding decisions necessary to ensure pension fund solvency well into the future, the Bill effectively makes Chicago taxpayers borrow from the pension funds at an additional cost of 18.6 billion. Now, I'm all for property tax relief and for property tax parity, but the fact of the matter is, Chicago hasn't taken care of their own with respect to pensions, city, fire and police, for some time. When was the last time there was a referendum on any property tax initiative with the City of Chicago, Majority Leader?"

Currie: "Chicago just increased its property taxes..."

Sandack: "Yes, it did."

Currie: "...really guite significantly."

Sandack: "I asked about a referendum for the taxpayers though."

Currie: "And... and this... remember, this is four times the State of Illinois decided to slow the ramp for downstate police and fire... four times... and Chicago should be able to have that same courtesy. The people of Chicago are taking care of the

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

people of Chicago under the provisions of this Bill. I think we ought to let them do it."

Sandack: "The Governor's Message also goes on to say, it's a game politicians like to play with taxpayer dollars by delaying payments today and forcing future elected officials to deal with pension funding issues tomorrow. As all know by now, that practice has led..."

Currie: "Wait..."

Sandack: "...to our current pension woes across the state and local pension systems."

Currie: "Yeah. First of all, the Governor says the Chicago police retirees are rightfully opposed to the Bill. He's wrong. This... the Bill has the support of the Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 7 and Chicago Firefighters Local 2 and retirees throughout the city because it protects the taxpayers from hundreds of millions of dollars in additional taxes. And it guarantees that their pensions will be safe. So, I find it amazing that the Governor..."

Sandack: "What about the Chica... retired Chicago police?"

Currie: "...so misunderstands reality that he gives inaccurate information in his Veto Message. I also would point out that the current pension plan from the Governor for state pensions would do the same kind of smoothing that is the subject of Senate Bill 777. So, it's sauce for the goose; sauce for the gander. Good for us, but not good for the people of the City of Chicago? Something's wrong with this picture."

Sandack: "Madam, what do the Retired Chicago Police Associations think of this Bill?"

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Currie: "I don't believe I have a slip from them, a witness slip, but my understanding is that as the active members are for this so were their retirees."

Sandack: "Well, that would be incorrect. And they've been on the record, I believe, and I think they're in the *Sun Times* today urging their members..."

Currie: "Well, they did not..."

Sandack: "Excuse me."

Currie: "...file a witness slip..."

Sandack: "Okay."

Currie: "...on this Bill."

Sandack: "All right. Well, I think they're on record in a pretty reputable newspaper urging the Governor's Veto and supporting... making sure it's not overridden. Ma'am, one other part of the... the numbers, actuarial estimates, that between now and 2055 when the law would require these funds to achieve 90 percent funded ratio, total contributions to the policemen's annuity and benefit fund of Chicago would increase by approximately 13 billion, an increase of 47.4 percent over contributions. Isn't that correct?"

Currie: "Chicago is never on the kind of ARC that we have given ourselves and our local governments the opportunity to deal with, you know, our state pensions or downstate police and fire. What this measure did was finally to establish a ramp that make sense for the taxpayers of Chicago and for the recipients of benefits under both the police and fire funds. Having a multiplier instead is very difficult for the taxpayers of the City of Chicago. A ramp makes sense for the state. It makes sense for downstate police and fire and it

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

makes sense for the police and fire systems in Chicago as well."

Sandack: "Chicago's a Home Rule unit of government, isn't that
 right?"

Currie: "It is."

Sandack: "That's what I thought. Thank you. To... to the... the Veto Motion override. Much has been made of the various pension pressures of a variety of units of government not including... including, but not limited to, the City of Chicago with respect to police and fire pensions. There are challenges, no doubt. Just like we have challenges that we're still struggling with, with respect to the five state pension systems. So, too, are other local units of government with their police and fire and to a lesser extent, IMRF, but most local units of government undertake a little bit of selfhelp. Most local units of government go to their taxpayers and/or just to responsible leaders and undertake the tough decisions necessary to control their own environment to the best of their ability, at least. There have been no genuine efforts by the City of Chicago to maintain let alone try and control their pension expenses and instead, they come here, point their finger at us and give us another Bill that invariably does a little bit to help them, but continues the past practices of pushing the matter down the line for future generations to come. It's a bad Bill. It's a good Veto. I suggest we do not override and deny this Motion. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

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

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Morrison: "Leader Currie, we did debate this Bill extensively last year, but I would just like to continue with Representative Sandack's comments. If an individual decides to pay less than the minimum payment, if that was allowed, if the credit card companies would allow an individual to pay less than a minimum payment, what would be the overall impact on the debt that an individual would have to pay?"

Currie: "If you're saying that there would be interest charges, of course, the answer's yes."

Morrison: "Okay. And..."

Currie: "And that's what we do with our systems. We have a... we have a lengthy ramp for our state systems. Downstate communities have a lengthy 40-year ramp for their police and their fire. And all of those carry costs, but the costs of immediate and full funding are so significant that I don't know a single state in the nation that does it any differently."

Morrison: "Well, there is... there is a significant cost and we all know that... that individuals in public office like to put off hard decisions. And you know, when the... in 2010 the aldermen in Chicago had the ability to address this and they decided to delay things, didn't they?"

Currie: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear the question."

Morrison: "I'm... back in 2010 when we had major pension legislation pass, we knew that in 2015 there would be a significant payment to make. Why... why didn't the... why didn't the State of Illinois or the City of Chicago make the necessary cham...

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- changes between 2010 to 2015 knowing that this payment would have to be made?"
- Currie: "Unfortunately, the payment that was required by that 2010 law was staggering and that is why the city worked with the police and fire in order to come up with the compromise that is reflected in the language of Senate Bill 777. This language reflects the will of the police, fire and for the record, the Police Retired Officers Association as well and of the City of Chicago and I would venture to urge of city taxpayers."
- Morrison: "Well, no doubt, it is a sizable payment, but don't you think that's because it was a sizable problem that had been building and building and building for decades? By the way, what... what is... what are the funds... what is the funding level of those funds right now, police and fire?"
- Currie: "The police is about 26 percent; fire is about 23 percent."
- Morrison: "And does this legislation include a benefit increase?"
- Currie: "It does. An increase in the minimum annuity. I can tell you what it is. It is 125 percent of federal poverty. Yeah, it's basically a little more than a thousand dollars."

Morrison: "And..."

- Currie: "It's 12... it's 12, 6... 600 now and it would be able to go up 2 thousand, 14,712. That's 2015 figures."
- Morrison: "Have... have we passed any other benefit increases out of this chamber this spring?"
- Currie: "Yeah, we have... in fact, I would think for something like this it's a good idea to show that we are being responsive to

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

the workers and making sure that there is something good for them to take home."

Morrison: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. We know that... that it's not just the State of Illinois, but it's our local units of government that are facing enormous pressures because of their public sector pensions. It's not just the state. It's the counties; it's the municipalities. What I'm hearing from my district: 1) the municipalities that I serve, and I would suspect that many of you also serve, are crying out for relief for their pensions. And so, I'm asking why... why are we only doing this for the City of Chicago? It's... it's not a good solution for Chicago, but it's frustrating when those of us recognize a problem statewide; we introduce legislation and we don't get it heard. But nevertheless, this ... this would exacerbate the problem. As our newspapers have reported, as other civically minded organizations have analyzed, City of Chicago finances, kicking the can down the road, whatever other kind of metaphor you want to use, it never works out. It delays the pain. It makes things more expensive over time. And I would ask the Body to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, what is the impact on the General Revenue Funds of this Bill?"

Currie: "Zero."

Harris, D.: "What is the impact on the unfunded liability of the five state pension systems of this Bill?"

Currie: "Zero."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Harris, D.: "When we passed the current ramp that we're on for our five state systems, we did that when? In 1995, I believe?" Currie: "That sounds right."

Harris, D.: "And we gave ourselves, I believe, 50 years... 5-0 years."

Currie: "And then I think we took a few extra along the path."

Harris, D.: "Well, we didn't adhere to the payments, but we gave ourselves 50 years to get to 90 percent, correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "When was the requirement that these Chicago pension funds get to 90 percent? When was that put in?"

Currie: "I believe in 2010."

Harris, D.: "And we only gave them 25 years, correct?"

Currie: "That's right."

Harris, D.: "In other words to 2040."

Currie: "That's right."

Harris, D.: "So, we're asking here... what you're... what this Bill does is asks for an additional 15 years to get to 90 percent, correct?"

Currie: "That is correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can address the Bill for a few moments and please be patient with me. You know, my son graduated from Northwestern and he was living in Evanston. My son is now a young professional and he said, as a young professional, there's only one place I want to live and that's Chicago. He didn't move to Rockford; he didn't move to Naperville, even though those are fine, outstanding municipalities. He moved to Chicago. What about corporate relocations or expansions? You know, last year Site

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Selection magazine named Chicago the top metro area for corporate relocations and expansions for the second year in a row. Now, those corporations didn't move to Marion; they didn't move to Carbondale; they didn't move to Springfield, even though those are all fine municipalities. They moved to Chicago. The young professionals, the corporations, they moved to the Windy City in what Site Selection magazine said was the combination of Chicago's logistical assets, available intellectual capital and diverse business sectors coupled with a thriving innovation and startup culture make the city a dynamic choice for investors and site selectors. Now, you know, every state has these divisions: upstate, downstate, suburbs. You know, the folks in upstate New York think that those folks down in the city, they get everything and there's this division between upstate and downstate. There's a division between central Pennsylvania and those two big cities of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. And here, in our state, we've got that downstate suburban city tension and we always say, well, the City of Chicago gets so much. unfortunately, oftentimes it becomes a partisan issue, simply Republicans versus Democrats. Now, let me give you an example that I've been here too long. Way back when, probably 150 years ago, we voted on the local school council for the City of Chicago. And for some reason, all of the Republicans said they were going to vote against the local school council except for three. Those three individuals were Representative Roger McAuliffe, the father of the current Representative; Representative Lolita Didrikson, who went on to become the State Comptroller; and me. I mean, it seemed to me that local

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

control was a good idea. Now, Chicago has its problems just like every major city. Certainly the finances are a big part of Chicago's problems and some of those financial problems can be traced to actions of the former mayor combined with actions of the previous General Assemblies. So, Chicago is in a... is in a terrible financial situation. It issues long-term bonds and uses too much of those proceeds to address shortterm issues. It has used a tactic known as scoop and toss, debt restructuring that hides the true cost of borrowing money. But to his credit, Mayor Emanuel has said that he intends to eliminate that practice and to his credit the mayor has initiated a \$500 million tax increase to pay the pensions of the city police and fire. Think about that. A half a billion dollars to do nothing except pay for pensions, not a penny for public works, not a penny for infrastructure improvement. You know what, that's a tough thing to do and I give him credit for taking that step. Like the state, the city has tried to make pension changes, but the Supreme Court has put them, as it has us, really in handcuffs. So, you know what, the city is down right now. It's taken its lumps. All right. I don't like to kick someone when they're down. I recognize that the idea of stretching out these payments is not good public policy. It isn't, but it's not an uncommon practice. It's done with debt restructuring all the time for bond holders and it's... it's a reasonable action to take. You heard the Minor... Majority Leader answer the question there's no impact on state General Revenue Funds. There's no impact on the unfunded liability of the state's five systems. There's no impact on the Turnaround Agenda. This legislation does not

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

impact any of those areas that we have struggled with and been at such partisan divide about over the past many months and over the past year. It's tough to vote against one's Governor and I don't like doing it, but I think if you disagree as I do with the Governor... I understand where he's coming from, but I respectfully disagree with his position on this Bill. I believe it deserves a 'yes' vote. And I hope you'll support the Motion to override his Veto."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Until 2010, we had this thing... we, as the Legislature, had the City of Chicago on a multiplier payment for the police and fire pension systems. It was completely unsustainable. We have other... the municipal and laborers, as we all know, are in... city pension funds are ... are still under that system and are woefully underfunded and headed in the absolutely the wrong direction. So, in 2010, we sought to change that and put them on an ARC, an actuarially required contribution. And we set up a ramp to get there. But we set up the ramp because we recognized that there needs to be a balance between what the city could afford and what was good actuarial practice. Well, here we are in 2016 and we still have to achieve that balance. Is what is it that the city can afford versus what is good actuarial practice. We're not abandoning that here. We are simply saying it's not affordable right now given all the other challenges that the city is facing, so we have to continue to balance that. We do that all the time here. We've done it for ourselves. We set up a ramp when... when we... a smoothing process so that if actuary... if investment returns go down

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

dramatically, we have five years to make that up. The Governor himself, in the working groups, has proposed two such items. One is he's proposed a... a smoothing for changes in actuarial asumb... assumptions. Well, what is that if it's not a ramp? So, again, the Governor has proposed that. The second thing he's done is he's wanted to change the actuarial calculation for the pension payments from looking at what they're... this is for Tier II... looking at what is the payroll that's demanded in... that's suggested in the legislation itself versus total payroll that has nothing to do with an actuarial assumption. All that is designed to do is to change the payment and thereby, put us on a little bit different ramp. So, we're doing it ... we're suggest ... having these things under discussion for our own pension systems. I don't know why it's such an anathema for ... for the city to do this. So, again, I think this is... this is... we are always trying to balance what is affordable with what is good actuarial science. And the consequences of not doing something like this are the ... would result in and I certainly don't know the city's finances, but I could imagine that what it would do would... it would impact the number of police and fire that they can have out working on the street. Now, I don't think any of us here want to be responsible for a dramatically reduced headcount for police and fire and the consequences of that. So, I think it behooves us all to say... to take a step back and disengage from the partisan politics around this and say, what is right for the City of Chicago and how can we help them get on a... on a program that will get them where they need to go, but is still affordable given other... all the other essential state

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

services that they have to provide. A 'yes' vote is the only way to go here."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McSweeney: "Leader Currie, are you aware of any other major pension systems that have a 25-year amortization schedule?" Currie: "I am not."

McSweeney: "One of the things that I want to make sure that I'm perfectly clear on is that this is going to result in about \$247 million of increased cost for the City of Chicago. Is the only option according to what I have heard is to raise property taxes again?"

Currie: "Yes. And that would be to the tune of about \$300 million." McSweeney: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, what I do know is that since I was appointed since August of 2013, first thing... one of the first Bills I had to vote on was pension reform. I voted on every pension reform. I know some of the unions don't like it, but... 'cause it was unsustainable, but what I'm asking or I'm telling you on the other side of the aisle and I'm asking people to vote 'yes' on this Bill because if you do not vote to override this Bill, you will virtually wipe out every Latino, every minority, every low-income person in my neighborhood. They will be wiped out. Right now, every day in my district is gentrification on steroids. This will push it over the edge. I am against the pension holidays, but I see no other possibility. In order to save any low-

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

income person in the City of Chicago at this moment the only way is for ... to override. Now, some of you have said there is a... that we should let the city do something about this. Well, a couple of things maybe ... I know there's a couple and I need a couple of votes from the other side to allow the city to create a separate levy for the Chicago Public Schools. Hopefully, when that Bill comes up, people from the other side and from this side will vote to allow the city to create their own levy and have the City Council vote on that. So, when that Bill comes up, I hope you remember that you said that the city should do something and I hope you help us. So, I ask for my community, for my low income, my minorities and anyone that is virtually on the edge of losing their home, currently, in the City of Chicago that are on foreclosure or will lose their home that this will definitely... if we do not override this Veto, they will lose their home and become virtually homeless or would be pushed out of the city. So, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, currently, the unfunded liability and the combination of these two systems is about \$11.74 billion. They only have \$4 billion in assets between them. They have \$4 billion in assets between them. And what we're discussing here truthfully is over the next four years not funding them \$800 million. Eight hundred million dollars is 20 percent of the total assets. You're going to underfund them over the next four years \$800 million. Now, any... any finance major knows that if you don't have that money put in to grow through investments, you're going to

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

lose money every day. And that's exactly what this Bill does. This is not... this Bill is not pro police and fire. This is actually against police and fire because you're taking away money that they deserve to have in their pension system. That's what you're doing here by \$800 million. So, it... it's interesting. I wish that I could actually question Representative Nekritz a little bit, but she mentioned about what the working group's doing on pensions and how this, you know, modifying the ramps on state pensions is part of the discussion. Well, I'd like to know what else is part of the discussion because if Chicago only fixes police and fire without may... taking into account all their other pension systems whose total unfunded liability approaches billion, then they're doing a disservice to the taxpayers by looking at it in isolation rather than as a complete pa... project that they have to deal with. That's the problem here. You cannot look at any of these funds in isolation because it's the same taxpayers that are going to pay for all four of the funds plus the CPS. So, this is nothing more truthfully than kicking the can down the road. And the truth is Chicago is basically... they're coming here again with their hand out. They're expecting the General Assembly to make a difficult decision for them, but they have the ability to clean up their own mess. As a Home Rule unit of government, they have the power and the authority to make the payment. They just don't want to. They want to tell their taxpayers, well, the General Assembly, you know, forced us into this type of ramp or this type of a decision. You know what, you guys, they can handle it themselves. Let them handle it themselves. All we're doing

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

here is kicking the can down the road and increasing benefits. And we know exactly where that has gotten us in our state pensions. Voting 'no' is the more responsible vote today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill. Franks: I've been listening to the debate and this is not an ideal Bill. I think we can all agree on that. And in a perfect world this wouldn't be necessary, but what this Bill does is it guarantees full payment into these pension obligations. And one... one thing I haven't really heard during debate is let's not forget that as a state, we are in a much worse position on our pension funding. So, let's not be hypocrites. Because, you know, we may need to do something similar and we may be discussing a different ramp for us. It's incredible to me about how silent we've been on the whole pension issue in this state since the Supreme Court ruled against Senate Bill 1 and we haven't done anything to fix our own. It's getting worse every day. And it may be that part of the solution that we're going to need here in the state is to do something similar as what Chicago needs to do. So, I... I would suggest that you not beat your chest and say terrible things because you might be asked to make a very similar vote for the citizens of the State of Illinois, if we're ever going to fund our pension systems like we're required to. It doesn't make me happy to have to do a vote like this, but it's the only responsible thing to do. And what we cannot allow is to allow our political dysfunction and petty partisan politics get in the way and to harm real people who need our help because soon we're going to be asking the Legislators who

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

live in Chicago to do a very similar Bill when we ask for their help for the pensions that we haven't paid. So, folks, what I respectfully suggest is that we understand that we're all are in this together. And the problems that we've created in this state don't stop at the border of Chicago. We've screwed this state up pretty bad, so we do have an obligation to help people so that we don't punish our sys... so we do not punish our citizens more. The only responsible vote is an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "A couple quick questions, Leader. I want to clarify.

I think I heard this earlier. There is a benefit increase in this Bill. Is that correct?"

Currie: "There is the minimum annuity would go up to 125 percent of poverty. In 19... in 2015 numbers, it would have amounted to enough... about a \$2 thousand a year increase in the minimum annuity."

Batinick: "Okay. And that is covered in the new ramp that..."

Currie: "Yes."

Batinick: "...our analysis has?"

Currie: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. What about the increase in benefit... the increase COLA that we passed... I don't know... the last 48 hours? My mind's kind of blurry on whether we passed it yesterday or a couple days ago. We increased the COLA for the Chicago fire pensions. Is that involved... is that in these numbers?"

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- Currie: "The firefighter's pay into that COLA, so it's not going to mean added cost in the long-term to the system."
- Batinick: "Okay. I'm being told that that's so... I'm being told that it's an added cost to that."
- Currie: "It is, but the fair share is being paid by the employees.

 That's right. I'm sorry. That's what I meant to say."
- Batinick: "Okay. The fair share, but there's still in Chicago sharing... Okay, I'm just going to go straight to the Bill. I mean, we can argue about whether... whether we need to restructure things, but twice this weekend we're increasing benefits in a pension system that is somewhere around 25 percent funded. I don't know. I just think it's absurd. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, I've been listening to debate and I want to speak to my... my friends on the other side of the aisle. You know, I hear sort of a back and forth that really doesn't jive. Right? I mean, on the one hand we talk about... I was reading the Governor's statement on this and it says continues the irresponsible practice of deferring funding decisions well into the future. Which means don't pay for it in the future when it's more expensive, when you can pay for it when it's cheaper today, fiscally responsible. Which is a great concept, if we could afford it. Wouldn't it be great if we could just top off all the pension funds today? Maybe it's something we would do here at the state as well, but yet, we only make the minimum actuarial required pension payment. We don't go above and beyond that. We could lower our pension ramp by putting more money in, but

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

we have pressures here in the State of Illinois, too. So, does the City of Chicago and yet, from your side of the aisle, I constantly hear about this... this property tax freeze that you want to impose on every municipal... municipality in the state. Well, how can it be both ways? You can't have any relief, but we're going to freeze your property taxes. I will tell you in my village ... in the Village of Norridge where I lived before I lived in Chicago... we faced a very similar pension crisis. And we did, much what the mayor did here, we raised property taxes to account for. Had you imposed an arbitrary real estate tax freeze upon us, we may have bankrupted our system. This is a decision of local control. And what we're asking you for, the people in the Republican Caucus, is to let our municipality sort out its own problems. We... these are ... these are our issues and we're asking you to give us that room. This mayor has made some very courageous decisions. He has raised property taxes to deal with this, but there's only so far you can go and you know it, otherwise you wouldn't be proposing a property tax freeze. This is giving us the ability to sort out our own problems on our own time. And as you all know, you're all champions of local control. Give us the control. If they don't sort it out, there's a process for that. There are elections. Our leaders will be held to the same standard. They've shown the courage to address this problem. Give them the tools to do it. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to request a verification, should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes."
- Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Mr. Sosnowski."
 Sosnowski: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Sosnowski: "I don't know the answer to this. I was wondering if you could help. I know we discussed on the floor the pension system is funded at about 25 percent. Do you know what the police and fire for the downstate pension on average is funded at?"
- Currie: "Actually, a good deal higher, 56 percent, we believe. I don't have that number in my folder, but that's what staff tells me."
- Sosnowski: "Okay. And then, for the five pension systems within the State of Illinois. Representative Franks mentioned this and he said it was worse than the police and fire in Chicago. I don't think that's accurate. Do you know what our unfunded liability is that the state..."
- Currie: "I know it varies. My recollection is the General Assembly system is perhaps the least well-funded. I... but I don't... I don't have the numbers. I... staff tells me that the five state systems averaged is at about 42 percent."
- Sosnowski: "Okay. Yeah. I just... I thought those numbers were...

 were fairly accurate that we were better off not good, but we

 were better off..."

Currie: "Right."

Sosnowski: "...than the police and fire at the City of Chicago. One other question for the Sponsor. In regards to the property

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

tax increase that was passed at the City of Chicago, was there debate and discussion about this amount when they passed that increase to help police and fire pension payment?"

Currie: "You know, I don't know if this Bill was mentioned during that debate. I'm not close to the City Council, so I can't answer the question."

Sosnowski: "Do you know what..."

Currie: "I know that was a painful vote."

Sosnowski: "Sure. And it... and I believe it was in the area of 550 million-plus. I'm just curious if they knew that there is, you know, this unfunded amount that they were going to be obligated for, why didn't they ask for a little bit more? I'm just wondering if there was any debate or any conversation with the mayor on that?"

Currie: "My guess is they thought they could... that they would do the least... the least that they could manage at that point."

Sosnowski: "Okay. To the Bill. Unfortunately, it sounds like we've got a real dilemma here. And I, you know, generally may be for this type of change, but I don't see anywhere in this Bill anything that we are asking from the City of Chicago in order to help with their unfunded liability. They're not proposing to make any changes, any modifications. They're basically just asking for an expanded ramp. And you know, this is on a system that, you know, obviously is having some struggles. The City of Chicago is having some problems. I would just ask that we hold on this and let's demand that the City of Chicago actually make some adjustments or make some proposals. And then, again, I think we need to get some clarity on why they propose a property tax increase recently,

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

but then still came back to us for even... even more money. It seems like if they were going to have that discussion at the city level, as was mentioned by previous speakers, this is something well within their control to handle, well within their control to legislate. There's really no reason at this point for them to come to us. And if we do... if this Assembly does want to take that up as a conversation point, I think it's only fair that in the conversation, in the discussion, you know, we have a bargain that makes sense in which they are going to be adamant and vigilant about making changes to their own system to improve the overall unfunded liability.

I would please ask the Members to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Earlier, I just Wehrli: heard a colleague say that everyone over on this side is in favor of a property tax freeze. And if one would review my voting record, you would find that I do not favor a property tax freeze for Home Rule units of government. And it is for this purpose alone, I'm sorry to say, Chicago, but you need to raise your taxes. You need to raise your taxes to fund pensions. You need to be able to fund education. When we do a comparative analysis between property tax bills between those in Cook County, Chicago specifically and those in the collars, they are extremely imbalanced. At some point in time, Chicago is going to have to take another painful vote and that is to raise its own taxes. I understand you did it to a tune of 300 million and that was quite painful to some, but pretty soon we're going to ... we may be debating another Bill and that would be HB813, which is a Chicago teacher pension

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

funding Bill. That is truly a profile in courage Bill because, once again, it just asks this General Assembly to do what Chicago elected leaders have failed to do for decades and that is to pay for all the empty, shallow promises that have been made with no intention to ever fund them. At some point in time, you need to take fiscal responsible for your own actions. Chicago, raise your taxes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I found the Gentleman from Naperville's comments interesting as well as the Governor's Veto Message. What's interesting is there seems to be this talk about local resources and certainly, Chicago's already raised property taxes and likely, in some cases, will have to again. But this isn't really about property taxes. This is ultimately a political judgement and it was a political Veto. I hate... you... you've got a Governor who put out a budget that would have cut Chicago's schools by 74 million... by the way, not just Chicago, a whole bunch of other schools like East St. Louis, and Cahokia, and Taylorville and a bunch just in central and southern Illinois. So, for folks who were talking about this being a local issue, what the state does has an effect on locality. You've got a Governor who comes from finance, so I would assume he knows finance, at a hundred million dollars through Chicago bond issue, on purpose, which can effect Chicago's bottom line. This is a patterned practice of attempting to break Chicago to try to pass a Turnaround Agenda. So, don't... don't... let's not talk about it being entirely a local issue. What we do here as a General Assembly matters. It matters to Chicago; it

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

matters around the state. Let's send a message that we're not going to allow this Governor to take hostages because if it's not... if it's Chicago today, it will be Macomb or Charleston or Carbondale tomorrow 'cause of the Rauner recession on higher education. Vote 'yes' on this Bill. It's the right thing to do. There are people on that side of the aisle who's doing the right thing. I'd encourage everyone to do so as well. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. First, to correct the record. The retired Chicago police officers do support this Bill. Second, it was said in debate that why do we do things just for Chicago? Why don't we do them for all the other communities in the state? Well, the problem, of course, is that we already did this for all the other municipalities in the state. The other municipalities in this state have a 40-year ramp to meet their actuarially required pension contributions; Chicago is stuck at 25, 25 not 40. I don't think that's fair. Senate Bill 777 says that Chicago will be on the same ramp as downstate police and fire and I have to say that the mayor of the City of Chicago has worked hard to fix pension problems. He did Bills that went to the Supreme Court and unfortunately, as with the pension Bill that was adopted by the State of Illinois, the court said no. But there are efforts at fiscal responsibility at pension responsibility in Chicago. This is about stabilizing the pensions for the Chicago police and fire. It is also about avoiding an additional \$300 million tax increase for the people of the City of Chicago. This requires nothing of

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Illinois State Government. This requires not a penny from Illinois State Pension Funds. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady has moved to override the Veto of the Governor. This requires 71 votes. Mr. Demmer has requested a verification. Members will be in their own chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And Mr. Demmer has requested a verification and he persists. So, Mr. Clerk, please read the roll of the affirmative."

"A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Clerk Hollman: Representative Acevedo; Representative Representative Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Bradley; Representative Burke, D.; Representative Burke, K.; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Conroy; Representative Costello; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Davis, M.; Representative Davis, W.; Representative DeLuca; Representative Drury; Representative Dunkin; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Representative Franks; Representative Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Guzzardi; Representative Harper; Representative Harris, Representative Harris, G.; Representative Hernandez; Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley;

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Representative Jackson; Representative Jones; Representative Kifowit; Representative Lang; Representative Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative McAsev; McAuliffe; Representative Representative McSweeney; Mitchell, C.; Representative Representative Moeller; Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman; Representative Nekritz; Representative Phelps; Representative Reaves-Harris; Representative Riley; Representative Rita; Representative Scherer; Representative Representative Sims; Representative Smiddy; Representative Soto ... "

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer is recognized."

Demmer: "I'd like to withdraw my request."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer withdraws his request. On a vote of 72 'yes', 43 'no', 2 voting 'present', the House does override the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 76... 777. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 7 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 730, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 730, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. A fiscal note has been requested, but not filed at this time."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Wallace for a Motion."

Wallace: "Yes. I'd like to rule... or I'm asking that the fiscal note be ruled inapplicable."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that the note be held inapplicable. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. Will the Lady yield for some questions?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sandack: "Certainly, Representative, there is a fiscal impact with respect to your Bill. Isn't that correct?"

Wallace: "Yes, there is."

Sandack: "Okay. Thank you. I appreciate the honesty of the Sponsor. There is a fiscal impact to her Bill, so the fiscal note is applicable. We ought to wait 'til it's answered. We should vote against the ruling of inapplicability because as the Sponsor just said a fiscal note is applicable. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. The Lady's Motion prevails and the note is held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Motions."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 730, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As many of us know, in January of 2015, our child care system program was devastated for no apparent reason by the Executive Branch. We did come to a supposed compromise in November, but it still continued to leave over 40 thousand families without access to state

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

affordable and adequate child care for their families. I am asking that we support this Bill to add a priority populations including homeless children, children with disabilities and children who are recipients of TANF as priority individuals so that when such unilateral decisions are made they are protected. I'm also... I'm also seeking to add back individuals who are nontraditional students in our higher education institutions allowing them to have their course time covered so they can pursue their education and their children can be someplace safe. And then finally, over the next two years we seek to expand to 250 percent of the federal poverty level. I do encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. To the Bill. I know we're in the waning days of our operations here or maybe not, I don't know, but when a... when a fiscal note is put on something, it's put on not for kicks and giggles. And to the Lady's credit, she said there would have... there would have been a fiscal impact on this vote. Why not go through the process? Why not go by our rules and undertake a fiscal analysis of something before we vote on it? Well, we don't do that because this is the House of Representatives and rules don't matter even the rules of the Majority Party, which are decidedly partisan, decidedly one-sided, and decidedly cast aside whenever it's easy and convenient for the Majority Party. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a serious issue that requires serious analysis including the fiscal impacts. Why we don't get it is absolutely em... just embarrassing. People that look upon us to see how we do what we do should have no faith and confidence that we

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

undertake any serious financial analysis to the things that matter. It was seen in the last vote, and it's going to be seen in this vote too. My goodness. We wonder why we're in a world of hurt financially because we can't even process things the right way. We can't even go do the ceremonial steps of doing a fiscal impact note and addressing them before we go on and pass the next spending initiative that we don't have the money to spend. My goodness. God, when is this craziness going to stop? Is anyone interested in some fiscal sanity or some procedural sanity even for the last two waning days?"

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Representative. And I know that your intentions are good as far as funding child care, but I just want to ask you a few questions of the cost of this Bill that Representative Sandack just alluded to. So, right now, the eligibility is at what?"

Wallace: "In terms of income?"

Bellock: "The eligibility. Is it 150 percent of federal poverty, 200 percent? What is it now?"

Wallace: "It's... it is at 162 percent which is down as a result of the Executive Order that took it from 185 percent to 50 and then there was a supposed compromise that brought it back up to 162 percent."

Bellock: "Correct. It was brought back up to 162 percent, correct?"

Wallace: "Yes."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- Bellock: "Okay."
- Wallace: "Still leaving 40 thousand children without child care."
- Bellock: "So, in this Bill, you want to raise from 162 percent to 200 percent. Do you know what that cost is?"
- Wallace: "Actually, yes. If we look at the current structure of copays which did increase under that Executive Order and those increased copays do stay in place, it will cost about \$187.5 million."
- Bellock: "Thank you. Correct. That's about what I have. I have around 200 million. So, then further on in this Bill you are saying in the second year that you want to raise that to 250 percent of poverty. Do you know how much that will cost?"
- Wallace: "That's the estimate for total. That was the estimate when you look at July of '16 being at about 200 percent and then July of '17 being at 250 percent. That's where I got the initial number from."
- Bellock: "I don't think that that's correct. I think in our record we have that the 250 percent when you raise that, that will be a \$500 million cost. So, in two years..."
- Wallace: "I've never seen a cost that high. I'm sorry to interrupt. I'm sorry."
- Bellock: "Oh, no, that's okay. So, in two years that cost will...
 your cost will be \$700 million."
- Wallace: "There's not one estimate that I've seen that has shown such a drastic difference between what we're saying... what I'm saying and what you're saying. I've never seen that estimate."
- Bellock: "We've gone through these numbers several times and that's what I had that it will raise by 700 million over that two years. So, that is a huge amount. It's... when we talked

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

about the Bills that we passed last week, there were four or five, and together four of those Bills cost almost \$3 billion. So, when I look at this Bill, and it's going to go up what we have in our analysis is \$700 million in two years, that's a huge increase. And with the problem with the fiscal crisis in Illinois that our deficit is \$5 billion at least, with 8 to 9 billion dollars of unpaid bills, that's the problem, Representative, that I have when I speak to this not that I don't think that there needs to be that addressed, that issue, but at this time in this budget an increase of 700 million is a large, large increase."

Wallace: "I understand what you're saying. It will not increase by 700 million. We're currently spending 400 million, so I'm not sure that we're going to actually go into spending over a billion dollars in child care. And... and when we talk about the fiscal state of our... of our state, when we look at what's going on, we need individuals to be out and in the workforce because that is income revenue, income tax revenue that we need. We also have estimates that show that for every dollar we invest in child care we get well over \$7 back into our local and state economies. So, I... this is an investment for the State of Illinois."

Bellock: "Representative Ammons, (sic-Wallace) I agree with you. I'm all for child care and I agree with you on what you're talking about as far as an investment... I've supported a lot of child care Bills. But I have the analysis right here by the Illinois Department of Human Services and this is their analysis of the Bill as to what this Bill will cost. It says fiscal impact. It could cost an additional 200 million in

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

FY17 and an estimated 500 million every year thereafter. So, in the two years in this Bill that we have before us, according to the state agency, it will be \$700 million. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I... I applaud the woman for her intentions of what she wants to do, but as I said, with a \$5 billion deficit, 8 to 9 billion dollars of unpaid bills, in this fiscal year I don't see how we can continue to vote on Bills after Bills after Bills that raise the issue by 700 million or thereafter. So, I cannot support this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Lady's Bill. You know, no one asked about the fiscal impact that it costs the working people of the State of Illinois when we close down the day cares so the babies could not go to school. And as a result of the babies not being able to go to school, surely the day care workers could not go to work. And as a result of the day care workers not being able to go to work and the babies not being able to go to schools, their parents was not able to go to work. They were not able to go to school. No one asked about the fiscal impact of what that cost the State of Illinois. So, the Lady's Bill will now, as a result of more children being able to be in a protected educational environment, will be able to be educated, number 1; protected, number 2. Their parents will be able to go to school, go to work and they will become tax contributors. The economy of the state will be better as a result of Senate Bill 730. When the Executive Branch of the... this office... the Governor's Office cut day

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

care and put the babies out of schools, put the parents out of work, put the kids out of school, no one asked about the fiscal impact. I urge an 'aye' vote for Senate Bill 730. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

"Mr. Speaker, thank you. To the Bill. I truly appreciate my colleagues on the other side of the aisle bringing forth questions of process. I, too, agree that process certainly should be in this discussion, but to this Bill process is important. The process of those children being put out of day care services and made ineligible needs to be restored and corrected. That's actually what Senate Bill 730 will do. Now, I've recently learned that there has been quite a bit of money expended to the tune of \$250 million without the appropriations process taking place. Expended for lots of things of which we won't belittle the point... belabor the point here about this particular Bill, but spending money unauthorized, nonetheless, that could have gone to the children under Senate Bill 730. Could have actually increased us from 167 another 25 percent, if we had used that \$250 million that has been expended without legislative appropriation authority for the children. And so, I stand in strong support of Senate Bill 730. We need to restore access to child care. We do need to look at necessary revenue for child care along with other programs in our state. I hope that that's what we'll do over the next 24 hours. But on today, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, what is the fiscal impact of this legislation?"

Wallace: "We... we just had that discussion. My estimate is \$187.5 million."

Demmer: "And our fiscal estimate was \$200 million in the first year and if it increases to 250 percent, that goes up to \$500 million. How might we reconcile the differences that we have in estimates?"

Wallace: "Are you saying that would be the total spent on child care or are you saying it's going to increase..."

Demmer: "The increase."

Wallace: "...by \$500 million?"

Demmer: "The increase. How might we reconcile two differing opinions on what the fiscal impact might be? How..."

Wallace: "So..."

Demmer: "...what... what might be... we do to reconcile that?"

Wallace: "Well, we might not double the total cost currently. I don't believe that that's what this Bill does at all. Additionally..."

Demmer: "Would a fiscal note help us understand what the fiscal impact is?"

Wallace: "One hundred and eighty-seven point five million dollars."

Demmer: "Well, there's obviously some discrepancy here. Wouldn't a fiscal note... isn't the purpose of the fiscal note to act... to help reconcile discrepancies just like this?"

Wallace: "No. That's not... they would give their fiscal opinion and their facts and whatever calculation they do..."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Demmer: "And those facts would help guide our debate."

Wallace: "...but they are not to say the merit and/or side in which the Bill should be thought of."

Demmer: "I couldn't agree more. I couldn't agree more."

Wallace: "So, it wouldn't necessarily..."

Demmer: "The fiscal note helps to provide the fact of how much the fiscal impact would be; then it's up to us as a Body to debate that. But we're missing even step one in this equation.

Representative, in the..."

Wallace: "Again..."

Demmer: "...in the Bill that you voted for a few days ago, a Bill...
a spending plan, I believe it was referred to... how much money
was included in the spending plan for child care?"

Wallace: "I'm not certain."

Demmer: "Would it surprise you to find that no money was included for child care in the spending plan?"

Wallace: "Well, then this Bill is definitely needed."

Demmer: "So, this is part of the spending plan, this Bill?"

Wallace: "It looks like it would be needed, if it was not included in the plan that we passed a couple of days ago."

Demmer: "Do you think it's responsible to pass a Bill that requires the state to spend money when the spending plan that was just passed out of this chamber doesn't include any funding for that?"

Wallace: "Those are court ordered things, so we did not include the court ordered and federal consent decree measures in the spending plan that passed a few days ago."

Demmer: "Okay. So, putting aside the fact that we're abdicating the responsibility of the Legislature and letting the

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

judiciary step in, let me ask you, what happens when a court order... when a court order requires us to spend at FY15 levels, yet this would expand above and beyond FY15 levels, how do we pay for the difference?"

Wallace: "The court order does not have those FY15 levels, not the particular child care order."

Demmer: "Still, we're operating under the assumption that those levels are continuing under the current court order. The cost certainly increased by at least \$187 million. How do we account for that when it's not included in the spending plan?

Do we have some way of paying for that?"

Wallace: "Well, I defer back..."

Demmer: "It wasn't included in the Bill."

Wallace: "...I defer back to the issues raised already as to the cost to our society and to our government when people are not at work."

Demmer: "So, speaking of costs, over the past several weeks we've heard a number of Bills in this chamber that have increased rates, increased wages, increased the size and scope of programs, probably to accumulative cost. I believe you voted for all those. You may have sponsored a few. To the accumulative cost of well north of a billion dollars. Right now, we have less than 36 hours remaining in our... in our regular Session and we're having a difficult time closing what we assume today to be maybe a \$7 billion gap. Do you think that adding another billion dollars helps us get to a compromise, helps us get to a solution or an agreement?"

Wallace: "I'm not adding a billion dollars."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- Demmer: "Aren't we making the problem even worse by committing the state today the things when we already can't pay for the program we're doing to expand those very programs?"
- Wallace: "I'm not adding a billion dollars. And currently, the federal block grant pays for over two-thirds of this particular program."
- Demmer: "Would the block grant match the individuals who are covered by this increase? Would the block grant provide matching funds for those individuals?"
- Wallace: "It does... it's not attached to an individual. Those block... it's a block grant. So, it's not an individualized grant."
- Demmer: "So, the block grant is a flat rate that we get. If we inspect... if we increase the amount of money we're spending, the block grant doesn't go up?"

Wallace: "We're..."

Demmer: "Is that correct?"

Wallace: "...we have no estimates on what we're spending because DHS has not provided those dollar amounts to us."

Demmer: "Oh, that's... that's..."

Wallace: "And we've been asking for those amounts..."

Demmer: "...that's a great reason for the fiscal note. Isn't that a great reason for the fiscal note?"

Wallace: "We've been asking for those amounts for over a year."

Demmer: "It's a great reason to have a fiscal note from the department."

Wallace: "So, if they haven't provided it to this point, I don't think they're going to provide..."

Demmer: "So understand..."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Wallace: "...it within the five-day period for a note to come back."

Demmer: "The great reason for a fiscal note. Let me ask you this.

If the state... if we pass this Bill, and we increase the size
and scope of this program, but we don't provide an
appropriation for it, what happens?"

Wallace: "It's already covered under a court order."

Demmer: "Okay. So, under... the court order will continue, the state would continue to provide services and we would... we would simply push liabilities into the future years, right? That would add to our unpaid bills. That would add to our unmet liabilities. If we don't apro..."

Wallace: "We could add..."

Demmer: "...provide an appropriation, which this Bill does not do, we would simply add to that pile."

Wallace: "Would you... I mean, we could add to our TANF rolls. I mean, that's another alternative."

Demmer: "We are adding... without paying for it... we're making a promise that the state will continue to deliver services and indeed expand on those services without any way to pay for it. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. What we see again and again are votes that, while they may be programs that have support on both sides of the aisle, while they may be concepts that many of us are eager to embrace, we have to reconcile the fact that when the state makes a promise in statute we have to find a way to pay for it. We can't simply make the promise and then ignore, through spending plans or budgets or whatever we want to call them, we can't ignore that commitment to follow through. We're making empty promises time and time again. This makes it more difficult for us to come to a

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

compromise. This makes it more difficult for us to balance our budget. This makes it more difficult for us to move forward with the kind of predictability that agencies across the State of Illinois are looking for. This Bill, although it's a good program, extends us beyond our means. It extends us beyond where we can live today. We need to find a way to reconcile the two of those. We can't simply ignore the fiscal impact or talk about future hypothetical costs. We have to reckon with those issues today before we vote on Bills like this. We can't put the cart before the horse. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Representative, we've been hearing a lot about the fiscal impact of this Bill and I think that the implication is, is that no one knows what the fiscal impact of this Bill is and I don't think that that's accurate. I think it would be helpful if you could walk us through the history of this program and how it's been under attack by the Governor's Office for months..."

Wallace: "Yes."

Thapedi: "...not today, but for months."

Wallace: "Yes."

Thapedi: "Now, initially, the threshold requirement was 185 percent of the federal poverty level, correct?"

Wallace: "Correct."

Thapedi: "And then, all of a sudden the Governor decided to file emergency rules in JCAR to reduce it from 185 percent to..."

Wallace: "To 50."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Thapedi: "...50 percent, correct?"

Wallace: "Yes."

Thapedi: "And then, after that, if I recall correctly, Leader Gordon-Booth filed a Bill and that was House Bill 580 to bring it back up to 185 percent and cure the issues with the emergency rule-making authority that the Governor's Office improperly invoked, correct?"

Wallace: "Yes."

Thapedi: "All right. And then after that, there was some negotiations in JCAR in which it was brought up to the current 162 percent, correct?"

Wallace: "Yes."

Thapedi: "When did you file this Bill?"

Wallace: "I filed 5580 earlier this year."

Thapedi: "Okay."

Wallace: "In February, I believe."

Thapedi: "All right. And 5580, is this the same..."

Wallace: "And this becomes that Bill."

Thapedi: "So..."

Wallace: "But it actually is less... I asked for 300 percent initially. I was going for the in total gusto. Now, we're looking at 250 percent over the next two years, but can I make a point?"

Thapedi: "No. Well... well..."

Wallace: "Okay."

Thapedi: "...well let me... let me finish so I understand correctly."

Wallace: "Yes."

Thapedi: "With respect to Senate Bill 730, when did that come to fruition?"

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Wallace: "This was late last week."

Thapedi: "Late last week?"

Wallace: "Yes."

Thapedi: "At that time, did anyone make a request for a fiscal note?"

Wallace: "No."

Thapedi: "So, there was no request to make a fiscal note late last week..."

Wallace: "No."

Thapedi: "...correct?"
Wallace: "Correct."

Thapedi: "So, when was that request made?"

Wallace: "Sometime between the start of Session today and the end of the Republican caucus."

Thapedi: "Oh, so something that was so important that they wanted to know the fiscal impact of, even though they've known the fiscal impact for months, they waited until today to make the request to get that fiscal information. Is that accurate?"

Wallace: "Correct."

Thapedi: "So, that sounds like to me that that was basically a ploy or a strategy to slow down the Bill so it couldn't move forward so it couldn't be resolved today. Is that accurate?"

Wallace: "That's what I believe to be true as well."

Thapedi: "Let... let me just ask you a couple clarifying questions as well. Would you dispute that studies show that investing in child care and early education has an immediate, positive... positive effect and impact on the Illinois economy?"

Wallace: "I would not dispute that."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Thapedi: "Would you agree that in 2014 alone these investments generated \$2.6 billion in revenue and employed more than 69 thousand people full-time?"

Wallace: "Yes. Based on the studies I've read that's accurate."

Thapedi: "Would you also agree that for every 100 new jobs created in the child care industry it was estimated that... that another 56 were created in other industries as well?"

Wallace: "Yes, I would agree."

Thapedi: "So, finally, would it be fair to say that this program is a solid return on investment and that for every \$100 that the state spends on child care 213 additional dollars are injected into the Illinois economy?"

Wallace: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "So, my first question has to do with, do you know what a family of four makes at the 250 thousand... or 250 percent of the poverty level?"

Wallace: "Yes. A family of four at 250 percent of the federal poverty level is \$59,625."

Ives: "So, just about \$60 thousand?"

Wallace: "Yes."

Ives: "And do you know how much we currently spend on the child
 care program?"

Wallace: "The estimate is about 400 million."

Ives: "No. What do we spend on the program? What's also do we get from the federal?"

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Wallace: "Four hundred GRF and about 600 million federal dollars."

Ives: "Actually, I... I did the math before this and it's actually about \$1.2 billion that we spend on this program. And... and our... our part... I'll take your \$400 million level, but really we spend almost... we spend well over \$500 million ourselves, the state taxpayers. So, in your Bill, our analysis says that you're going to spend upwards of \$700 million by FY18. So, that's well... that you are doubling... more than doubling the cost of this program for the state taxpayers without any federal match. Are you aware of that?"

Wallace: "I will continue to stand by the fact that that's not what my estimate says."

Ives: "Okay. Where did you get your estimate from?"

Wallace: "From... Let's look at some of the studies. There's about three different studies."

Ives: "Well, I'm looking at the information from the Illinois Department of Human Services. I'm looking at their information and they say that its estimated cost 500 million by FY18. So, we're going to more than double the cost."

Wallace: "Can you please repeat that? I'm sorry."

Ives: "You were going... according to the Illinois Department of
 Human Services, their estimates alone which are what I'm going
 by..."

Wallace: "Okay."

Ives: "...we will more than double our costs with getting nothing
 more additional money from the Federal Government for this
 program, which is already \$1.2 billion cost."

Wallace: "Okay."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Ives: "Okay. So, how are we going to pay for that? We... your caucus just passed a Bill that increases the amount that we're going to spend by \$7 billion and that is without this appropriation. So, how are we going to pay for this?"

Wallace: "As I just stated to the previous Representative from your caucus, TANF rolls are also an alternative. So, we could increase that roll. Either way, we're going to pay. So, do we want to pay for individuals..."

Ives: "Where's the money going to come from?"

Wallace: "...to go to work and contribute to our society to complete their higher education degrees to make sure that their children are safe? Do we want to pay for that or do we want to pay for individuals who have no job because they cannot afford child care?"

Ives: "Do we want to pay for child care for people making \$60
 thousand a year?"

Wallace: "For a four-person household?"

Ives: "Yes. Do the..."

Wallace: "Perhaps you should poll the middle-class families in your district. I would venture to say that they would appreciate some assistance seeing that child care costs as much if not more than tuition at the U of I for one child."

Ives: "Well, okay. So, you have no way to pay for this appropriation. That's what you're telling me. We just passed \$7 billion over budget; your budget last. Now, this is not appropriate. Now, if I remember correctly, the first bud... the first Bill that we voted on when Governor Rauner took office... the first Bill was a \$300 million appropriation to this

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

program because you... Democrats over there... underfunded child care intentionally in the previous Bill. And so..."

Wallace: "I wasn't here."

Ives: "...we voted to give you guys \$300 million for this program."

Wallace: "I was not here when that initial budget took place. I was not here."

Ives: "That was the first vote we took under Governor Rauner was to..."

Wallace: "Okay. Well, yes..."

Ives: "...to fill a gap..."

Wallace: "...to close the fiscal year '15 gap..."

Ives: "Well, here's the..."

Wallace: "...but I did not... I was not here for the initial FY15 budget."

Ives: "So... so, what's going to happen here? Are we going to make a supplemental appropriation for this that's not funded in your already \$7 billion overfunded Bill that you sent to the Senate? Is that what we're going to do? We're going to have to come back and make an additional appropriation?"

Wallace: "Again, this is covered under court order."

Ives: "So, we're just going to continue... your... your idea then is that we should just let the courts decide how we spend all sorts of money? That's what your decision is."

Wallace: "I would pre... I would prefer that we not, but since I have been in this Assembly... I joined here at the end of the 98th, came in the beginning of the 99th... we've not had a budget."

Ives: "Okay. Let me ask... let me ask..."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Wallace: "I would not prefer for the court to do anything. I would prefer for each branch of government to function in the way that it should. That's my preference."

Ives: "Did you ask your Democrat Leadership to make sure that this was funded in the Appropriation Bill that was \$7 billion over our revenue estimate. Did you ask them to fund this or were you just expecting that the courts would order this instead? Did you ask your Leadership to put this into the budget Bill?"

Wallace: "I ask my Leadership for everything that I feel is a priority, so that's what I did."

Ives: "So, you did. So, you went to your Democrat Leadership and you asked them to put this in that budget Bill?"

Wallace: "The Bill is here on the floor right now."

Ives: "No. I know. I... I'm asking about the budget Bill last week."

Wallace: "So, obviously, there's been some discussion in terms of bringing it to this point."

Ives: "Okay. The last thing I want to touch on is higher copays.

What is the problem with asking folks that are getting a larger amount for child care to pay a little bit more for the child care themselves?"

Wallace: "That's what this Bill provides for."

Ives: "In this Bill..."

Wallace: "The copays are based upon income. And so, if your income increases, your copay will increase. That's how the program has always worked."

Ives: "But the language does not say that according to... to our analysis and additionally, if you are at the same income

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

level, you're not paying an additional... a higher copay and we have not adjusted copays for quite a while."

Wallace: "My understanding is those in... those... yeah, those copays were increased last year."

Ives: "The... for the..."

Wallace: "The copays were increased last year and as your income increases, so does your copay. That's simply how the program works."

Ives: "That's... that's actually the first time they were increased since 2011 because they were lowered in 2011."

Wallace: "Okay. But you just said they had not been increased and they have been."

Ives: "So, that just basically rolls them back to pre-2011,
 period. There's not really..."

Wallace: "Well, you..."

Ives: "...been a copay increase."

Wallace: "Well, you just said there had... they hadn't been, so I'm just pointing out that they did. They were increased."

Ives: "Are you familiar with IRS Form 2441?"

Wallace: "No, but I'm sure you'll enlighten me."

Ives: "Yeah. That's right. That's the child care credit form. That's the child care credit form. And so, if you're paying a copay, you actually can get a large portion of that back from the IRS based on income level. And everybody's eligible up to any income level. It just declines with your increase in income. So, even if we passed on a higher copay, it is more than conceivable that most of that higher copay actually comes back to them as a Federal credit on their IRS Form. That's what happens. So, why don't we do that? Why don't we

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

increase copays knowing full well that the majority of people that are accessing child care from the State of Illinois will receive an additional amount back from the IRS based on the copay that they paid? I think that's a good idea."

- Wallace: "Well, I mean, if you were to bring that forward than we could talk about us supporting that and working on that together. I'm not a CPA. I know that you are."
- Ives: "I... I understand that you're not, but... and my point is that that I think we should ask for a higher copay knowing full well that they're going to get a large portion of that back. There's nothing wrong with increasing the copay over time gradually."
- Wallace: "The copays were increased and your copays do increase as your income increases. That is how the program works."
- Ives: "Again, that's not what our analysis says. To the Bill.

 Just vote 'no'. There's no way to pay for this. They didn't

 even have the wherewithal to ask the Democrat Leadership to

 put this in the... in the spending Bill that was 7 billion over

 budget to begin with. This is just an easy 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. My name was used in debate. I'd like to speak to the Bill, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you. Well, I get it. There's a little bit of head shaking and because we're getting tired. The Gentleman from Chicago questioned the Sponsor about some procedures and then put in... suggested there was a political plot with respect to a fiscal note. Let me suggest a couple things. This Bill came out of committee yesterday. It was read for a second time

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

yesterday. And so, yes, a fiscal note was put on it today. That's the process. I'm not sure I could have moved faster than doing it today when the Bill was read, got out of committee and read for a second time yesterday. Our entire conversation about this... our entire conversation has been about the fiscal impact. We don't know the entirety of it. We just do know that we're going to spend money we don't have. And it wasn't part of a large, really ridiculous budget Bill passed out of here by the Democrats that spent ostens... ostensibly \$7 billion more than they want to spend. So, this is another spending Bill. We did it last week too. There is absolutely no math involved in the process any more. So, when I put a fiscal note on, it's not for kicks and giggles, it's to actually slow the process down so that we're thinking can we pay for this? Is this yet again an unfunded promise? So, I get it. We all voted the note was inapplicable, but the note was totally applicable. The process is getting jammed down our throats, but you are all going to vote in favor of it because, well, it makes you feel good. And I get it. But the fact is we've been doing 'feel good' Bills for a couple decades now and it's caught up to us. And yet, this august Body will continue to spend more than we have, go back to your con... constituents and say, I fought for you. Oh, yeah, I can't pay for a thing we fought for. And we wonder why the credit history of this state continues to decline. We wonder why trust and confidence is ... erodes with our taxpayers. And we wonder this hot mess just gets hotter. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Barbara Wheeler."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Patti Bellock."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. I would just like to reiterate... I know we've had a lot of discussion over this Bill and I know that your intentions are very good... and I want to say that we have supported child care all along. When the new Governor came in, 2015, that budget, we spent three months in meetings downstairs and around trying to come up with the money to pay for the child care, to pay for the court reporters and to pay for the prison guards. And in a bipartisan fashion, we worked that out. And that is my concern right now and a lot of the other Members concern is that we don't want to pass something that we don't have the money from right now and it's not included, as you had said, in the \$7 billion Bill that went over because it is court ordered. So, that is the problem. You're putting a \$700 million item into un... you know, voting for it right now and then, come six months from now when we're into the next year budget, we may be downstairs in a room again trying to figure out how we're going to pay for that. And that's our issue. It's not that we don't support child care; we certainly do. We understand the efforts and how it helps women and how it helps children in Illinois, but we also understand that the deficit... it's \$5 billion now, 8 to 9 billion dollars of unpaid bills and 700 million doesn't sound like a lot to that, but every single Bill that puts it over what we have, puts us deeper into the fiscal crisis that they're in ... we're in and that's what we're trying to solve now, to turn that around

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

for all Illinoisans who are fed up with what has happened in Illinois. They don't want the tug-of-war anymore before Democrats and Republicans and they want to see this budget impasse end. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, does this particular... does this particular Bill spend General Revenue Funds?"

Wallace: "Yes, a portion of it comes from General Revenue Funds."

Wheeler, K.: "Somewhere in this Bill is there hidden a revenue estimate for what our General Revenue Funds then should be for fiscal year '17?"

Wallace: "No."

Wheeler, K.: "According to the Illinois State Constitution, is it constitutional for the state to provide child care assistance?"

Wallace: "I'm not sure. Will you please share that with me?"

Wheeler, K.: "I'm asking the question of you 'cause it... 'cause
I'm assuming that the Bill is constitutional based on the
fact that it provides child care assistance?"

Wallace: "I mean, to my knowledge none of the grant programs that we fund are part of the Constitution."

Wheeler, K.: "But they're not out of balance with the Constitution?"

Wallace: "I'm sorry, Sir?"

Wheeler, K.: "Has the... put it this way. Has the child care program been found unconstitutional in the past?"

Wallace: "To my knowledge, no."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Wheeler, K.: "According to the Illinois State Constitution, is it constitutional for the General Assembly to appropriate more funds than what it expects to be estimated for the available fiscal year... available for the fiscal year?"

Wallace: "That question I remember from eighth grade, so I think we all know the answer to that."

Wheeler, K.: "And it is?"

Wallace: "I'm sorry?"

Wheeler, K.: "The answer to the question is? No, it's not constitutional for us to spend more money than we expect to take in. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, in the name of helping families by expanding a program that has merit and does help families, we're again spending more money than we have. And we're making the state's fiscal... fiscal condition even worse. At this time, we really have no choice but to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Bill. It's wrong to attack the homeless, the children. And I move to the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Unfortunately, Mr. Jones, you can't speak to the Bill and move the previous question. But thank you. Mr. Davis is recognized."

Davis, W.: "I'll move the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves the previous question. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Representative Wallace to close. There are no Republican lights on. Don't get your pants in a bunch. Are you... if you're insisting on a Roll Call, I'll give

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

you one. Those in favor of calling the previous question vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all those who... voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 72 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And the previous question is put. Representative Wallace to close."

Wallace: "I think it's no surprise that this is something that is very dear to me. I've shared my own experiences. I've listened to my constituents and their concerns. This is a Bill that is about making sure that the next generation has what they need in terms of safety, access to early childhood education. It pumps dollars back into our economy. And... I'm sorry, I'm sorry. It pumps money back into our economy. And I don't know if you guys remember September 2 of 2015, but on that day Representative Golar was here to make sure that then House Bill 580 did pass. She left what many of us did not know to be her deathbed to be here. Senate Bill 730 has her as a cosponsor in its original form. And I can't be more honored and more privileged to carry a Bill that sees through the legacy of a woman who spent her life making sure that all had access to education and to making sure... she spent her last days making sure that we put these families first. I do encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 70 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 10 of the Calendar,

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- Consideration Postponed, House Bill 746. Mr. Verschoore. Mr. Verschoore, please proceed."
- Verschoore: "Thank you. First of all, I'd like to withdraw the Amendment to this Bill. And I'd like to read a letter that I got from the..."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore. Gentleman asks that the Bill be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Amendment."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 746, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Verschoore, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore on the Amendment."
- Verschoore: "I would like to withdraw Amendment #2 to this Bill, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Amendment 2 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 746, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore."
- Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like your indulgence for a minute to read a letter that I got from the... the Rock Island County Forest Preserve director. The current governing body of the Forest Preserve District of Rock Island County supports the effort to have a directly elected governing body by the residents of the district to govern the Forest Preserve District in Rock Island County.

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

The governing body recognizes and desires the support of the Legislature as it only through a change in the Downstate Forest Preserve Act that a change in the matter with the governing body of the Forest Preserve District restructuring can occur. I have precluded with this letter a Resolution adopted by the Forest Preserve Commission known as the commission dated February 16, 2016. The vote was 23 'yes', 1 'no', in favor of supporting the Resolution. The current governing body is made up of all 25 Rock Island County Board Supervisors who serve ex officio as the Board of Commissioners of the district. Even though the governing body of the Rock Island County Forest Preserve District are one and the same, currently, the district is its own separate body corporate and politic. As noted in the Downstate Forest Preserve Act, the Forest Preserve District of Rock Island County was established in '41 by re... 1941 by referendum of the residents of Rock Island County and described in the Downstate Forest Preserve Act. With the proposal of the referendum by the voters of the district, the Forest Preserve District of Rock Island County became a recognized unit of government. I want to repeat that. Was recognized as a unit of government in Illinois and instead is governed as such with its own independent structure and meetings headed by electric... elected President from within the body of the Forest Preserve Commission as stated in the downtown (sic-Downstate) Forest Preserve Act. The district has its own corporate levy and noncorporate levies that supported the operation. No new levies would be created with this legislation to amend the Downstate Forest Preserve Act. The authority to levy the

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

existing tax levies come from the downtown (sic-Downstate) Forest Preserve Act. The Forest Preserve District finances are independently held and the district performs its own comprehensive and annual fiscal... or financial annually. The district receives an independent credit rating from companies such as Moody's Investor Service and Standard & Poor Financial Services for the bone... for the bonds sold. The district also has its own EIN or Employee Identification Number and the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund recognizes the Forest Preserve District as an independent entity. An employer requiring the district to fulfill its requirements for participation and enrollment. As stated above, the district is its own body and all courts shall take judicial notice of the... all Forest Preserve Districts organized under the downtown Forest Preserve Act... Downstate Forest Preserve Act. The district may sue and be sued contract and contracted with acquired and hold real and personal estate necessary for its incorp... corporated purposes and adopt a seal and alter the same as its pleasure from Downstate Forest Preserve Act. The district currently is... has a labor agreement with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Council 31 Local 2025A. The agreement shall remain in effect should legislation change the manner in which the governing body is organized. On May 17 of 2016, the Commission approved a new labor agreement to take effect December 1, 2016 through November 30 of 2021 with AFSCME Council 31 Local 2025A. Should the legislation restructing... restructuring the manner in which the district's governing body is organized becomes law, the district will be obligated to fulfill the terms of that

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

agreement as well as all other existing and future contracts and agreements with the parties that the district has lawfully entered into and exists. I hope this letter serves as a clarification to any issues or misunderstanding regarding the desire of the Rock Island County Board of Commissioners to have a directly elected governing body by the residents of the district governing this... the Rock Island Forest Preserve. Again, legislation is only... the only alternative in which the governing body of the Forest Preserve District can rely on to restructure itself. Previous Amendments to the Downstate Forest Preserve Act by the Legislature allowed other Forest Preserve Districts, specifically DuPage and Winnebago County Forest Preserves, to have independent and elector governing bodies. With this, I know there was... in the past there was some talk or discussion about this being not its own entity and would create another governing body. I don't feel that it does that. And I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes."

Sandack: "Pat, the first time we voted on this Amendment 2 was part of the Bill. Isn't that correct?"

Verschoore: "Yes."

Sandack: "Why did you withdraw?"

Verschoore: "Because we're going to... the AFSCME Local did not particularly like the language..."

Sandack: "Oh."

Verschoore: "...and they want to work on it in the Senate."

Sandack: "Okay."

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Verschoore: "So, that's what we're going to do."

Sandack: "So, AFSCME didn't like it, so maybe you'll pick up some votes this time around? So, other than that, what is it that they... that they found offensive?"

Verschoore: "I can't answer that. They just didn't like... hold on a second... it wasn't specific enough to what they wanted."

Sandack: "For what they want? Okay. To... to the Bill. Thank you for answering, Pat. This received a rather vigorous vetting last time. It failed for a reason. And the most particular reason it failed is it's adding another layer of government. That long letter that was read was wonderful, but it's adding another unit of government. So, if you're going to do the... you're going to vote for this, just know that last Session my good friend from McHenry one of the first things we did was try and stop the bleeding by saying we're not adding new units of government. I guess it's kind of equivalent to we're not going to spend money we don't have. We regularly violate our own rules when it's convenient for us. We said no units of government, no new local units of government. How about we abide by what we just did about a year ago? Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The reason this failed last time is because we didn't have a full complement of Representatives and Representative Verschoore did not have as much time to work the Bill, which he's done since. In fact, he's... he's taken the time and effort to come by and give us all newspaper articles about this particular topic. And I think we need to remember that there already is a forest preserve. It just now would be moving to an elected

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

body independent. So, that makes sense. We like elections. We like democracy. And there's another point here to which is that a Forest Preserve District has inconsistent aims from a county board. The forest preserve exists to preserve natural property. The county board exists to develop that property. So, having the same members doing both jobs can get you into trouble. Now, we had this same issue in DuPage County a few years back, which resulted in the creation of an independent Forest Preserve District. We had Diehl Road cut right through one of our chief forest preserves, McDowell Forest Preserve. And so, the people of the county wisely split off six of the county board members, made them the Forest Preserve District, kept the other 18 as a county board and now, both entities are able to work independently and represent with full vigor the independent aims, one preserving property and one developing property. This is a wonderful idea. It's a great idea. It does not create a new unit of government. There already is one. But it gives a new and independent group of elected officials the ability to run that government for the sake of the people and without the conflicting interest that a county board has. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, I had the chance to serve over the course of the last year on the task force that was previously mentioned, the Global Government Consolidation Unfunded Mandates Relief. One of the biggest issues that we addressed, and I think this has been no secret to anybody who serves in

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Illinois elected office, is that the State of Illinois has more units of local government than any other state. We recognize that in passing a moratorium on the creation of new units of local government and I have a hard time seeing how this is not a creation of a new unit of local government. We have a county board right now who's... who's overseeing the Forest Preserve District. Yet, you asked for the establishment of a new group of elected officials to govern the Rock Island County Forest Preserve District. How is this not in violation of the moratorium that we placed on the creation of new units of government?"

Verschoore: "Well, as I said earlier, I think it's a difference of opinion. One of the former speakers said that he thinks it's a new unit of government. You think it's a new unit of government. Our legislative research people say it isn't. And in this letter I got it said this district was formed in 1941 as a unit of government. So, it's already a unit of government."

Demmer: "And I have a note from that... that statute that passed a couple years ago that it said that the moratorium included the creation of new entities within existing divisions.

Doesn't that kind of fit the... the context of what you're talking about there?"

Verschoore: "No, I don't think so."

Demmer: "This is the creation of a new entity within the division?"

Verschoore: "I don't think so. Like I say, it's a difference of an opinion. You think... you and some of your fellow Members

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

think it is. I and our legislative staff doesn't as well as the park director. So there are fortunate..."

Demmer: "All right. Sure. And I appreciate that. I... I know that many times, in fact, this kind of highlights the fact that we have such an issue with the number of units of local government that many times we have different counts of what counts as a unit of local government from one organization to the next; that number changes regularly. It's difficult for any citizen... I think it'd be difficult for any of us... to go through and list off all the different units of local government that we ourselves are a part of or that the home that we own is a part of. Because these have kind of grown up so much through the years, that's one of the reasons I think we went to that moratorium. On another line of questioning I... I'm curious. As we establish a new group of elected officials, are those elected officials entitled to compensation?"

Verschoore: "No, no compensation."

Demmer: "Are they entitled to participation in the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund?"

Verschoore: "No."

Demmer: "Are they..."

Verschoore: "As a matter of fact, the county board has voted... or they're going to vote on doing away with the municipal employment pension."

Demmer: "...are they... are they entitled to the reimbursement for expenses?"

Verschoore: "Reimbursement for what?"

Demmer: "Expenses?"

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Verschoore: "If they are specifically sent somewhere, they have a policy in the... in the county for all employees that they will be reimbursed reasonable expenses with proof of the expenses."

Demmer: "Are they entitled to any health care?"

Verschoore: "No."

Demmer: "Does this Bill specifically say that they're not entitled to these things?"

Verschoore: "They... if they're... I'm not sure about this. They're on... they're only entitled to reimbursement... reimbursement expenses."

Demmer: "Are they entitled to administrative support provided by taxpayers?"

Verschoore: "They... I think they already do that."

Demmer: "They already do that as... provide that to members of the county board, right? The county board has administrative support, but they may need administrative support for this board because you're making it a separate entity now, right?"

Verschoore: "They... they already have a pot of money and it's coming from the Forest Preserve District, so I'm assuming that's how they cover it."

Demmer: "Okay. I appreciate that. Thanks for your questions and I... I know there are... or your answers. I know there are some differences of opinion about whether this constitutes a unit of local government. I think that just highlights part of the issue that we have in the State of Illinois with far too many units of local government. That's the reason we brought forth a moratorium. That's the reason we convene a panel to study this. That's the reason that we're trying to be more

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

accountable to taxpayers by limiting the scope of things that they have to pay attention to. It's not fair to ask taxpayers to vote on a bedsheet ballot every time with every unit of local government. They don't have the chance to attend those meetings to look at what is being voted on in those groups. They don't have a chance to vet those candidates. They don't have a chance to be engaged active citizens when we put layer upon layer upon layer of local government on them. I understand that this is, you know, we're talking about a very narrow issue here. But we have to ask ourselves, how many times do we talk about narrow issues and keep on adding this growing burden of local government? I'd encourage a 'no' vote here. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative Peter Breen explained very well, you know, what we're... what the Representative Verschoore is trying to do here is not create a new idea. There's already one that's worked, worked very well, up in Representative Breen's district. So, we don't have to wonder if it works. The very stated objective for doing this was that it would provide greater transparency and efficiency while removing politics from this body. These are things that we frequently say we want to do: more transparency, more efficiency and take politics out... out of it. We're going to have a board there now, if this becomes law, that the citizens of the county are going to know who they are and that that's the area of governance that they're dealing with. So, it's going to be much more accountable to the people. Again, transparency, and efficiency are a concept

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

that's already been proven in some other areas, other park districts. I think this is good public policy. And I think it would be wise to stop and think. We're frequently critical of all these… the number of governments that we have in Illinois. Oftentimes… it's just like our counties are not in a position to take over all the duties of townships, et cetera. But you know, all… all those local governments that I'm familiar with, every one of them have adopted a budget each year, every one of them are on time with those budgets. They're responsible to the people, they're delivering their services that the people wanted. They're directly accountable to them. I think we're sometimes critical something that really isn't a problem. It's already been… say, this is proven. This is a good Bill. It's a good concept. Urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore to close."

Verschoore: "I'd like to thank the other speakers for their comments and questions. I... as a former... this recent speaker said, this has more transparency and I... and I've heard them a thousand times in this chamber, we need the people choosing who represents us. And this would be a way for the... the citizens of Rock Island County to choose that. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Bradley, Davis, Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 81 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Currie for an announcement."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. The Democratic Caucus working groups will continue meeting tomorrow at 10 a.m. Workers' Comp, at 11 a.m. Collective Bargaining. Both meetings will be in Room 402A in this building behind the Bill Room. Look forward to seeing you all tomorrow."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Barbara Wheeler."
- Wheeler, B.: "As we all know, it's been a very long day, but we have to wish a happy birthday to staff member Lauren Messmore who's 20... turning 26. So, please give her a round of applause."
- Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday. Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Proceed."
- Chapa LaVia: "We often miss our anniversaries and the loved ones for birthdays, but today is Mr. Andersson's anniversary. And I want to say his wife is up in the gallery. So, she should stand if she's there. Oh, she already left? Well, happy anniversary to both of you, 29 years. God bless."
- Speaker Lang: "Happy anniversary. Thanks for joining us. On Supplemental Calendar #1, Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 2804, Mr. Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2804, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Under the Order of Resolutions, on the same Supplemental Calendar, there appears HJR150, Mr.

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

- Turner. Please proceed, Sir. Out of the record for the moment. HJR153, Mr. McSweeney. Please proceed."
- McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 153 will require the IEPA to conduct a study of lead levels in water systems throughout the State of Illinois. There's been a lot of recent attention on lead in water systems in Illinois. The IEPA is neutral on this legislation. I believe that it's important that we maintain the integrity of our water systems. A report would be required by December 31. As the results become available, it would be available online. Plus, there would be also available a report on September 1. I recommend a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1299, offered by Representative Frese. And House Resolution 1300, offered by Representative Meier."
- 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 announcements for today and tomorrow."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after Session today. Meeting at... in Room 118 is the Revenue & Finance Committee. Human Services is meeting in D-1. Labor & Commerce in 114. Substance Abuse in 115. Judiciary-Civil in C-1. Judiciary-Criminal in 122. Meeting at

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

8:30 in the morning is Executive in Room 114. At 9:30 in the morning Business & Occupational Licenses is meeting in D-1. Elementary & Secondary Education: School Curriculum & Policies in 413. Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges in C-1. Consumer Protection in 118. Personnel and Pensions in 115."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. HJR150, Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. HJR150 will create a statewide tax fo... task force for disconnected youth. The purpose of the task force is to assess policies, programs and other issues regarding the needs of disconnected youth. The aim is to improve educational skills, employment development, so as dis... these disconnected youth can become a productive part of society. There was some legislative intent... intent that I'd like to work into the record regarding this being held at the Department of Human Services. I think there's an Amendment we have to adopt, actually."

Clerk Hollman: "Mr. Clerk, do you have an Amendment? The Amendment is still in Rules, Sir. What's your pleasure?"

Turner: "Let's take this out of the record for a second."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record. Chair recognizes Mr. Bennett."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Bennett: "Thank you. I have a brief poem that was written by a young man and I'd like to share it for a moment. His name is Jacob Gilhaus. It's basically written for Memorial Day. He wrote this poem when he was in the eighth grade. And it was for a contest that he won and as the winner, he was able to

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

lay a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The title of the poem is called *The Unknowns* and if I may, just very briefly read this for... for our group here today. *The Unknowns*. For those who have fought and never returned, for those whose families still hope, for those whose tags we never did learn, for those whose friends must cope, in remembrance of them we award a medal in remembrance we show great respect, in remembrance their graves we dare not meddle in remembrance the mat is trekked, for this country they bared and lost their lives for their... for this country we honor their deaths, for this country their intention still survives, for this country they sacrificed their breaths. Again, this was from an eighth grader, Jacob Gilhaus. His parents are Greg and Annette Gilhaus. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Bennett. Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "I just wanted the record to reflect that I meant to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 10."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention, Representative. And with that, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, May 31 at the hour of 11 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6582, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 6583, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. First Reading of these House Bills. Committee

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

Reports. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Judiciary - Civil reports the following Committee on committee action taken on May 30, 2016: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1047, Senate Bill 2359; recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 3 to House 5902. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 5539, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 6123, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 6213. Representative Lang, Chairperson from the Committee on Substance Abuse Special reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 346. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 324; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2261. Representative Sims, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2016: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4603, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5472, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6010, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6200, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6303, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 206. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee

140th Legislative Day

5/30/2016

action taken on May 30, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2604; recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3554. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 324, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 346, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 1047, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2261, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2359, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2604, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of these Senate Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."