148th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Padget."
- Padget: "Let us pray. Bless this House and all who serve here, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "May have to keep him. Be led in the Pledge by Mr. Verschoore."
- Verschoore- 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 Representatives Arroyo, Gordon-Booth, Reaves-Harris, Scherer and Skoog are absent today..."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."
- Brown: "Morning, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Andersson, Brady, Phillips, and Barb Wheeler are excused this morning. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. We have 109 Members answering the roll and we do have a quorum. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1476, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. House Resolution 1477, offered by Representative Kay. House Resolution 1479, offered by Representative Wehrli. And House Resolution 1480, offered by Representative Wehrli."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

- 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. Chair recognizes Leader Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I'd like to ask the entire... all the Members today to greet my Page for the day who has come down all the way from Lombard. It's Adil Ahmed, and he's in 10th grade at the Islamic Foundation School in Lombard. So, will everybody give him a round of applause and welcome him... see how government runs in Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Glad you're with us today. Enjoy your day here in the House chamber. Representative Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

- Gabel: "I would like to introduce my Page for a day, Jack Shreve, from Evanston. He goes... he's in 4th grade and goes to North Shore Country Day and his folks, Jennifer and Jim Shreve, are up in the gallery. So, let's give them a big Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Thank you for joining us today. Chair recognizes Representative Wallace."
- Wallace: "Good Morning, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Wallace: "I would like to welcome individuals who are in the gallery, who are joining us from INCIO, a network of independent living organizations. Many are throughout the Capitol today advocating and working to better the... the outcomes for their community. So, I just want to say welcome to the group if they are in the gallery and encourage everyone

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

here on both sides of the aisle to make an opportunity to go and speak with some of the members from our disabled community. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Moffitt is recognized."

Moffitt: "Rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Moffitt: "I would like to introduce my Page for the day, who is back for a second day. He... I didn't get to introduce him yesterday, but he came to a committee, Elementary & Secondary. He did ask me after yesterday's Session, what just happened? And I'm still working on the answer, so if you can help me with that. But would you please make welcome Caden Wilson from Galesburg, Illinois. Caden."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for joining us today. Thank you, Representative. Members, page 2 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate-Bills Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 870. Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill. Mr. Zalewski, you do have an Amendment, Sir? Mr. Clerk, please put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 870, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. 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 Zalewski."

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

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 represents the Bill. It represents a... an agreement between the optometrists, the ophthalmologists, the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation and the Med Society

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

about a... a moderate scope of practice increase for optometrists. Initially, along with the provision for a task force to be convened in the next year to discuss further ways in which the training that's being done in the optometric schools can be applied to patients in a future setting. The Amendment becomes the Bill. I'd ask, Mr. Speaker, if Representative Moeller could present the Bill on Third Reading as she did the front half of the work on the Bill. But the... the Amendment becomes the Bill and it's agreed to. And I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan, can we move it to Third and then get back to you? 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 870, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Moeller on Third Reading."

Moeller: "Thank you, Chair. As Representative Zalewski just explained, this Bill is the Optometric Sunset Bill that will extend their license in Illinois for 10 years. It also extends the Medical Act for 1 year. The Amendment is an agreed-to language between the optometrists, the ophthalmologists and the Med Society on training... a task force that will develop educational standards for our optometrics school here in Illinois so future optometrists can be trained in some enhanced prac... procedures that they may use in their practice.

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Again, this is an agreed-to Bill. We spent several months with both parties working to come up with this language and I urge your adoption. Would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you. I did get one of my answers in that this is an agreed Bill. Why are we doing the optometric licensure for 10 years and not the rest of... the Medical Act for just 1 year?"

Moeller: "It's my understanding that the... the Medical Act is on a one-year renewal cycle and it has been this practice for over 10 years. And we're just extending that practice."

Sullivan: "There's... there's no doubt this has always been going on for one year to one year to one year, and I... I'm just wondering if it's good for one area of the medical field, why should we not do it for all of it? I think it'd be the better practice to do it more than one year, but okay. So, has there been any discussions to try and change that procedure or that practice?"

Moeller: "Not that I'm aware of."

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Kelly Burke. Kelly Burke. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, Senate-Bills Second Reading, there appears

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Senate Bill 1626, Representative McAsey. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1626, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1626, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This legislation is extending the sunset date on the Mercury Switch Removal Act. Prior to 2003, vehicles were built with mercury switches. What the Mercury Switch Removal Act does is say that those switches need to be removed from vehicles before they are crushed or otherwise demolished to protect our environment and protect people from mercury poisoning. I ask for your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, would you refresh for us what this Bill does in terms of generating revenue to remove these switches?"

McAsey: "There is no change to the underlying Mercury Switch Removal Act but for extending the sunset date by 10 years. So, if there isn't..."

Pritchard: "I... I understand..."

McAsey: "Yeah."

148th Legislative Day

- Pritchard: "I understand what your Bill is doing, but you're extending a law that established a fee so that we had revenue to remove these switches and prevent them from going into landfills, correct?"
- McAsey: "I... I believe you. I did not sponsor the original legislation. And I'm just looking through the Bill file here and unfortunately, the text that I have does not include all of the text for the Mercury Switch Removal Act. It only includes the portion with the... the extension."
- Pritchard: "So, when this Act was originally enacted, most vehicles had mercury switches?"
- McAsey: "I'm... I'm being informed that there is a \$2 fee that is paid by the vehicle manufacturers related to the switches."
- Pritchard: "So, that generates what kind of revenue?"
- McAsey: "And it's not a revenue that comes to the state, but is paid to the collectors of the switches."
- Pritchard: "Do we know how much that amounts to?"
- McAsey: "I don't have... I'm looking at some information from the Illinois EPA to see if it indicates that. I don't have that information... and the information that I have actually I think is about national statistics, not..."
- Pritchard: "But it's \$2 on every vehicle that's sold, correct?"
- McAsey: "No. It's... it's \$2 based on the actual switches that are collected. So, it's not a fee... as I understand it, it's not a fee on... at the point of purchase, but is a fee that the car manufacturers are essentially reimbursing the collector that... the person who is doing the disassembly, taking it apart, taking the switches out of the vehicle. That individual is getting the \$2 fee from automobile manufactures."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Pritchard: "But it's collected on every vehicle?"

McAsey: "Every vehicle from which there's a mercury switch removed. So, vehicles that were manufactured before 2003 in the United States, and before, I believe, 1992 for foreign vehicles."

Pritchard: "So, that's my point. Since those dates, there hasn't been any vehicle manufactured that has a mercury component."

McAsey: "And... and again, to the statement that I made, this is not a fee on auto manufacturers or on consumers purchasing automobiles at the point of the purchase. It is only a \$2 fee that is remitted by the auto manufacturer to the... the scrapper, the person who is taking the..."

Pritchard: "Correct."

McAsey: "...switch out of the vehicle at the end of the vehicle's life. So, it's... it's only on this small group of vehicles that still have these switches, you know, in an effort to prevent further environmental contamination from mercury."

Pritchard: "But it's my understanding that there haven't been any vehicles manufactured with mercury switches, so I'm wondering why there is a need for a 10-year sunset?"

McAsey: "Because there are still vehicles that are on the roadways that were manufactured with mercury switches and are still approaching their end of life. And I would argue that... that perhaps 10 years from now when this legislation is... you know, that sunset date comes up again, perhaps at that point, that's a conversation that we ought to be having about whether there is any utility to having this because, you know, another 10 years from now vehicles that were manufactured before 2003 likely will not be on the road. Right now, today, there are

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

many, many vehicles that were manufactured before 2003 that are still on our roads and that are every single day approaching the end of their life and... and being in this situation where they can be compacted and have the mercury in these switches released into the environment causing harm."

Pritchard: "Thank you for your explanation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andrade: "As someone who drives a lot during off time, so… and of… of means… small means, I just… I had a 1985 Chevy Cavalier and my other vehicle that I use for my other employment is a 2001 vehicle. So…"

McAsey: "So..."

Andrade: "So, my '85 vehicle, I just had to get rid of because I couldn't afford the insurance anymore, so that 1985 vehicle when it went to the scrapper they would probably pay the \$2 fee to recycler?"

McAsey: "To remove the mercury switch."

Andrade: "All right. And so..."

McAsey: "You are absolutely correct. You are describing the exact scenario that we are talking about that vehicles... Yes."

Andrade: "And now my 2001 minivan that I have will probably be aged out and then I have to get rid of that, too, transmission is dying. So, when I get rid of that 2001 vehicle that a lot of people in my neighborhood probably... it's very common to have cars that are from 1980s and 1990s from... in my neighborhood. I see around tons of cars, a lot of people. My wife had a '99 vehicle."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

McAsey: "Yes."

Andrade: "So, I would say a lot of the United States and a lot of people in lower middle... in our middle-class economy, it's not uncommon for them to have a vehicle that's in the '90s and the '80s."

McAsey: "Yes. That's exactly correct."

Andrade: "So, ten years from now..."

McAsey: "And right. And that's why this... extending this sunset date is so very important to make sure that those vehicles that have these mercury switches have them safely removed and have that mercury safely disposed to protect our environment, to protect our families, to protect those middle-class constituents in your district and in mine that are driving these vehicles."

Andrade: "Thank you. Thank you very much."

McAsey: "Thank you, Representative."

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. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2363, Mr. Reis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2363, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. 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."

148th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2363, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis. Third Reading, Sir."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill (sic-Senate Bill) 2363 simply extends the sunset date of the 12 Insurance Acts. It makes no technical changes at all. It just increases the sunset date by 10 years."
- '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 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2921, Mr. Turner. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2924, Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bradley. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2924, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. 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 Bradley."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley on the Amendment."
- Bradley: "This is an extension of the vegetative filter strips, which is a farm initiative. I'd ask for its adoption, move it to Third."
- 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."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2924, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Hello. So, this is an extension of the Farm Bureau's Vegetative Filter Strip Bill. We passed this overwhelmingly in the regular Session. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. Know of no opposition."

Speaker Lang: "Those... Mr. Sullivan on the Bill."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Can you explain the Bill a little bit more than when we passed it earlier and so forth?"

Bradley: "Yeah. As I said, it's the vegetative filter strip for the Farm Bureau... for the farmers. It allows for the classification of strips of filter to keep the... the rest of the land in good shape."

Sullivan: "So, what we're doing is we're classifying a portion of land that will be valued in a certain way other than active crop land?"

Bradley: "Yeah. We've already done it and we're extending it."

Sullivan: "We're just extending it?"

Bradley: "Yeah."

Sullivan: "Thank you very much."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 2 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 565, Representative Lilly. Representative Lilly. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1506,

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill. I understand you have an Amendment, Representative? Let's move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Clerk and please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1506, 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 #3 is offered by Representative Wallace."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace on the Amendment."

Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This particular Amendment is a gut and replace of the Bill. And it simply becomes a trailer Bill to House Bill 6136, which passed here overwhelmingly and was signed after leaving the Senate by our Governor."

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 1506, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you. This simply makes sure that the At Risk Student Advisory Council is a more complete membership. I just want to add two additional members who can help make some of those district level decisions about recommendations coming from the council. I do encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, how many members are on this advisory council now?"

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Wallace: "Currently, there are 21."

Pritchard: "And, again, to restate, you feel that this current makeup is inadequate to reflect the real public policy questions that they should deal with?"

Wallace: "Yes. Well, I feel as if we need to have management, our principals, involved in the council so that as recommendations come forward the council does not have to consistently come back to this Body to be able to begin to implement some of those things."

Pritchard: "So, the policies that this council comes up with are then implemented, is that correct, across our state?"

Wallace: "There'll be recommendations, but I think it's important to have those who would be tasked with implementing them at the table."

Pritchard: "Very good. Thank you."

Wallace: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Guzzardi, Martwick, Riley. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2196, Representative Hernandez. Representative Hernandez. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2216, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2912, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2912, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2912 is an initiative of the State Board of Education, which responds to the concerns that there is a teacher shortage in the state, mostly some regions of the state, and it also addresses a substitute teacher shortage as well. It makes it easier for educators who have licenses from other states to obtain licenses in the State of Illinois and it restructures a substitute teacher licensure as well. I'd be happy to address any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, is there a shortage of substitute teachers in our state right now that this Amendment is needed?"

Crespo: "According to State Board of Education, throughout the state there seems to be a shortage of qualified substitute teachers. The issue with teachers in general, it seems like in some border counties are having a difficult time getting teachers in those districts."

Pritchard: "Is there concern that the standards that other states have don't match the standards that we have here in Illinois?"

Crespo: "Well, one of the things is they want to make sure that State Board of Education... that the... the standards are comparable to the ones here in this state. That would be one of the requisites."

Pritchard: "And I think it's important that this Bill reduces the substitute teacher licensing. Is that funding still going to be adequate to supervise this issue?"

Crespo: "I... I didn't hear the question."

Pritchard: "The licensing fee is reduced in this Bill."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Crespo: "From \$150, correct."

Pritchard: "What's the justification for that?"

Crespo: "It's just to make... it's just to make sure they get more of them in a pipeline, makes it easier to get their licenses."

Pritchard: "So, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good piece of legislation to respond to a need that many of our school districts have. My district is in the middle of northern Illinois and yet we have difficulty always recruiting substitute teachers and regular teachers to fill openings. And it's also good to see in this Bill that we were reducing some fees, which makes it more affordable for individuals to come and work in Illinois. I would urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Fred, I... I understand what you're trying to do is to make it easier for substitute teachers to be able to get accreditation as well as regular teachers, correct?"

Crespo: "Right."

Franks: "I think that's a... I think that's important. Here's the only caveat I want to... I guess this would be for the staff and Governor's staff. I'm hearing so many complaints in my office. I don't know if you are as well, but we are not getting people licensed quickly. So, even when they fill out their stuff and send everything into the state, the delays by the state are causing people not to be able to work and they are exacerbating the situation. I've got constituent requests in my office right now where people cannot get their

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

certificates because the state keeps messing it up. So, if we're going to pass this piece of legislation, I would ask that we have something as well to make sure that they actually implement these laws because even when we pass them, they are meaningless when the bureaucrats fumble at the goal line. I... I've got a lady yesterday who was literally in tears, who cannot take a job, because she has not been able to get her certificate. It's affecting her family. It's affecting the economy. It's affecting the people who need her services, and I see this all the time. I'm going to support your Bill, but I'm hoping people in the Governor's Office are listening right now to get the resources to their agencies in order to implement this Bill, because it will be meaningless unless we actually follow through. And for those of you out there listening from the Governor's Offices as well, I would ask that you start moving these much quicker. We have nurses who can't nurse. We have teachers who cannot teach because we are not doing the job at the bureaucratic level. So, let's pass this Bill and let's send a message that government has to work for the people."

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? Andrade. Please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Rules Report. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee

148th Legislative Day

- action taken on November 16, 2016: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 163."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 2504, Mr. Rita. Mr. Rita. Out of the record. House Bill 2932 (sic-Senate Bill), Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill. Senate Bill 2932, Representative. You have a Floor Amendment on this? We'll move the Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2932, 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 Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Flowers."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 is identical to Senate Bill 574. And the Bill wasn't signed by the Governor because it had not been read three times. We supported this Bill before it passed out and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions. But it does create the Illinois Muslim American Advisory Council which includes the creation of the Illinois... the Illinois Advisory Council. It provides details on the goals of the council, the appointment and the number of members that will be appointed to the council, as well as the term limits. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- 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."

148th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2932, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers. You've already described the Bill, correct?"
- Flowers: "I would appreciate 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? Mr. Franks. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no'. And... this Bill requires 71 votes, Representative. Do you wish to put this on the Order of Postponed Consideration?"
- Flowers: "Yes. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "That will be done. Chair recognizes Mr. Martwick."
- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir. You have a guest with you, two."
- Martwick: "I have two guests with me today, Mr. Speaker. I... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, friends and colleagues, I'd like you to join me in welcoming my wife who's been here before and my brand new son, Bobby, is here. So... thank you. Thank you very much. Come over and say hello."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House Floor. Representative Moeller is recognized."
- Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise on personal privilege... for a personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Do you have any guests with you?"

148th Legislative Day

- Moeller: "I would to introduce my district's community outreach coordinator, Elsa Hernandez. She's here with her cousins who are from Mexico City visiting our State Capitol. And I'd like to give them a warm Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for being here with us. Thank you. Mr. Leitch is recognized."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the House to recognize my Page today who's from my district, an outstanding young lady, Cera Jones. Thanks for coming, Cera."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Thank you very much for being here.

 Representative Kelly Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I meant to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 2932. Would you let the record reflect that I pushed the wrong button?"
- Speaker Lang: "The record will so reflect."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Page 2 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 2504, Mr. Rita. Hurry up, Sir. We understand you have an Amendment. Mr. Clerk, move the Bill to the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2504, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. 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 Rita."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita on the Amendment."
- Rita: "I... I'd like to adopt the Amendment, which becomes the Bill, which extends the sunset for the Boiler Pressure Repair Act for their licensure."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor..."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Rita: "We can debate it on Third."

Speaker Lang: "...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 2504, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "Senate Bill 2504 extends the sunset provision. It's an initiative of the Illinois State Fire Marshal for the Boiler Pressure Repair Act. It doesn't make any changes. It just extends it for another 10 years for the licensure."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor will yield."

Demmer: "I apologize, Representative. We're having a little of delay on the computers over here. Could you just explain a little bit about what... what we're extending here? What's this Act that we're moving out?"

Rita: "It's... it's an initiative from the State Fire Marshal. This was something that we... was overlooked in the past General Assembly, but it'll... it'll expire at the end of the year. What it does, it just extends the licensure that implements and... for individuals that repair and work on boiler pressure vessels."

Demmer: "Individuals who repair boiler pressure vessels have to register with the... with a state agency?"

Rita: "It... it just lays out all the... the requirements that they must meet for those that... to work on them and/or repair them."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Demmer: "Does it change anything about the process that they go through to register?"

Rita: "No."

Demmer: "Or the fees... the fee that they pay?"

Rita: "No. It just extends the date out 10 years."

Demmer: "Keeps the program as is?"

Rita: "Yes."

Demmer: "Moves it 10 years in the future. Thank you, Representative."

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. Burke, Harper, Martwick. Please take the record. There are 105 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Go ahead, Sir."

Butler: "I can fill some time here a little bit for you. Last Friday was not only Veterans Day, which we celebrate in this country, but it was also the 90th anniversary of Route 66. Those of us in Illinois where Route 66 begins are very proud of Route 66. We're the first state to have Route 66 paved end to end. In honor of that, we're starting the Route 66 Caucus to look out for all things Route 66. I invite everyone to Obed & Isaac's this evening for a Route 66 Caucus reception at 5:30 on Historic Route 66. So, I would like to invite all my colleagues there to the reception and to join the Route 66 Caucus. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Speaker Lang: "Thank you very much, Representative. Chair recognizes Mr. Evans."

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

Speaker Lang: "You may go right ahead, Sir."

Evans: "Thank you. Many of my colleagues probably got contacted by my office regarding the formation of a Cancer Caucus. Around the nation, a lot of states have Cancer Caucuses where they push for awareness, information, research to make sure that we're the most informed group with regards to cancer. The richest person in Illinois all the way down to the poorest has been affected by this disease. And we can lead the fight to cure it, but also inform our communities and have all the information necessary to do that and have one centralized caucus where we can go to for information. I'm going to have a meeting this evening, I guess if we're still here for session tomorrow, at 3:30. It'll be a quick meeting just to talk about the scope and hopefully get it going in the 100th General Assembly, if that's what we decide to do. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "You may go right ahead."

Batinick: "I have a three-page letter that was sent to me by a constituent. I'm not going to read the whole thing, but I did want to read one important paragraph. On July 9 of 2015, we received notice from the IDNR that our project was suspended pending approval of the state budget. We were given the option to (a) immediately suspend all activities on site or (b)

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

continue working with the understanding that we will get paid, but payment would be forthcoming until... it would not be forthcoming until a new budget has been put in place allowing the IDNR to reappropriate the federal pass-through funds for payment for the project. Again, I don't want to get into every intimate detail, but on July 9 we had the site in extreme conditions which would have posed a major issue if we were to cease all activities. We had areas of the site which had a 90-foot vertical drop-off. We had pumps running in a 30-foot barrel to keep area dewatered. If they were to continue... if we were to not continue completion, we would have seen major soil erosion, sediment and drainage problems. If we were to stop work, our firm would have been exposed to liability, IEPA stormwater discharge issues that would remain unresolved, on and on and on. So, the contractor did the right thing. He's a small-business owner and he has been owed a \$1 million of pass-through money for over a year for this project that he completed, which was the right thing to do for the state. I have filed House Bill 6422. I do urge for the adoption of this Bill. Once again, this is a pass-through Bill. And this is the sort of thing that... that is hurting the economy and the small businesses in our state. He's owed \$1 million, but all that money's already been put out in labor and other expenses that he had in... in the process. So, I urge the Body to adopt House Bill 6422. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. On page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 950, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 950, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor.

The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No
Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by
Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Can I ask us to adopt the Amendment, which was approved in the Executive Committee. And then I'll explain the Bill on Third Reading."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 950, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a an exemption from the Liquor Code for two restaurants, one which is traditionally been able to sell alcoholic beverages that is the universal and entertainment center which is part of the Christ Universal Temple at 11901 South Ashland in Representative Davis's district. The reason for this reauthorization is that there was a change in ownership. The alderman is supportive of a continuation of past practice and there has been no opposition from the community. The other is a restaurant called Nando's Peri-Peri, in my district. It's across the street from a church, a United Methodist Church, and both the church and the alderman have approved an exemption. The idea is that this is a South African restaurant

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

which wants to sell beer, wine and Sangria. Sangria, for the uninitiated, at least the way they make it, requires some use of alcoholic beverages. I would be grateful for your support as the communities and the aldermen support both of these projects."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 2921. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2921, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. 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 Turner."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to handle the Amendment. Please proceed."
- Currie: "Thank you. I'd appreciate it if we could, again, adopt the Amendment and then discuss the Bill on Third."
- Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, 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 2921, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill would extend the sunset date for a very important program in Illinois, the Affordable Housing Tax Credit. It operates so that 50 percent of donations for certified affordable housing units are available to the... the donor and there is a cap on the program. We've had this program, I think, since 2001 and it has meant that we have, across the state, found a lot of housing for low-income people. Without the extension of the tax credit, there are six or seven projects that will not happen. I was reminded that there is a... a really fine veterans' project that is going up. That would not be affected by this credit extension at this time, but that is the kind of thing that would be affected in the future if we don't renew the credit. I know of no opposition. And I would be grateful for your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I know you were not in committee yesterday when we considered the Amendment, but let me ask you so we can put it in the record here. What is the value of this credit in terms of the impact... potential impact to the General Revenue Fund of the State of Illinois?"

Currie: "The... the cap in 2017 would be 27 million. Over time, we have actually spent 7... 7,435,000 over the..."

148th Legislative Day

- Harris, D.: "Right, but the cap is potentially, if everyone took advantage of this, there are \$27 million worth of credits here available."
- Currie: "Right. But we've never..."
- Harris, D.: "And those... and those credits can be transferred or sold to another entity, correct?"
- Currie: "They... they can be and... but I would tell you that over the life of this credit, which is now I think since 2001, never, ever has... have we come close to reaching the cap."
- Harris, D.: "Wasn't there a... some thought by the Majority Party that in doing credits, tax credits of one sort or another, that rather than do them individually all of the credits would be looked at at one time saying, okay, does this makes sense, does that make sense, should we continue it, should we not continue it. And... and what's the total impact overall of any number of credits which we may grant? Wasn't that the... didn't the Majority Party at one point talk about looking at them in... in total?"
- Currie: "We... we have talked about it. We will talk about it again. The problem here is that this credit expires December 31, 2016, at the very end of this calendar year. With projects halfway done, halfway in the ground, it would be irresponsible not to extend this credit today. I do think that we will continue the effort to try to look at all the credits together. There are several others that will be sunsetting soon and I think we should do that. But in the meantime, I don't think you want to let six, seven, eight projects that are part... partway constructed on the hook and leave them without the opportunity to continue building."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Harris, D.: "Ladies and Gentlemen... thank you, Madam Majority Leader. And Ladies and Gentlemen, just very briefly to the Bill. Twenty seven million dollars, that's the potential value of what this credit is worth to the impact of the General Revenue Fund of the State of Illinois. Granted, not all 27 million may be used, but potentially, it's \$27 million that won't be coming in to the General Revenue Fund of the State of Illinois, in a state right now that has only a temporary... I don't even call it a budget, has a spending plan out there. And we are struggling financially, but we're going to extend this one credit. I'm not opposed to this. I'm going to vote in favor of the Lady's Bill. I recognize the importance. I do contend, however, that it's not absolutely necessary that we do this by January the 1st because there are six or seven projects, if we did it in the new Session, could be grandfathered in. There could be ... there could be documents prepared. Maybe it's a little bit of a legal hassle, but it doesn't have to be done right now. But keep this in mind, there are all sorts of credits out there. The Donation Tax Credit, EDGE Credit is a tax credit, the... the R&D Credit. All sorts of credits which, in my opinion, should be looked at in total because they all have an impact on the General Revenue Fund of the State of Illinois and we're struggling. So, let's vote for this. Let's send it out. It's an important Bill. It does have ... it does help supportive housing throughout the State of Illinois, especially within Cook County. But keep in mind, when we do this one at a time, we disadvantage ourselves because we don't look at things as a whole. And we need to look at this budget and our budget problems as a

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

whole. So, I commend the Lady for bringing it forward. I just wanted to put that into the record for your consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Majority Leader yield?" Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Franks: "Representative, I'm looking at the Bill. I'm... and I understand the... the intent is to encourage folks to invest in low-income housing, correct? My question though is, I understand the tax credit, but is there a fee that's associated with this underlying... I'm not sure how this is funded, this program. Besides the tax..."

Currie: "Well..."

Franks: "...credit, are there fees involved?"

Currie: "Yeah. There is an application fee. But what happens is that a not-for-profit developer, Habitat for Humanity is an example, would decide to do a project in a... in an area of need for low-income housing and would approach others to help fund the project. So, in no case does the development of the... the Donation Tax Credit hardly ever would cover the actual costs because when someone makes this kind of donation, the credit is only up to 50 percent of that commitment. So, there is often bank financing, other kinds of financial tools are used by the not-for-profit developer to make the project work. We have... we have created a... I don't have the number in my head, but a very large number of affordable units through this tax credit over the last 15 years. The Illinois Housing Development Authority is a very strong proponent of the credit and of this Bill."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Franks: "Oh, I'm not questioning that..."

Currie: "Good."

Franks: "...and I appreciate that answer. I'm just wondering how it's funded with the fee. I get the... I get how the developers raise their... their portion of it and go to the banks and stuff. But is there a foreclosure fee or something that's associated with this? I'm wondering what the underlying fee is to help... to help fund these programs, and it's not in our analysis. And that's what I'm trying to determine."

Currie: "All I know about is the \$500 application fee."

Franks: "Okay. So, there's an application, but there's no other...
there's no other fee like adding it on to a foreclosure?"

Currie: "Not... not that I'm aware of."

Franks: "Okay. I... I'll try to do some more research. Thank you."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is just a reminder to the Body as a whole that according to the Comptroller's site, we owe \$9.2 billion to other people for other items; \$9.2 billion, headed to double that if we don't have a budget. This is a tax credit we can't afford. We can't afford anything, nothing. We're broke. The State of Illinois is broke."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I do appreciate the comments about the importance of looking at tax credits as a package, but this tax credit is about to expire. Projects depend upon our continuation of the tax credit. And certainly, any kinds of housing... affordable housing that we will be able to start in

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

February, March, April and May is dependent upon our adoption of this measure, which will extend the life of the Donation Tax Credit so we can help low-income Illinoisans find a way to put a roof over their heads. I appreciate your 'aye' vote." "Please bear with the Chair one moment. Leader Speaker Lang: Currie has moved for the passage of the Bill. This Bill requires 71 votes. 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? Please record yourselves. Davis, Guzzardi, Rita, Turner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, the Chair has an announcement that you'll all find interesting. It is the intention of the Chair to adjourn today and cancel tomorrow's Session. Representative Hammond is recognized."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Hammond: "If the Members of the Body would join me, I would like to welcome the students from Illini Central High School and their... and Donnie Bowman who is also with them up in the gallery. If we could give them a welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for being with us today. Mr. Martwick is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Another baby?"

148th Legislative Day

- Martwick: "No. Not yet. No. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would you join me in welcoming three Pages that I have here today. I have two international students and a student from the City of Chicago. Zev Goldberg is here. Melisa Esponosa Rivera is here. And Ddageum Lee is here. Please give them a warm welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining us on the House Floor today. Mr. Evans. Another caucus, Sir?"
- Evans: "Not another one. Point of personal privilege, please." Speaker Lang: "Proceed."
- Evans: "Thank you. I did make an announcement for a 3:00 meeting for the caucus, but we'll be gone at that point. So, that meeting will be rescheduled when we come back on Tuesday. I'll make sure my office gets all the information on your various calendars. Thank you all again."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Representative Williams is recognized."
- Williams: "Likewise, the Green Caucus meeting that we had scheduled for today will be canceled and we'll reschedule when we return or do a phone call in the interim. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution. Members, we are not adjourning. We're just doing the Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 165, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Wednesday, November 16, 2016, it stands adjourned

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

until Tuesday, November 29, 2016 at 12:00 o'clock noon, or until the call of the Speaker; and when the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, November 16, 2016, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 29, 2016 at 12:00 o'clock noon, or until the call of the President."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. On Page 5 of the Calendar, under Total Veto Motions, there appears House Bill 6299. Mr. Andrade on your Motion."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I Motion to... I'd like to take a Motion to Override the Veto. And..."

Speaker Lang: "Do you want to explain your Motion, Sir?"

Andrade: "Yes. House Bill 6299 passed with bipartisan support.

It's to help our paraprofessionals and it just helps very low wage constituents of... of both sides. And I hope for and ask for a favorable Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, can you explain the original intent of your Bill, again? We didn't quite catch that."

Andrade: "The original intent of the Bill was... it's basically when someone has been working for... in the past, the... when someone was... was laid off, technically, for the summer and to go back to work, a paraprofessional would... they would be technically laid off because the summer is off of school. When they would go back to their form... place of employment of the education, what would happen was they would retain their

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

seniority. And this Bill would allow them to retain their seniority on people that probably make \$13 thousand a year. And some people have been paraprofessionals for over 20 years, 26 years. And what would happen is, there was a situation where that someone that worked 23 years went back and was told, sorry. And this is... and one thing that I would keep in mind is, this is not an unlimited, unendless, infinity. It's basically if you don't go... if you go back that... within the year and the next school session, then you receive your... you receive your... your seniority back."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Andrade: "So, it's not unlimited, it's not infinity. So, it's very... the new people."

Sullivan: "So, you have a... an incidence in a school district, I take it, that this happened? Why would we not collectively bargain that at the local level? Why do you think the state should step in and mandate to the school district how to run their collective bargaining agreements?"

Andrade: "Well, I... I wouldn't say exactly mandate or... it's just a... it's a protection for a very low paid thing. We're just protecting the, you know, some of these people have been there for... and what happens is they were at 20, maybe 6 thousand, and they go back to 13 thousand. So, it's... it just seems unfair that... and it's... we... we've mandated many stuff and we've passed many stuff citywide. It wasn't even... it was... it was brought to my attention and... from... from downstate and I thought it was an honorable thing to do..."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Andrade: "...to try to protect these employment."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you. To the Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, it certainly is noble to want to protect people's rights within their seniority, but this certainly seems like an overreach by the state on something that should be locally, collectively, bargained. That is the reason for the Governor's Veto. And I certainly would think that we would rather trust our local school boards to make these decisions through the collective bargaining process. I certainly urge to uphold the Governor's Veto, and vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Representative, who made the decision in the Kaskaskia Special Education District as to employee benefits?"

Andrade: "Pardon me? I didn't hear you. Can you repeat that?"

Breen: "Well, I... who made the decision about how to treat the employees in the Kaskaskia Special Education District?"

Andrade: "I believe, if I'm correct... I stand to be corrected, but it was still in ar... in arbitration and what happened was, in arbitration, they said that they can't rule on this, if I'm correct. I don't remember the case law, so... But I think that's what happened; it went back to the administration."

Breen: "Okay. But I... the problem is... I mean, the... the fundamental premise of your Bill is that... I'll go to the Bill. I mean, the fundamental premise of the Bill is that the local school board, who are elected by the people, that the administration who are selected by the school board, that the arbitrator and that everybody else, this whole system we've set up, are in... incompetent to set benefits and deal with the employee issues

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

to the point that we have to come down to the State Legislature and mandate from a state level every single school district and school administrator. It just doesn't make any sense. And so from that place, maybe ... maybe this is right, maybe it's wrong. Maybe these folks should've been treated differently. The problem is, the remedy is not here in Springfield. We don't change the entire law of the state because of one thing that happened in one place, no matter how good or bad it may have been. And so for that reason, it was a... a proper Veto. You know, we feel sorry for the folks. Maybe they should have been treated differently and... and may ... we hope that the folks there in Kaskaskia will possibly do something through their school board to help with these folks. But this is not the way to do business. We should not be continuing to mandate on our local governments. We need to putting things back to the local governments. The local government is where Illinois works. The Legislature here is where Illinois does not work. So, we should get out of this and out of a lot of other things that we've put ourselves into. I'd urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Representative, isn't it true that, in fact, most support personnel are not unionized in school districts?"

Andrade: "That is correct."

Willis: "Right. So, they have no protections from their unions.

Once upon a... To the Bill. Once upon a time, I actually was
one of those support personnel in a school district. And it

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

is unfortunate that many times support personnel are let go because at the end of the school year, they don't always know what the future is going to be in that fall and that happens very often. You could have someone that has been a long time one-on-one aide with a special needs student and not knowing if that student's going to come back in the fall or if you're going to have a new student that that person's going to do. I think this Bill is a good Bill. It protects our very vital support personnel in our school districts. I voted 'yes' originally. I will be voting 'yes' to help keep the Bill active and override and I encourage all of you to look at that. Those of you that have children in the school districts know that while the teachers are very vital to the education of our students, it is the support personnel that assist the teachers and help our students maintain a good education environment. And I urge an 'aye' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Meier."

Meier: "Yes. Last time I voted for this Bill. I've been working with the Governor's Office coming up to a compromise. I do not believe this is policy that should be set for the State of Illinois. Children from my district go to this school. What was done to these people was not right, but it should be straightened out with the school board. Our compromise is working on that. So, I will be a 'no' vote on it this time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade to close."

Andrade: "Thank you very... Thank you. I appreciate everyone's opinion and I hope that once you found it in your heart to have... to see the ability to protect these constituents of

148th Legislative Day

- yours and I hope that you find it in it again. And I respectfully request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade moves that House Bill 6299 pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion 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 64 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Chair recognizes Mr. Davidsmeyer."
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."
- Davidsmeyer: "Representative Hammond and I would like to introduce the kids from Virginia and Merdosia-Chambersburg. If you could stand up. We had the opportunity to speak with them this morning, explain what was going on here today and I'm glad they came. They had some great questions for us. And I wish we could give them a great, warm Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for here. Hope you're enjoying your day in Springfield. Representative Williams is recognized."
- Williams: "I apologize, Members, I spoke too soon. We will be still meeting as a Green Caucus immediately upon adjournment in Room M-1. Again, Room M-1, Green Caucus, immediately upon adjournment. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "So, the canceled caucus meeting is back on? All right then. Representative Stewart."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

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

Stewart: "Would the Members of the House please recognize Aaron Bailey today. It's his birthday. And I understand he's not 29."

Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday, Aaron. Thank you. Thanks for pointing that out, Sir. House Bill 5931, Representative Gabel on a Motion."

Gabel: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to pass House Bill 5931, notwithstanding the Governor's Veto. House Bill 5931 raises the base wage for direct service support persons or DSPs, those who work with persons with developmental disabilities, to \$15 an hour. Back in May when we passed this Bill, I described a crisis in the system of care for persons with developmental disabilities. Simply put, the private, state-funded agencies that are the backbone of this system, simply cannot hire staff. That crisis is only getting worse. We cannot afford inaction. Instead, the Governor vetoed this Bill and has not offered any meaningful alternatives. The average wage of DSPs now in our state is \$9.35 an hour. By comparison, the average wage for full-time workers at Walmart is now \$13.38, and Macy's is paying \$12.70. The problem is is that they cannot fill these jobs. There's a 30 percent vacancy rate. And it... for fairness for workers and quality of care for our clients, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Demmer: "Representative, I remember in this spring Session we had a long debate on this Bill and many conversations, both in committee and... and on the floor. And I think one of the... one of the concerns that many people had with this Bill was the total cost to the state. What would the estimated financial impact to the state be of this piece of legislation?"

Gabel: "About 150 million, not including the federal match."

Demmer: "A hundred and fifty million. I have it in my analysis here that the increased costs for caring for people with disabilities would increase by \$330 million per year?"

Gabel: "That... that's including the federal match."

Demmer: "So, a hundred and fifty million... 330 million dollar total cost, 150 or more million dollars to the state. Is that correct?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Demmer: "Do you have any way to... to come up with \$150 million extra that the state could spend on this program?"

Gabel: "So, the issue with this is that the court monitor with the Ligas Consent has said that this is not... it currently... that the wages are too low and that they cannot fulfill the consent decree. So, we can either make a decision to do this now or we can wait for the courts to tell us that we have to do it. I mean, I understand that this is a cost. I... I think that we have to look at our priorities in our... in our budget and look at our General Revenue Fund and really figure out what our priorities are in our system and make sure that our people who are the most vulnerable are taken care of."

Demmer: "So, I understand the challenges that are faced here and, you know, of course we'd like to... to be able to support people

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

who are doing good work in whatever way we can, but we have to face the very real financial challenges that the state sees today. We just talked it about earlier that we have \$9 billion in unpaid bills. We... we know we have a multi-billion dollar deficit between what proposed budgets were and what estimated revenues are coming in. We... we're being pulled in 10 different directions now, and to override a Veto like this would just put yet another burden... yet another financial burden on the state when we already can't... can't make ends meet. So, I... I think the... the point to focus on here is, especially at a time when we can't live up to the existing promises we have made, the state's not in a position to make another \$330 million financial commitment going forward. That's why I urge a vote of 'no' to override the Governor's Veto on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, the City of Chicago, as an example, raised its minimum wage, did it not?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "And... and how did it do that? What... what's the minimum wage in the City of Chicago?"

Gabel: "It's on a ramp. I... I don't know what... what exactly it is now but it's on a ramp to... the increase."

Harris, D.: "Well, that's the... you just hit the... you said the magic word, quite frankly."

Gabel: "Yes. And... and I would be..."

Harris, D.: "It's... it's on a ramp."

148th Legislative Day

- Gabel: "Yeah. And this Bill does not say..."
- Harris, D.: "And... and there's a reason why..."
- Gabel: "...there couldn't be a ramp."
- Harris, D.: "...it's on a ramp, because it gives employers and others who pay the minimum wage the opportunity to adjust to that over time. There's no ramp in this Bill, is there?"
- Gabel: "There... it does not say it has to be a ramp and it doesn't say it can't be a ramp. It's open. It could be."
- Harris, D.: "Well, it's... it's my understanding that... the legislation is pretty clear. It says, you have to pay \$15 an hour."
- Gabel: "Pardon? So, in the past, we have done... we have had Bills that give a three year ramp. Those have not passed. So, this year... I mean, years keep adding on and the wages don't get increased. So, this Bill does expect this to be done in one year."
- Harris, D.: "Right. And... I think that's really one of the key points. And to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Look, I represent, in my... my district, Clearbrook Center, which is one of the largest agencies that deals with the developmentally disabled. I've had conversations with the director over there and he's absolutely right. You can go to Walmart, you can go to... to McDonald's, you can go to a fast food restaurant, and you can make more money per hour in those locations than you can caring for people. People who absolutely need that assistance. But at the same time, what you're doing here... what this Bill does here is impose in one fell swoop a significant increase on the State of Illinois by way of what we are mandating that... that minimum wage to be.

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

If there were some sort of a ramp, then the impact on the State of Illinois would be much less and more reasonable. I don't question that the people who take care of the developmentally disabled and those direct support personnel need an increase. They do. But to come in on a heavy handed one fell swoop, hit us with \$15 an hour, I think is the wrong approach. And just look at what the City of Chicago and other municipalities and other entities around the United States have done. They've built in a ramp. There is no ramp in this Bill. It's the wrong approach to take. The Governor's Veto should be sustained. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Could you tell us how you came up with the \$15 figure? Why is that the magic number?"

Gabel: "I know that there has not been a raise in 8 years. And I believe that the \$15 is considered a living wage."

Ives: "By who is the..."

Gabel: "Not poverty. It's because it takes a family of four out of poverty."

Ives: "That's... that's where you came up with the magical \$15 an
hour?"

Gabel: "That's how we came up with it. People who work shouldn't have to live in poverty. They work hard every day. This is a very difficult job. People need to be paid a fair wage for it."

Ives: "Nobody is disagreeing with you that this is a difficult job. In fact, it's one of the most difficult jobs out there.

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

It takes an inordinate amount of patience to... to work with this... the disability group. And certainly, there's a high burnout rate, which is what we hear from our providers of these services. But even they have not argued that \$15 is the magic figure. In fact, some of them say that their folks would be happy with \$12 or 13, but I've not heard from them that they want \$15, which is why I'm questioning where the \$15 came from."

Gabel: "Well, I'll repeat it again. The \$15 is a fair wage. It takes families out of poverty. This is an amount that came out of a coalition of organizations who work... who provide these direct services. I mean, it's easy for us to decide what people should make here in the chamber, but these are actual people doing the work, people from the ARC of Illinois, the Illinois Association of Rehab Facilities, the Center for Developmental Disabilities and others, the Institute on Policy... Public Policy for Persons with Developmentally Disabilities."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. So, it's interesting that she's...

Sorry. Okay. It's interesting that she was asking for a \$15

wage increase when actually we don't know what the market

price is really for this type of work. We have no idea. We

should let these providers actually set these prices based on

what they can hire folks for. We should let the market decide.

The truth is, though, what I've been hearing from my

providers, is that they actually need workers' comp reform.

Ray Graham Association had a threefold increase in their

workers' comp costs in the last five years, which means that

they can't afford to give the raises that you're talking

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

about. So, maybe we should give them other things that they need to run more efficiently, which is workers' compensation reform. Something this Body needs to do, not just for the not-for-profit community, but for the business community and for government as well. But another thing that we need to be aware of is, instead of spending this money, which we would love it if we had this money to give to this community. We would love it in the State of Illinois if we could provide this type of dollar increase per hour to this... these people doing this work, but instead, what the State of Illinois is facing is nearly \$1 billion more next year just for pension, just for pension. Do you see, the way that we get out of this from the State of Illinois' perspective is that we have to do pension reform first. If we don't pension reform, there is no new money. No new money to be had. And in fact, when I was doing a little thing, because TRS when they lowered their investment rate and decided that they needed \$400 million more just themselves, I had staff come up with a list of what \$400 million would buy in the State of Illinois. Well, when it comes to the disability community, \$400 million would actually move 81 percent of those people currently on the PUNS list into home-based services. Or it's half of the money needed to move half of the PUNS list into home-based care and the other half into community... Community Integrated Living Arrangements. So you see, there's an opportunity cost with every dollar we spend. So, when we decide to raise... with these wages to \$15 an hour and spend the extra 150 million, what else are we giving up? We never make that calculation. But it's the same thing with the pension payment. The longer that

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

we delay pension reform, the more and more this state is going to go down the tubes. We're not going to be able to afford to revive this type of money. So, it all hinges on that. We need to get behind pension reform, workers' comp reform, property tax relief and all the other initiatives brought on by the Governor."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McDermed: "I was intrigued by something you said, Representative, where you said that our two choices were to have a court order us to pay more or to pass this Bill. I'm wondering if you've considered a third alternative."

Gabel: "Sure."

McDermed: "That would be passing a budget. It's our constitutional responsibility."

Gabel: "I think that's a great idea."

McDermed: "I do too. To the Bill. I would strongly urge everyone not to continue down this piecemeal, one-off, non-holistic approach to dealing with the challenges that we have as a state. I would strongly urge everyone here to do the job that we've been elected to do, which is to put together a budget that considers all the needs of all the people in the State of Illinois. Yes, we need to raise this rate. Located within my district are the headquarters of the ARC, Trinity Services, and St. Coletta's. All of whom I have spoke to, and all of whom who would be far, far, far better benefitted if we approached the budget as a whole instead one-offing these piecemeal solutions that don't really deliver the stability

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

and security that these agencies need. Please vote 'no' and turn your attention to an entire budget. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill.

We've heard a lot of debate on this Bill and we all know that
this is one of the most important issues facing us. But all
has been said about the budget, \$5 billion deficit, we have
\$10 billion of outstanding bills. We're spending \$20 billion
this year on Medicaid. Those issues are all in front of us
right now. And so moving forward today, even though we know
how important this issue is, in order to pay our bills and
get our state on better fiscal footing so we can move forward
hopefully in the future in addressing how important the
disabled community is, we have to move forward today and vote
'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill is... it really should not be controversial, but under the current climate, we understand why it is. Like many services in the State of Illinois, developmental services is under serious attack and at crisis-like levels. I received a letter in relationship to this and it says the critical shortage of direct service professionals is threatening the ability of nonprofit community providers to meet the basic health and safety requirements outlined by the Federal and State Laws and regulations for tens of thousands of Illinois residents. This is a... this is not a choice of whether they should just go and work at Walmart 'cause they pay more. This is really whether we will invest into the needed services for people

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

with disabilities. And I understand that, as one of the Representatives mentioned, we need to have a full budget. I think everyone over here and over there certainly agrees with that. But the conditions under which to get a full budget may not be things that we can agree upon, which is why we don't currently have a full budget. If we were simply talking about passing a budget so that we can help people with developmentally disabilities or people who are in senior services or in-home services, we would make this a non-issue and \$15, which is still below... below the poverty line, would be a non-issue and we would all vote 'yes' on this. But because we won't give certain things that are required by the Governor's Office in order to get a budget, then we will vote down all of the good Bills that could help the good people of Illinois provide these services for developmentally disabled people. I urge an 'aye' vote on supporting this legislation and I thank its Sponsor for moving it forward. Even in the face of great difficulty in this Body, we do urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jesiel."

Jesiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. A number of years ago, I worked as a Human Resources Director for a local agency that served people with disabilities, and even then we had a challenge to try and hire good people. It's very... it's a difficult field as we know. It's difficult to hire and retain good people. And there is nothing more than we would like to see to pay them well and attract competent people to do this very difficult job. But in the context of our current economic climate, as much as I would love to be able to support the

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

agency, and I still do, I communicate with them frequently and I know their challenges to retain good people. But again, in the economic climate in which we are at this point, it is very difficult to be able to vote for something outside of the context of a balanced budget which, again, is our responsibility. And so, I would urge us to focus our attention on providing these funds to these people in that context. Let's get back to work on a budget. Let's get this balanced. And let's make part of our budget the priority of funding these people and these services so that they finally get what they deserve. So, I urge a 'no' vote. And I urge that we get back to the table and get this settled. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "So, the system of care for persons with developmental disabilities is in crisis. They cannot hire people. The people are not getting the kind of quality care that they deserve. Our budget is a moral document. It is something that we have to consider when we take this kind of a vote. The court monitors have said that we are out of compliance. And employers... employers, themselves, have said that they need \$15 an hour to be able to fill these positions. Thirty percent of the positions are left open at this time. Many of the agencies that you... that my colleagues have talked about are in support of this Bill. This is not an outrageous ask. This is an ask that is reasonable and that will allow us to take care of our most vulnerable citizens. I urge an 'aye' vote." Speaker Lang: "The Lady has moved to... that the House pass House Bill 5931, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. This will require 71 votes. Those in favor of the Lady's Motion

148th Legislative Day

- will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Dunkin, Franks. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion fails. Chair recognizes Representative Ives."
- Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a point of personal
 privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Ives: "I would like to welcome, today, to the House Floor, the
 Winfield School District eighth-grade class. Thank you for
 coming."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Glad to have you with us today. Enjoy your day in Springfield. House Joint Resolution 163, Mr. Crespo. And I understand there's an Amendment, Sir. So, you may proceed on the Amendment."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. The Amendment lists the recommendations of which waivers to deny and/or accept to the School Code."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Now, as to the Resolution, Sir."
- Crespo: "Yeah, well, the Resolution, as I said before, this is what we do every year. We get the waivers from the State Board of Education. We did receive from them... they transmitted to us 57, out of which we are accepting 56, denying 1 which is a debt limitation for School District 104. They came before the committee and we learned that they do have other options. They can go through referendum. And not only that, but

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

typically they go through a Bill form or legislation to get this waiver; and therefore, it was denied. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Dunkin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, with us today is a gentleman who came all the way from Chicago on the train by himself to watch and observe us, Mr... Let's give him a warm round of applause and welcome Mr. Brandon Volpeda, out of my district."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber, Sir. Page 7 of the Calendar, Senate Joint Resolution 53, Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz on your Resolution."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Task Force Bill.

Department of Ag is neutral. Department of Public Health is fine. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Maybe we could have a better explanation of that? So, this is a task force to work with issues related to feral cats?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Sullivan: "You had indicated that there's some people that are neutral. Are there some folks that are opposed to this Bill?

I... I seem to see some folks that are."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

- Feigenholtz: "Yeah. I'm not... I know DNR was opposed to this in its first iteration, Representative. They haven't come to talk to me about their opposition. I'm not sure if... what their opposition is. They haven't explained it to me. "
- Sullivan: "Okay. I... I see that DNR Trappers Association and Federation of Outdoor Recreation opposed this. And I'm... bear with me, I'm trying to see if we have anything that suggests why they are opposed."
- Feigenholtz: "It's a Task Force Bill."
- Sullivan: "Okay. They... they seem to believe that they're opposed is geared to studying the effectiveness of the TNR Program rather the general management of feral cats?"
- Feigenholtz: "I think management to the Department of Natural Resources is euthanize. It's not management of population. So, I think theirs is a philosophical agreement. I... I think that they just think cats should be euthanized."
- Sullivan: "Okay. So, they just want to get rid of them and you want to somehow manage them through sterilization, I take it..."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Sullivan: "...would be a optimal point? Okay. Thank you for that."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint... we did... House Resolution 1269, Mr. Phelps. Out of the record. House Resolution 1310, Mr. Walsh. Please proceed, Sir."

148th Legislative Day

- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 1310 is designating the week of... the week of September 11 through the 18 of 2016 as Chase Week. Over that course of the week was the chase for the cup, the initial playoff for Nascar Sprint Cup. And it celebrated the 15th anniversary of the Chicagoland Speedway. And I'd move to adopt this Resolution."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davis. Harper. Please take the record. There are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1349, Mr. Sims. Please proceed, Sir."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Sims: House. House Resolution 1349 simply calls on Congress to allow the Centers for Disease Control to recognize and study gun violence as a public health crisis and to... it also commends the American Mental Association for recognizing the same. Currently, the... there's a... there's been a ban on the Centers for Disease Control studying gun violence as a health... public health issue. As we know, there have been numerous people... thousands of people killed across this country who were victims of gun violence. And it makes sense for Congress to step up and allow the Centers for Disease Control to study not only the incidence of gun violence, but also the resulting traumas that result after the gun violence occurs. So, this Resolution simply calls on Congress to... to do that. I'd ask for its passage."

148th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1317, Mr. Ford. Please proceed, Sir."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Resolution 1317 is a designation for portions of Roosevelt Road from Cicero Avenue to Austin Avenue in Chicago only. And we want to designate that as Muhammad Ali Road."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 1384, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1384, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. 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. Page 5 of the Calendar, Amendatory Vetoes, House Bill 5104. Mr. Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise today with a Motion to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 5104. House Bill 5104 deals with privatization of nursing services... just getting to the right page here. Bear with me one sec... privatization of nursing services in the Illinois Department of Corrections. What this Bill would do is require the state to maintain its complement

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

of registered nurses that it had on the payroll and continues to have vacancies for in the budget as of January 1 of this year. This is an issue that is very important to us as we enter an era where we are negotiating consent decrees in court because of mistreatment of prisoners. It quarantees quality care for those prisoners and reduces liability for the state. It does not cost the state any extra money to do this as these positions already exist. The purpose of the legislation is simply to maintain the number of positions that were available at the beginning of January 2016. The Governor's Amendatory Veto dealt with an item that was included in a collective bargaining negotiation that went forward with the Illinois Nursing Association, but the nurses membership overwhelmingly objected and rejected this provision. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not only about making sure that our inmates are safe, not costing our state money. This is also an issue, you know, that we really need to think about within a national discussion of is it appropriate to privatize correctional systems. I stand here today to say there's been nothing but trouble from making the correctional system in the United States of America a private for-profit enterprise. And I believe that this particular action by the Department of Corrections could be another step into privatizing the corrections system in the State of Illinois. I would respectfully ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

148th Legislative Day

- Demmer: "Representative, I'm looking through the... the message from the Governor's Amendatory Veto on this and I think it's worth... it's worth considering whether the Amendatory Veto would have been appropriate to accept. One of the lines in our analysis says that the Amendatory Veto provides language that's commensurate with the most recent collective bargaining agreement with the state's nurses. So, it's... it sounds as if the Amendatory Veto would have brought it in line with the collective bargaining agreement. Yours actually would go beyond the collective bargaining agreement. Isn't that correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Actually, that's not correct. There was a negotiation with the Nurses Association, Representative. But when that contract was presented to the membership, the membership overwhelmingly rejected the contract including that provision."
- Demmer: "And you made... you made a point in your earlier remarks about opposing the privatization of... of correctional institutions. We're not talking about privatizing prisons here. We're talking about, specifically, nurses who work in a correctional institution, right? I mean, there's a very big distinction between a totally private outside prison and positions within an organization, people who perform a specific task."
- Harris, G.: "The... the Gentleman who used to sit next to me, here in this chair for many years, the Honorable Representative George Scully, who is now Judge George Scully, often talked to me about the slippery slope that we enter into here in the State of Illinois. Where something seems innocuous, something

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

seems like, oh, this won't really be harmful, this is not that and it leads us to other consequences. Given the heightened scrutiny of, you know, inequities in our criminal justice system and the, you know, school to prison pipeline and so many other issues, I just think it's very important to not go down this path because it might take us someplace that we would regret in future years."

- Demmer: "So, you're opposition isn't necessarily to having nurses who are... come from a third party, rather it's a... you're... you're opposed to some hypothetical that could under a slippery slope happen years and years down the line if we allow continued... continued efforts in that direction?"
- Harris, G.: "I would propose that we maintain the status quo, Representative. And just for your information, we have a mixture now of agency nurses and INA nurses in the Department of Corrections. They happen to be both represented by different collective bargaining organizations. But I think it's important particularly for our end, which is the highest skill level of nurse, to maintain our existing complement of state-employed nurses."
- Demmer: "Why wouldn't this be more appropriate to be a subject of collective bargaining rather than an action of the Legislature to insert itself into what would normally be a contract issue?"
- Harris, G.: "This is an appropriation issue. And it is by nature of the fact that we are now in litigation over... an consent decree regarding both behavioral health care and there's an ongoing case regarding the physical health care of our inmate population for which we as Legislators and the taxpayers are

148th Legislative Day

- going to be liable, I think we need to do everything we can to be sure that we have the best quality care."
- Demmer: "And I certainly agree with our efforts to protect the quality of care, but isn't it true that this... this piece of legislation, should we override the Amendatory Veto, would actually limit the number of options that the Department of Corrections has in order to determine what is the best avenue for quality of care? It would limit the places they could look. It would limit the groups they could work with to provide that care and it would... it would force them to work with one group whether or not the quality was actually there? Does an increased choice help us make the best quality pick?"
- Harris, G.: "I shouldn't text and talk along with text and drive.

 Could you repeat your question? I'm sorry."
- Demmer: "Sure. This... this piece of legislation actually limits the choices that the Department of Corrections would have. So, in... in looking for the best quality, we have to flexible. We have to look in different places for it. And this Bill would actually limit the number of options that we have in delivering that quality of care."
- Harris, G.: "What this Bill does is limit us, but it limits us to the best option with the highest level of education."
- Demmer: "So, I... I appreciate the... the consideration that you've given to this issue before. Were you involved at all in... in conversations with the Governor's Office about the Amendatory Veto? Have you considered how that may be a path that, perhaps, would be an agreement between multiple parties and multiple branches of government?"

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

- Harris, G.: "Yeah, I always urge and... you know, we had a similar hearing yesterday of which... I can't remember if you attended in Appropriations-Human Services on a similar issue in the Department of Veterans Affairs with the nurses where their... it is... a similar situation where, I mean like, but not exactly like. You know, I'm always open to, you know, talking and working with people. But in... given this situation and the facts that surround it, I think this is the appropriate course of action."
- Demmer: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think it's worth considering that what we have here is not a Total Veto. We don't have an outright rejection of the concept. We have an Amendatory Veto, something that seeks to find a further avenue for compromise. I believe there are some legitimate concerns that have been raised about the flexibility for the Department of Corrections to be able to deliver the kind of care it needs. And this... this Bill... taking this and putting this in state statute may create more problems than it solves. And for that reason, I urge we... we vote 'no' on the attempt to override. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, would you say that this Bill dictates to the Governor's Office how the Department of Corrections should be run in this particular area, specifically, in the maintaining of... of nurses in the department?"

Harris, G.: "Is that the whole question?"

148th Legislative Day

- Harris, D.: "Well, I have... I have more."
- Harris, G.: "This Bill requires... this Bill requires to maintain the existing staffing levels of, I believe, it's a hundred... around 160 state-employed registered nurses within the Department of Corrections."
- Harris, D.: "So, it... it restricts..."
- Harris, G.: "It... it creates a floor. Yeah."
- Harris, D.: "It restricts the Executive from how... how the Executive should or ought to run a department within the Executive Branch of Government."
- Harris, G.: "It certainly sets minimum standards that I think are appropriate."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. And it's my understanding, at least from the analysis that I have, that the Bill represent... and to quote my analysis. Tell me if this is accurate. The Bill represents the Illinois Nurses Association's break from a tentative agreement with the Department of Corrections and it is an attempt to circumvent those negotiations. Is that accurate?"
- Harris, G.: "Representative, I'm going to be very evasive in how I answer your question, so I hope you'll appreciate why. I'm not a party to those negotiations. I've not been in them. What has been represented to me was that the language that the Governor suggested in his Amendatory Veto was language that was negotiated between the state and the Nurses Association. But when that language was put to the membership of the Nurses Association, it was thoroughly rejected."
- Harris, D.: "Okay."
- Harris, G.: "Be... beyond that, I am not party to those discussions."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Harris, D.: "Seems to me that's circumnavigation of the ... circumvention of the... of the negotiation. Just briefly, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill if I may. Number one, I do believe that what... what this Bill does, it restricts the... the ability of the Governor, the Executive of our state, the Chief Executive Officer, to run in the manner that he or she determines best a department under his or her purview. And... and I think that's wrong. We... we can lay out guidelines as to what we think should be appropriate, but we shouldn't dictate staffing levels and things of that nature. But on a... on a different level, and it... this picks up on what my colleague on this side of the aisle just said ... I know many on that side of the aisle think the Governor is anti-union and he's just going to come down and do whatever he can against the unions. But you know, if you read the Governor's Amendatory Veto, the Amendatory Veto indeed follows collective bargaining procedures. It requires that before the Department of Corrections awards a contract that would reduce stateemployed medical personnel, they must first prepare a cost comparison between the expenses of utilizing state employees versus an outside party. And you know, this is something which has been an... an issue of contention between AFSCME and the Governor on other union negotiations. And oftentimes, AFSCME can show that their employees can perform a service less expensively than an outside contractor. So, what the Governor's Amendatory Veto does is, indeed, in line with what other unions in the State of Illinois have sought. And it also provides for a reasonable time to meet with the affected employees or their labor organization negot... representatives

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

and discuss alternatives. My point here is that the Amendatory Veto is reasonable. It protects the rights of employees. To... to seek to override, and totally, the Bill and ignore the Amendatory Veto is... is not the appropriate course of action here. I think we're trying to dictate to the Governor what should be done in a department which he has the responsibility to run. I think his Veto, or the Override Motion, should be defeated. And I would encourage you to support the Amendatory Veto. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris to close."

- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you for the very excellent questions. And to the last speaker's point, you know, I just want to remind the Body that as a Legislature, you know, we often set standards by which the Executive Department runs. That is one of our major tasks here, to set standards and minimums to protect the health, safety and welfare of our constituents, of our employees, and those in our care. I would urge you to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch, the Sponsor has closed. This is on... this is not on this Bill? Thank you. Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 5104. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion fails. Chair recognizes Mr. Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise on a point of personal privilege."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

- Welch: "You know, on behalf of myself and Representative Lilly and Representative Ford and Reaves-Harris, we'd like the House of Representatives to welcome three good friends of ours: Bishop Claude Porter, Bishop Joseph Jones, and Pastor John Harrell from Interfaith Illinois joining us here in Springfield today. Let's give them a warm welcome to Springfield."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for being with us today. On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of Total Vetoes, appears House Bill 4351, Greg Harris. Please proceed, Sir, on your Motion."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise for a second time to... with a Motion to override the Veto of the Governor on House Bill 4351. House Bill 4351, if you remember, deals with maintaining the current standards and levels of care for our senior citizens in the Community Care Program. We all know and I think, you know, everyone on both sides of the aisle understand that as our population ages in the coming years, as the baby boom gets older, a growing cost and a growing liability to our state is going to be managing programs within the Department of Aging and other state departments that serve seniors and persons with disabilities. As we all get older, we are going to need these services. You know, certainly some of our parents do right now. And we need to find responsible, reasonable ways to manage costs and to deliver services in new, effective and innovative ways. What this Bill seeks to do is to protect those folks who are currently enrolled in the CCP Program and prevent a change in their service level that has been proposed

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

by the Department of Aging. I think this is important for us to do right now because this new proposal, the CRP Program, of which you might have heard, which is being, you know, roundly opposed by senior advocates, AARP, and others across the state, is a... a pilot program that has not been tested. And it is something that very well could put our seniors and our... our home... homebound seniors at risk. It's something also that, should it not be successful, those people who are right now able to stay in their community with the current CCP Program, if they're able to get a couple of hours of home care each week, are automatically entitled to move... move into nursing homes under the state's Medicaid Program that will actually cost the state four times as much. It will cost us four times as much to provide the care to which they have an entitlement. So, not only could this be harmful to seniors and their families, but it... this is also very, very much liable to result in directly increased costs to the state. I would certainly... have talked to the administration and the Department of Aging to find other ways and different ways to implement some changes, to work with the advocates, the stakeholders, the caregivers, the senior groups to come to a common understanding of how to do it. But this CRP Program that would result in the loss of services for nearly 40 thousand Illinois elderly is not the way to go at this point. I think it's something that we should put on hold; we should pause it. This is a item which we have appropriated for. It is a program which has existed across our state that works from our biggest cities like Chicago, and Peoria, and Springfield, and Rockford, to our suburbs, to our most rural

148th Legislative Day

- areas. It meets the needs of the frail and elderly seniors. It allows people to stay in their own homes and their communities for the maximum length of time and provides a... an enormous cost savings to the taxpayers of Illinois. I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor, of course, yields."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much. So, Representative, the first question I wanted to ask was are there any other states now that are doing the DON score?"
- Harris, G.: "Representative, this does not have to do with the DON score, this portion of it. This has to do with the service levels and the switch to the CRP Program."
- Bellock: "I thought it included about the DON score also? The front end of the Bill is the DON score?"
- Harris, G.: "The... the DON score is included in the Bill, but it would maintain those levels. And if you'll remember, we did do the DON Score Bill as a separate Bill. Then the Governor's Office and the administration also withdrew their proposed, I believe it was a federal waiver change, I may be getting the term wrong. Moved back their request to change the DON score, but now are talking about moving a large portion of the frail, elderly population to a new level of services."
- Bellock: "Right. I just wanted to point out with the DON score, which I thought was in here, was that the Governor had sent a letter, I think it was to HHS, reiterating that he was not

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

going to change the DON score at that time when we had this discussion."

Harris, G.: "Yes. And that was on a..."

Bellock: "Okay."

Harris, G.: "...a previous Bill. And you remind me of a very important part, Representative Bellock. And... and this... this also envisions us moving to what's called the universal assessment tool..."

Bellock: "Right."

Harris, G.: "...the UAT, something that you and I..."

Bellock: "Right."

Harris, G.: "...as appropriations people, you know, are very familiar with but other Members may not, so if you'll bear with me. The Universal Assessment Tool is a replacement for the DON score. It's supposed to be a better and more efficient gauge of the ability to... of seniors or people with disabilities to stay in their home and, you know, be given the appropriate menu of services, but that... that has not been implemented yet. So, we are trying... what this legislation is, is to protect the status quo for those seniors who under, you know, previous rules and regulations have qualified for home care, from losing their home care arbitrarily, getting different levels of services, which they do not expect or may not understand, and it would allow us to transition to the UAT, the Universal Assessment Tool."

Bellock: "Right. Yes, we're... we're all waiting for the Universal Assessment Tool. I know we've had a lot of discussion about that. But going on to CCP, which we all know is an outstanding program that we've all supported for years and our whole

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

initiative with the CCP Program was to keep seniors out of nursing homes and into their homes and that program has been very successful. But how many people are in that program now?"

Harris, G.: "I can get you a..."

Bellock: "I think it's 85 thousand, around there?"

Harris, G.: "It... it's between... yeah, it's upward close to 100 thousand. And under this proposal, nearly half that number could lose their services under the CRP Proposal. And that... that's what worries me. Not that we shouldn't be looking at doing things better and more efficiently, but you don't roll out a pilot program statewide on 44 thousand elderly people and hope for the best."

Bellock: "I know. We're all concerned and think that's what the Governor was trying to address when they developed the CRP Program. And the Department of Aging came into our committee, described that program. They said they would include the three core missions that are in the CCP Program, but that they also were going to look at addressing the issue of the non-Medicaid people that were within that program."

Harris, G.: "There are a number of ideas that have, you know, you and I certainly have discussed, have been discussed in our committee about, you know, other paths that could be pursued to reduce the state's costs as, you know, the population ages. There are discussions of, you know, different income levels. There's discussions of copays for higher income people. There are discussions of changing the service mix. And I think all those are worthwhile discussions, but that is not what... There's one other and I think this is the probably the most important. It is making sure that those seniors who were

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

enrolled in CCP are also enrolled in Medicaid so the state could obtain federal match. You know, I... I think about 40 some thousand seniors in CCP may be Medicaid eligible. We're just not getting federal match 'cause they're not signed up, so enrollment is another key factor. But that, again, we're getting a feel from what this Veto is. This Veto is to preserve the existing level of services."

Bellock: "Absolutely. With regard to the Medicaid, when we had the last financial crisis with CCP a couple of years ago, we were all on the CCP Program people that they... at that point, I think there was only 7 percent of the program on Medicaid. They have brought that up to 45 or 50 percent, which is what we asked them to make sure and do if we could get the Medicaid match on that. But in this case, looking forward to as you said, I thought it was 85 thousand, if it's up to 100 thousand, I think what the Governor and the administration and Department of Aging was looking at is how are we going to address this? And with the CRP Program, they're trying to address that in another way so that we can move forward in still addressing the three main goals of the CCP Program. And moving forward on that, I think that we're going to have to look at a lot of our issues of which we provide services for as we did years ago when we did initial assessments of children in early education and we made changes to that program at that time. I think that the Governor's Office and the administration, Department of Aging, is just trying to move forward in creating a new program. I think that the Governor, in this override, that we should support him. And I would ask people to vote 'no' on this. Thank you."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris to close."

"Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you, Harris, G.: Representative Bellock. Again, I think, you know, for... for the seniors, for the 44 thousand elderly folks, you know, across the State of Illinois who, today are watching to see what we do, whether we protect their in-home services or if they are about to lose their in-home services, and their families are going to have to decide, you know, what... what to do with their parents or their loved ones. Do they move them into a nursing home? Who is going to care for them? Who is going to take care of their needs? These are, you know, pretty momentous decisions that we'll be making. I think the appropriate vote is a 'yes' vote to maintain the status quo so that these people can remain in their own homes, remain with their same level of services while we continue to work with stakeholders and providers to devise new and better ways to make sure that their life needs are met and that we are able to stretch our tax dollars further. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 4351. This Bill requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Mr. Clerk, committee announcement."

Clerk Bolin: "The Energy Committee will meet one half hour following Session in Room 114."

148th Legislative Day

11/16/2016

Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, November 29 at the hour of 12 noon. 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 of Resolutions. House Resolution 1475, offered by... offered by Representative Stewart. House Resolution 1478, offered by Representative Phillips. House Joint Resolution 164, offered by Representative Sims. These are referred to the Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6628, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. First Reading of this House Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."