121st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3239, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 5010, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 5045, Floor Amendment #1 House Bill 6020, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6041; approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 747."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Dr. Kenneth Gogins who is with Faith Community Assembly in Decatur. Dr. Gogins is the guest of Representative Scherer. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Dr. Gogins."
- Dr. Gogins: "Thank you then. Let us all pray. Eternal God, to You we come at this time knowing that You are master of every circumstance and every situation. We thank You for the privilege of doing the work of the people of Illinois. You... we've come from many places, but we've come with one purpose, for betterment of our communities, our villages, our cities. We ask You to let Your richest blessings be upon this House. We ask now that You would endow our knowledge with perfect wisdom. We understand we need the wisdom to know and understand the business of Illinois. We ask now that You would continue to bless us with health, strength and a sound mind. We cannot do anything without You but through You we can do all things. Now we commend this Body to Your care and Your

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

keeping, knowing You have every situation, every issue that we face in excellent control. And for that we do say thank You. Now, unto Him that is able to keep You, and bless You beyond measure. This we pray... In His name we pray, Amen."

Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge by Representative Ives."

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

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

Bourne: "Thank you. All of the Republicans are present today."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Didn't sound like Mr. Brown. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 117 Members present. And we do have a quorum. Chair recognizes Mr. Mitchell. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Mitchell, B.: "Tha... thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Mitchell, B.: "Could I have a little order, please? Thank you. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to introduce, in the gallery on the Republican side... Will they stand up? We have the IHSA Class 1A Basketball State Champions from LeRoy, Illinois and their coach, Mark Edmundson. So, if everyone could give them a big Illinois welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for joining us today. Representative McDermed."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

McDermed: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

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

Her name is Stacy Linklater. Stacy, you want to stand up for

Everybody? And her mom, Roxanne is here as well."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard."

McDermed: "Give them a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Glad you're here with us. Mr. Brady."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Brady: "I, too, along with Representative Bill Mitchell, want to congratulate as they go out the LeRoy Panthers from LeRoy High School, Coach Edmundson, representing very close to LeRoy, in my district. Let's give them another big round of applause for having the first Class 1A State Championship in the school history of LeRoy High School."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams is recognized."

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

Williams: "I'd like to introduce two very special guests on the floor with us today. We have... from Audubon Elementary in Roscoe Village, we have Jack Lee and Anthony O'Mahony. Wait, all right, I've been working on this... O'Mahony from Roscoe Village, and his brother Lucas, in the gallery. And products, amazing students right from our Chicago Public Schools. Welcome, guys."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thank you for being with us. Mr. Riley is recognized."

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

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Riley: "I'm not sure if they're still here, but there are a lot of community colleges down here, seeing what's going on in Springfield. But there were members of the faculty and administration and students from South Suburban College here, so if you're still here, please stand up. Thank you so much."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Sommer: "I, too, would like to introduce my Pages for the day from the City of Washington. They are Jackson Ward and Jared Flanders. Mr. Ward's mother, Jewel, is up in the gallery to my right. And also present is Jim Gee, councilman from the City of Washington. Please welcome them."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the Illinois General Assembly. Mr. Frese."

Frese: "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Frese: "Thank you. I'd like to welcome today to Springfield Ms. Shani Belshaw who's a graduate of Western Illinois University, and the reigning Miss Gem City 2016, and will be competing for Miss Illinois here in a couple months. She's in the back of the gallery. Please welcome her to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. I think it's the one with the crown, right? Right. Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to welcome to Springfield, as my Page for the day, her name is Rahel Luscher. And she is a foreign exchange student from Switzerland and is a senior at Batavia High School. She's

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

here with an agreement from the American Field Service, and she will be here all day. So, I would like the Assembly to welcome her as our Page for the day."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for joining us on the House Floor. Mr. Sims."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Sims: "I've got two very special individuals with me today.

They're individuals who are joining us. They're winners a... as my Pages for the day... they're winners of my Representative for a Day essay competition. They are standing with me right... right now. I've got Kelsi Sumter. She's a sixth... she's a seventh grader from Lenard Elementary School. And I've got Desiree Jackson... Johnson, who's a sixth grader from Dixon Elementary School. Welcome them to Springfield with me."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for being here with us today. Mr. Clerk,
House Resolution 1156. Mr. Unes."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1156, offered by Representative Unes.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate Tyree Mack with this House Resolution for his outstanding accomplishments and unique character and wish him great success in his future endeavors; and be it further

RESOLVED, That we further congratulate Tyree Mack for being named as Canton High School's "Mister Little Giant"; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Tyree Mack as a symbol of our esteem and respect."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with great privilege that I offer up House Resolution 1156 today. Mr. Speaker, if you don't mind, may I get the Body's attention, please, for this? Thank you very much. It is my great privilege this morning to introduce to you a young man from my district who I think each and every distinguished adult in these chambers can learn from and look up to. Tyree Mack of Canton, Illinois, who is standing just above me and behind me, is a senior this year at Canton High School. He is recognized by both his peers and community leaders as a person of exceptional character and a heart of gold. Tyree was raised by his grandparents. And like many students in my district, he comes from very humble beginnings, but has always made great strides in his short life by learning to develop a strong set of personal qualities and to happily give more to others than he himself has ever received. His teachers describe him as an extraordinarily positive individual who is always smiling. He is remarkably friendly and polite, and never seems to forget the value of being helpful and supportive of his peers. Just about every young man and woman at Canton High School knowns Tyree and would consider him to be a friend. Earlier this year in fact Tyree's talent and character earned him the distinctive title of Canton High School's Mister Little Giant. In addition to helping out his family by maintaining a part-time job, Tyree is involved in several extracurricular activities at school. And at home he helps care for his younger siblings, and in the community he has selflessly volunteered his time with the Salvation Army, the Renaissance Care Center and the Helping

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Hands resale shop. He has a passion for doing anything he is able to try and improve his community, particularly for those in the greatest need. After high school, Tyree plans to acquire a degree in music and business, with the dream of one day establishing... establishing a local organization that serves the physically and mentally disabled. Tyree joins us today with the support of school administrators and community leaders who have encouraged him to continue to dream big and do well. It is my intent for this Body to also offer its encouragement to Tyree as the qualities that he already possesses are so rare yet so valuable to our local communities and to our state at large. Indeed the world would be a much happier, kinder and more productive place if more people could be just a little bit like Tyree Mack. Keep up the ger... great work, Tyree. We are very proud of you and I know that there are many great things ahead of you. And we look forward to seeing and watching your accomplishness... accomplishments and success. Tyree is joined today by community leaders Debbie and Kevin Stephenson and teacher Jodi Everle. And I'd like to welcome all of them and congratulate Tyree. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you very much for joining us and congratulations. Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going back to priority Bills. And we're going to start with some Bills on the Order of Second Reading after we get a report from the Clerk. Mr. Clerk."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 4323. Representative Sims also reported back from Judiciary -Criminal reports on April 20, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 5572, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6200, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6291. Representative Kelly Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 4312; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5566, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5729, House Resolution 1127. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 5628; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 887, House Resolution 1143, House Resolution 1145. Representative Ford, Chairperson from the Committee on Restorative Justice reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 5417. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3297, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6162. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2262, Floor Amendment #4 to House

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Bill 4554, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5604. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5973. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6292. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6123."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 5763, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5763, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid, was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor #1, offered by Representative Ammons, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5763 is a consumer friendly Bill. We've worked diligently on... with the Illinois Association of Medicaid Health Plans and the Department of Healthcare and Family Services to address concerns they raised about our legislation to provide clear direction for Medicaid recipients. We've been successful in bringing all of our opponents together for this Bill. This is an agreed Bill out of committee. And I ask for an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

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

121st Legislative Day

- Sandack: "Actually I was going to make an inquiry of the Chair if that was okay?"
- Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry."
- Sandack: "Is there any notes on this Bill, Sir?"
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Please answer the inquiry."
- Clerk Hollman: "A fiscal note and state mandates note is still outstanding at this time."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. But the fiscal note and state mandates note are still required at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 5907, Mr. DeLuca. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5907, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time prev... on a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative DeLuca, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to adopt Amendment #2 to House Bill 5907. And what it does, is it extends a current exemption for state banks and credit unions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

121st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5973, Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans. Out of the record. House Bill 5201, Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative Gordon-Booth. Out of the record. House Bill 5762, Representative Harper. Representative Harper. Out of the record. House Bill 6125, Mr. Harris. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6125, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Greg Harris, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 was approved in Executive Committee yesterday. It adds some additional exemptions to the 100 foot limit that were brought by my colleagues to amend the Bill I had previously. I know of no local opposition to these Amendments."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3408, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3408, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Kifowit, has been approved for consideration."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #3 just solidifies the language of this Bill. The Bill looks at pensionable salary to exclude allowances, such as travel allowances and club dues. And I ask for the Amendment to be approved."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5912, Representative Moeller. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5912, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Moeller, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #1 is a gut and replace on the original Bill. It clarifies or simplifies the intent of the Bill, which is to specify that cyclists have the same right-of-way privileges as vehicles. Ask for its adoption."

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

Sandack: "A question of the Sponsor, quickly?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields quickly."

Sandack: "Thank you. Anna, is there anymore opposition once your Amendment's adopted?"

Moeller: "No, there is no opposition."

Sandack: "It makes it an agreed Bill, essentially?"

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Moeller: "Ex... exactly, yes."

Sandack: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Stewart is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Stewart: "Thank you. Today I'd like to recognize Highland Community College Student Leadership, and President Tim Hood, who is on the House Floor this morning. Thank you for coming to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Thanks. It's a pleasure to have you all here. House Bill 6162, Mr. Skoog. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6162, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Skoog, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skoog."

Skoog: "I'd like to recommend to adopt House Amendment #2. This Amendment exempts an employer who has a paid time off policy that provides the benefits required under this Bill. It removes the requirement that rights and remedies be cumulative and nonexclusive."

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

Sandack: "A few questions for the Sponsor on the Amendment."

121st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."
- Sandack: "Representative, does this... does your Amendment take away any of the opposition on the Bill?"
- Skoog: "It does take away the... the... yeah. It goes neutral with the... it goes neutral with the Department of Commerce."
- Sandack: "Okay. So, the... the Chamber of Commerce, with your Amendment, would go neutral?"
- Skoog: "They'll go neutral with this, yes."
- Sandack: "All right. 'Cause I see a whole lot of other opponents.

 Are you still working with other opponents to try and get them to neutral or they still going to be opposed?"
- Skoog: "I think they're going to be opposed."
- Sandack: "All right. I... I appreciate that. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. A fiscal note has been requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "That Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 5530, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5530, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5995, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Sullivan. Out of the record. House Bill 3239, Mr. Andrade.

 Please read the Bill."

121st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3239, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments #2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Andrade."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade on Amendment 2."
- Andrade: "Can we... Thank you, Mr. Chairman. House Amendment 2 is a gut and replace that becomes the Bill. I will have another Amendment after this wi... will be a technical change. But House Amendment 2 basically changes the local school council; and this Bill only effects the City of Chicago. It changes the definition of community resident to be age 17."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Andrade."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."
- Andrade: "Yes. House Amendment #3 deletes lines 2 to 6; it was inadvertently inserted. It was a technical change."
- 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. House Bill 1190, Representative Kelly Burke. Representative Kelly Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 1290, Leader Currie. Out of the record. House Bill 2470, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

121st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2470, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record. House Bill 5931, Representative Gabel. Out... Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5931, a Bill for an Act concerning care for persons with a developmental disabilities, which may be referred to as the Community Disability Living Wage Act. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. But a Fiscal Note and a mandates note have been requested and have not been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please continue to hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 5010, Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. House Bill 5045, Representative Mayfield, Representative Mayfield. Out of the record. Oh, Representative Mayfield is in the chamber. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5045, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Mayfield, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "Floor Amendment #4 was discussed in committee. It was House Amendment #3 that was tabled by accident. So, all it does is it's a page and line. It just adds SIU. It was discussed in committee. I did talk to the Chair and we should

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

be good. I didn't change anything, we just wanted to clarify. I did mention in committee that SIU was included in the Bill, and this just makes sure they're in the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "A ques... question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Rita, I... I was confused. What is the Amendment, what does, what's different about the Bill now?"

Mayfield: "Nothing. In House...

Sandack: "An Amendment that does nothing. That's my kind of Amendment."

Mayfield: "...Committee Amendment... No... no, okay. No. No. In House Committee Amendment #3, SIU was supposed to be in the Bill. So, when we moved it out of committee, we moved Amendment #2 not 3. So I did clarify that SIU was supposed to be in the Bill. This Bill just puts SIU in the Bill, as discussed in committee."

Sandack: "Who's in your Bill?"

Mayfield: "Chicago State, Eastern, Western, Northeastern and SIU, five."

Sandack: "So, those five universities..."

Mayfield: "Those were the five that we discussed in the...

committee. I did not change it from those five that were

discussed in committee."

Sandack: "Thank you."

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

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

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 581. Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 581, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is a measure that provides transparency and accountability in State Government awards of contracts in the social services providing that there be notice before discontinuation of a contract and also notice to the General Assembly if there is a insufficiency in funds available for various of these services. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate it if we could put the Amendment on by voice vote."

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

Sandack: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, on your Amendment, it... would it take away the... I see a lot of opponents. Does it address the opponents concerns?"

Currie: "Sorry. Say that again."

Sandack: "On the Amendment you're proposing, would it address the opponents listed in my analysis?"

Currie: "We are... we are trying to meet with the agencies. If they have different time periods to recommend, I'm more than willing to accommodate them, but that meeting has not yet happened."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Sandack: "Okay. And I... I think that the Clerk will verify or clarify. Were there notes placed on your Bill?"
- Currie: "I believe that notes have been placed. I don't know if the notes have yet been filed."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Bellock: "Those were similar to my questions because I think in committee there was still opposition to the Bill, wasn't it, that you hadn't worked out yet?"
- Currie: "And as I say, I'm more than happy to work with the agencies. We're waiting for them to tell us what it is they would like."

Bellock: "Thank you."

Currie: "So, in the meantime I'd like to move the Amendment to...
on to the Bill, and then if there are more Amendments, if
they do have recommendations, I'm happy to bring them to you."

Bellock: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. But a fiscal note and a mandates note have been requested on the Bill, as amended, have not been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be held on the Order of Third Reading.

 The Chair recognizes Mr... Excuse me. The Bill will be held on

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

the Order of Second Reading. The Chair recognizes Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. I'd like to welcome the eighth-grade students form Serena Grade School to the chamber today, along with their teacher Mrs. Hoffman. Along, also, with one of my oldest friends, Kevin Kuhn and his daughter, Ellie. They're up in the chamber right behind me. Let's give them a big Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thanks for joining us. Going to do some Third Reading Bills now, Members. The first one is House Bill 6332, Mr. Beiser. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6332, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill, as amended, does three things and it's the... it's amending the Sexual Assault Evidence Act. It clarifies that the Department of the State Police is required to notify the investigating law enforcement agency of a DNA profile results when there is a hit. It also requires that law enforcement agencies, after conducting an annual inventory of all the sexual assault cases in their custody, they have to provide a written notice of its findings to the state's attorney. And then finally, it provides that beginning January 1 of '17 the State Police must publish a quarterly report on its website indicating a

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

breakdown of the number of sexual assault cases submissions. I'd ask for your 'aye' vote. And I'm happy to answer any questions."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6163, Mr. Crespo. Out of the record. House Bill 4434, Mr. DeLuca. Out of the record. House Bill 5924, Representative Fine. Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5924, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was brought to me by a constituent whose parents have since passed away. He had a situation that has happened to many others who have sick or elderly parents. In this particular case, a sibling had guardianship of his elderly father and made it difficult for his other siblings to visit their father or receive updates on their health. This Bill would allow adult children to petition the court for information regarding the parents changing health status, visitation or burial. I ask for..."

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? Hurley. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Sandack, I'm sorry. I saw your light after I started to take the vote. House Bill 4661, Mr. Jones. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4661, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 4661 is an initiative by the townships to acquire property to stabilize the community. It doesn't provide for any new funding, no new taxes. It allows the communities and the townships to work together to get homes that are foreclosed, repair those homes, and put them back on the tax rolls. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Sandack: "Thaddeus, I think I understand why this is necessary, but can you elaborate a little bit on the genesis of this Bill, what it would do, what it would cost?"

Jones: "So, the genesis of the Bill is to... we have investors who come in the community who purchase homes. This will allow townships and municipalities to create an intergovernment agreement to work together for homes that are either foreclose that are on the tax sale list, take individuals who in the... in the community who have skills to repair homes, give them employment and have them repair those homes, put them back on the tax rolls. There's no new cost to this and it allows them

121st Legislative Day

- to apply for money; so, there's no money that they're applying for now."
- Sandack: "So, a... a township... so, a house in an unincorporated area, we'll just say Rich Township, 'cause I saw that's one of the proponents and it's where I grew up. So, if there was a foreclosed home in Rich Township, in an unincorporated area of Rich, would the township buy the house out of foreclosure first?"
- Jones: "So, the township the... the way the... the intent of the Bill is to have them purchase it, we worked with the Real Estate Association and also with the... the townships. They would have an intergovernment agreement to make sure that they would select the list, if it's ten homes or if it's a hundred homes, they would actually make the standard of which homes they would have on that list for that year. It's a pilot program and it goes to make sure that they're having homes on the tax rolls as opposed to having investors fund."
- Sandack: "I... I get it. I think it's a worthy cause. My... my... I'm just trying to figure out, how it mechanically would work. Would the township buy the property, then enter into these agreements to fix it up and then put it back on the market and get out of the business of..."
- Jones: "Well, yeah. It's not... there wouldn't be... the townships wouldn't be the holders of the properties. So the townships..."
- Sandack: "Well, how do they then make... then how do they get the right, the legal right, to fix private property?"
- Jones: "So, the mem... second part of the Amendment took the authority away from the townships to be able to assume taxes. So, we would buy the... the homes off the tax... tax sales that

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

the counties have, make sure that the homes get back on the market. That's the goal of the Bill. So, hopefully, I explained that right, Representative."

Sandack: "All right. Yeah. 'Cause I'm still concerned. I... I guess I don't understand who owns the property? If it's a foreclosed property that meant a bank or a lender typically took the property away because the owner vacated and/or defaulted on their loans. So, what I'm trying to figure out is what authorizes a township or other unit of government to improve a property in the absence of taking title to that property?"

Jones: "Yeah. At the point of the township acquiring the property, a township would have control of the property."

Sandack: "They would own it?"

Jones: "They would own the property."

Sandack: "Ah ha. Okay."

Jones: "But at the... at... in the process of getting it back on the tax rolls, working with real estate agents and working with intergovernment agreements, the goal will be to get it back on the tax rolls, sell it so the township is not the holder of the property for..."

Sandack: "Right. 'Cause they don't want to get in the business of accumulating real estate, right?"

Jones: "Exactly. And that..."

Sandack: "That's not your intention."

Jones: "No, that's not the intent of the Bill."

Sandack: "It's to flip it, fix it and get it back out on private market."

Jones: "Yes, Sir."

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

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Jones: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the speak... Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, is the township owning these or is this the... the Authority? So, the townships are creating Authority and this Authority is going to own these properties. Is that correct?"

Jones: "That's correct. The Authority will own the property."

Sullivan: "Okay. And so, the method by which they're going to buy these are they're going to apply for grants through the Federal TARP Act. Different grants through the Federal Government is going to be the main source of income to manage this property and buy the… or manage this Authority and buy these properties?"

Jones: "Correct."

Sullivan: "And so, as you put the properties on, you might not sell the properties. You might actually rent them out. And so, that would be another form of payment into the Authority."

Jones: "Well, in rent... well, the goal... I wouldn't want to have them rented. The goal would have... they could... you know, the goal would have create first time home buyers or they can have veterans move into the homes. Once it's repaired, the Authority can do what it wants to create this program and make it effective. The intent is to make sure that homes and the communities are stabilized. We have some communities, not only in my district, but in adjacent districts that have almost 500..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Jones: "...foreclosed homes or abandoned homes. So this would..."

Sullivan: "I'm genuinely, genuinely supportive of your initiative here. I... I my other question is on our analysis it says that the Authority shall have the ability to borrow funds. If this Authority would somehow go belly-up through bad purchases and things of that nature, who would be on the hook for that Authority's borrowing ability? Would it be the townships that created the Authority or would it be the authority itself?"

Jones: "Can you repeat your question, Representative?"

Sullivan: "Well, I don't know what mechanisms that this authority will be... will have to borrow funds, but it does say that the authority will be able to borrow funds. I get that you're going to be soliciting grants and so forth, but let's say that they do enter into some type of relationship where they... they're loaned money. There's a note on this and we don't know how successful this Authority is going to be. Let's go to worst-case scenario that it goes under, that it doesn't have the funds to, you know, keep these... these properties. Who is liable for the note on any future borrowed funds? Is it the Authority itself or is somehow that brings into the townships have some due diligence in this whole thing on... on who ultimately has to pay these funds back? I guess the question is, are the townships guarantors of this authority?"

Jones: "Well, it will be that the townships, but the goal would have the… the Authority. So, it'd be the Authority. So, the goal of it will make sure that the townships, when they enter into the agreement, that they're not holding the taxpayers accountable, I que… or well… liable, I quess."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Sullivan: "Okay. Well, and that... and that's what I'm getting at is that the townships aren't going to be... the township residents aren't going to be on the hook for any future notes that are out there and how all that works. And so, that's what I'm trying to get at is if this Authority goes under it's the Authority and obviously, maybe your... your ability to borrow money might be a little harder because there's no backing of this Authority through township funds. Just like, you know, the state backs the bonds and... and we have certain groups that we back their ability to borrow. You're... we... you're... you're putting it on the record that the township is not going to be liable for any of the default on loans for the Authority."

Jones: "And that's... and that's... that's not the intent and the goal is that if there's, the township applies for no money, gets no money, then this program is not going to be successful."

Sullivan: "Sure, sure."

Jones: "So, there won't be any borrowing. There won't be any money coming from... in and out for the township. The goal is to have the townships work with the municipalities, if they create an intergovernment agreement, to stabilize the homes and get the homes..."

Sullivan: "Right."

Jones: "...then that money would get re... recirculated back into the Authority."

Sullivan: "Okay. Well, thank you for your comments."

Jones: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones to close."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Jones: "I just ask for your 'aye' vote on this important piece of legislation. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves please, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4371, Mr. Andersson. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4371, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4371 addresses Andersson: water authorities in the state. This is a seldom used type of district; there are only 16 or 17 in existence at present time. I would note that, although they're called water authorities, they do not produce water. They're only there to regulate the drilling of wells and in rare occasions, they regulate a reservoir in the case of Effingham, Illinois. I would note that under virtually every other circumstance the IEPA regulates this sort of activity, and so they are somewhat duplicative, although I won't say entirely duplicative. The purpo... the purpose of the Bill though is to bring their statute in line with every other local government entity that I'm aware of, which is that it can be created by referendum and most can be dissolved by referendum, but not water authorities. If you create one, there is no way, presently, to dissolve them. This Bill would address that. It would

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

create a voter referendum that would allow them be... to be dissolved, if the voters of the district wish that to occur. I would note this dissolves no districts, no districts at all, it only creates that option if the people of the district wish to do so. I'm happy to take any questions, would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Andersson, for this. Can you just clarify for what reason would we want to dissolve a... a water authority?"

Andersson: "Sure. I can give you one example up in my area. I had a mayor come to me and discuss the option because the district had become, in... in the mind of the village, effectively inactive. It was regulating, not water so much, as boundaries between two communities. Those boundaries became established and because of that the relevance of the district ceased to really be relevant. And so it still exists, can't get rid of it. I believe they levy a small tax, but they really do nothing. And so, that would be an option."

Ammons: "And would... would the option to get rid of the water authority in a particular community, would that option... How would the water be managed then? Does it go to the next city or town or who... whoever..."

Andersson: "The... it's an excellent question. For the most part, there would be no impact to that because I said water authorities don't manage water. That's the misnomer. All they do is regulate drilling. Once the drilling is done, they're done."

Ammons: "Thank you very much."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Andersson: "You're welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Those... 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Unes. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Unes: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Unes: "Mr. Speaker, with us today, in the back of the gallery behind me, are the planning and development directors for both the City of East Peoria and the City of Washington. I'd like to please recognize and welcome, if they would rise, Ty Livingston and Jon Oliphant from East Peoria and Washington. Welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome, gentlemen. Thanks for being here with us.

House Bill 4377, Representative Mayfield. Representative
Mayfield. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4377, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you. This is the used car Bill. It's come before this General Assembly last year. It was vetoed by the Governor. Asking that we spend some time and work with the independent car dealers, they felt that they were being singled out in the Bill. We have reached out to them several times and we'll probably continue the conversations with them on this. But we did give them some of the concessions that

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

they asked for. We reduced the... the warranty period or the notice period for the car purchaser from 15 days down to 5 days, which they said was acceptable. We changed it so that they're not responsible for the entire car, but just the power train components of the car; and I believe those are outlined in the Bill. And we also removed a Section that required them to pay remedies to the purchaser of the car. So, it looks like we are on the road to a really good Bill. As I stated, we are still having conversations with them because we want to make sure that the Governor signs the Bill. So, if there are any additional changes that happen in the Senate, it will come back here on Concurrence. Right now, I think we're okay, but just in case they come back, we want to make sure that we are covering everything that they're asking us for."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Rita, I remember the... the vote on the floor. I remember the override attempt and I'm pleased that you're continuing to work with all of the stakeholders..."

Mayfield: "Yes."

Sandack: "...but if... if I heard you correctly, it's not quite there yet. And you're hoping to pass it out and work on it in the Senate. Is what I'm... think I'm hearing?"

Mayfield: "Right. And that's... that's my intention. We talked to them, we received an e-mail response back to them. They were fine with the changes that we had put in the Bill, but they had not spoke to all of their members. So, they did indicate

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

that they may come back with another change. So, we just want to give them that opportunity."

Sandack: "So, can I ask you a favor? Why don't you take it out of the record and let that process evolve rather than, I mean, we're not under any huge rush."

Mayfield: "Well, I think..."

Sandack: "I think a better process would be just to wait, don't move the Bill now, hold it. Get any other input, change, if change is needed, or you can say it's an agreed Bill. Because I still see... show the Governor as opposed and I know you just said you want to get a Bill to him that he'll sign."

Mayfield: "Right. I have not spoken to anyone in the Governor's Office. We have spoke to individuals in the... from the Independent Used Car Dealership Association and I believe the keyword is 'may' because they said that they had not talked to all of their members and they 'may' have changes. So, I..."

Sandack: "They may not."

Mayfield: "...don't want to hold the Bill up on a 'may'. You know, I'd... if there is a change that they're asking for, we'll just bring it back on Concurrence. And I don't think they're... that the Body should have an issue with that because we are working with them. We've been very transparent in the process and we're definitely trying to get something that the Governor will sign."

Sandack: "Thank you for your answers, I appreciate the conversation. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This week and last week it's been very rushed in committee and we've... we heard our colleague say I'm going to vote to get this out of committee so it gets to the floor. And it's kind of

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

eviscerated, in many respects, the committee process. It just happened earlier today, where we just passed a massive Bill out of committee, even though almost everyone agreed it wasn't primetime. So, then sometimes Bills come to the floor, but we're not under a truncated schedule. We're not on an expedited schedule, but when we say, hey, it's almost soup On... you know, there may be additional comments, but I would have worked on it going the other way. We are really eviscerating good process in exchange for fast process and when you have fast rather than studied and thoughtful, mistakes happen. We shouldn't be doing it this way. I respectfully ask that... that the Sponsor take it out just 'cause it wasn't fully vetted yet. There may not be another Amendment, which is cool, but there may be. In which case, we're going to amend something on Concurrence. Again, we're not using our time wisely. We're acting in a rushed fashion when we shouldn't, so I'm going to vote 'no'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just... question for the Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "And I... I apologize. I wanted to ask you this as soon as you got finished with your explanation. But I'd like to know can I have an appointment for an oil change?"

Mayfield: "I don't do those."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield to close."

Mayfield: "Okay. I'd just like to say that this Bill was vetted in committee. There was not passed out on a commitment or

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

anything el... like that. As I said, we are continuing, you know, everything has been open. It's been transparent, and we believe that we've got a good Bill here. We've included a lot of the things that they've asked for. You know, I don't know how many members they have or if they're still even waiting for a response. We have not heard back from them since the last e-mail and this does include the... what they asked for in their last e-mail. If there is another change that they're asking for, we'll bring it back. That's all I'm saying. But I don't want to hold the Bill in committee on a maybe or an if when we are fully working with this particular entity, and we are doing things in a very transparent manner. So, I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6285, Representative Moeller. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6285, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 6285 concerns mobile home park owners and tenants. Essentially, it does three things. One, it outlines notification requirements when a tenant receives a fine from a mobile home park owner. Two, it prohibits the park owner

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

from deducting fines from rent payments for up to 45 days after the fine has been issued. And thirdly, it prohibits the park owner from refusing to accept a rent, if a fine is owed, up to 45 days after the fine is issued. This final Bill is the result of negotiation between the mobile home park owners and the Homeowners Association. It is an agreed to Bill. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack. Gentleman does not wish to speak.

 Those in favor of the Bill 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 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Leader Durkin for an announ... an introduction."
- Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege.

 I am honored to have with me today, over my left shoulder, is
 the… the… in the gallery, Coach Scott Walker and the Lyons
 Township High School swimming and diving team, who are the
 newly minted state champions. The first time in school history
 they've won the State Championship for diving and swimming.
 I wish we… this gall… this Body can extend them a very warm
 Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Thanks for being with us today. House Bill 6167, Representative Sente. Out of the record. Let's try again. House Bill 4532, Representative Sente. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4532, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "House Bill 4532 amends the State Universities article of the Pension Code and it's an initiative of SURS. The Bill contains various cleanup language but the main provision is to codify a current contractual practice that states if an employee does not select their own investment fund for their self-managed plan that they will place into a default plan. There are no opponents and the Bill passed unanimously out of Pensions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Real briefly, a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "I apologize, Carol, I... because there was a lot of commotion. This is a fully agreed upon Bill?"

Sente: "Yes."

Sandack: "No opponents?"

Sente: "No opponents."

Sandack: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Sente, would you like to vote for your Bill? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4327, Representative Bellock. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4327, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4327 is a Bill that is supported by the Cook County Public Guardian and DCFS. And all it does is it provides an exemption for active military to execute a short-term guardianship, 30 days past their active service."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 746, Mr. Verschoore. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 746, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore."
- Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm looking for another Amendment on this Bill, so take it out of the record for right now."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman asks that his Bill be taken from the record. House Bill 4558, Mr. Bennett. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4558, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bennett."
- Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, House Bill 4558, it amends Section 2.24 of the Wildlife Code to include some additional offenses for which someone who violates those Sections while deer hunting may, and I repeat may, have to appear before a judge. This is an additional tool. Conservation Police officers can use to help thwart the more

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

serious offenders of our deer hunting regulations. I do want to note, I appreciate the great work with Representative Costello, the Illinois Farm Bureau and the Conservation Police Lodge to craft appropriate and agreeable language. This Bill passed out of the Ag Conservation Committee on a vote of 17 'yes' and 0 'no'. It does not add any... add any new offenses to the Act, nor does it increase statutory penalties. It's supported by the Conservation Police Lodge, the Department of Natural Resources, the Illinois Federation of Outdoor Resources and the poni... Police Benevolent and Protective Association. I ask for an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1056, Representative Tabares. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1056, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Tabares."

Tabares: "Yes. This Bill recognizes the distinctions between vehicles and manufactured homes by providing language treating licenses for dealers of manufactured homes differently than car dealers. The Secretary of State may adopt any rules necessary to implement the provisions in this Bill. The language is similar to Senate Bill 1702 that passed the General Assembly last year, but was subject to an Amendatory Veto of the Governor. This Bill includes the suggested changes from the Governor's message. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6304, Leader Durkin. Out of the record. House Bill 4996, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4996, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4996 is an initiative that has been supported by the Department of Children and Family Services, National Association of School Social Workers, CPS and many others. The Bill does not have any opposition. It allows each school board to designate at least one employee to act as a liaison to facilitate the enrollment and transfer of records of students in the legal custody of DCFS. Currently, we have over 11 thousand school age children, who are wards of the state, who exist in over 860 school districts. It is extremely difficult to keep track of and provide proper services to the wards of our state. This initiative will help us serve them better, and I ask this Body for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Representative, we had a... a two good vettings of this in committee. And I think it's fair to say that you listened

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

to your colleagues and you changed the Bill from, arguably a mandate, to unquestionably permissive in nature. Isn't that correct?"

Welch: "That is correct, Representative."

Sandack: "And obviously, the intention I always supported. I think this is a good Bill. So, thank you for being collegial and interactive with your colleagues."

Welch: "Thank you for your guidance."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Flowers? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, HJRCA26. Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 26 would allow voters to choose whether they wish to amend the Illinois Constitution to increase the income tax on millionaires to provide additional funding for education across the state. If approved by the voters, individuals reporting net income over \$1 million would be taxed an additional 3 percent, but only the portion of their income that exceeds 1 million following deductions. All revenue from this tax is required to be distributed to local school districts on a per pupil basis. The tax is estimated to generate approximately \$1 billion annually in new revenue for education, with school districts receiving roughly \$530 per pupil. This proposal is not a

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

partisan issue. An advisory question on this issue was put to voters in November of 2014 at the General Election, and it received overwhelming approvals statewide. Over 60 percent of the voters voted in support of the referendum in both Democratic and Republican districts. Of the 118 districts, over 50 percent of the voters supported this issue in 113 districts, so there were only 5 districts where the referendum failed to receive 50 percent. The referendum received over 50 percent of the vote in 42 House Republican districts. Let me repeat that. The referendum received over 50 percent of the vote in 42 House Republican districts. The referendum received over 60 percent of the vote in 12 districts currently represented by a House Republican, including the districts of Representatives McAuliffe, Cabello, Moffitt, Butler, Demmer, Unes, Hammond, Bourne, Wojcicki Jimenez, Hays, Kay and Bryant. Quite frequently this chamber is called the Body of the Legislature that's closest to the people that we represent. People of your districts have spoken. It's time to listen to their voice, not the voice of the 1 percenters or those who would put profits ahead of education. Clearly the residents of your districts support this measure. And I hope you'll vote with their wishes, and vote 'yes'. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Mr. Speaker, you listed a number of my colleagues' districts with respect to polling or results from the referendum question that was advisory. Have you polled and/or taken a look at districts, perhaps other than those, maybe

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- even your own with respect to term limits and the popularity of term limits as a potential question?"
- Madigan: "Mr. Sandack, I support term limits as administered by the voters of the state."
- Sandack: "My question was whether you had taken the time to maybe consider putting that question to the electorate for, while you may consider it an election, what your voters and what my voters think. Isn't that a question that also should be posed?"
- Madigan: "Members of your political Party and Governor Rauner subjected me to a vote of the people in the last Primary Election, and I won overwhelmingly, thank you very much."
- Sandack: "I... I don't know what you're referring to but elections are elections and I... perhaps someone put the gentleman up, perhaps it was his own volition. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it matters and you did win overwhelmingly, so congratulations. My question still, Sir, is don't you think term limits... because I... I have a feeling we're going to hear an array of potential questions to put before the electorate come November. Why wouldn't term limits be a perfect question to ask the lect... the electorate about?"
- Madigan: "Again, Mr. Sandack, term limits are administered by the voters. Every time there's an election in Illinois the voters administer term limits. If they choose to retain someone in office, that's what they do, if they choose to turn someone out of office, that's what they do."
- Sandack: "Okay. I guess you... the answer is you're not going to let that be taken before the people. So, to the question that's presented today, isn't it accurate to say that for the

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

first time in Illinois history we would have in our Constitution language that put out a tax rate for those who make a million dollars or more?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Sandack: "And in 10 or 15 or 20 or 50 years would it still be appropriate to have that language in our State Constitution, unamended?"

Madigan: "It will remain in the Constitution unless removed by a referendum vote of the voters."

Sandack: "Are you aware of any other instance other than the present Motion where we have sought to insert in the Body of the Constitution a tax sum or bottom line... bottom line for a tax?"

Madigan: "Not to my knowledge."

Sandack: "Okay. So, this would be unique, would it not?"

Madigan: "Apparently it would be."

Sandack: "Are you aware of any other state that has in their State

Constitution a tax rate that puts in an amount equal to 3

percent or whatever percent of a million dollars or more being

required to... to be an upper tax or a new tax?"

Madigan: "To the best of my knowledge, no."

Sandack: "So woul... this would be unique to the best of your knowledge as well?"

Madigan: "The answer would be yes."

Sandack: "Okay. You're... you've served quite a historic tenure.

Have you ever sought to put in this type of Constitutional question before today, Sir?"

Madigan: "I've offered this Resolution, I believe, last calendar year."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Sandack: "Right. That was the referendum question that was advisory, right?"

Madigan: "No, it was offered to the House of Representative."

Sandack: "Oh, that's right. And it didn't get the requisite number of votes."

Madigan: "You probably voted 'no'."

Sandack: "I did vote 'no', Sir."

Madigan: "Now you remember, right?"

Sandack: "I do remember, thank you for refreshing my recollection.

So, in the absence of th... of last year, there was no previous instance where you sought to put a Constitutional Amendment question before the electorate setting a millionaire's tax into the Body of the Constitution?"

Madigan: "Mr. Sandack, I lost the line on your questioning, but to my knowledge, I offered this Resolution last calendar year and I'm offering it today. There may have been other instances by other people, but I don't recall them right now."

Sandack: "Okay. Thank you for answering my questions, Mr. Speaker. To the proposed Constitutional Amendment, Mr. Speaker. This is happening, not in a vacuum, this is a political question in a politically heightened time. And I suspect we're going to see a series of other Constitutional Amendment questions put to the electorate, not for the propriety or for the truth of the matter asserted, but for other purposes. And I find it slightly disheartening when we can't even... when we're going to have 5, 6, maybe 10 questions on the ballot. One of them won't be term limits, which we know... we know is a popular entity... a popular belief by the electorate. They want to do that. And we frankly, one person, is prohibiting that from

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

actually going forward. So, while you vote 'yes' because it's politically helpful, let's be honest with ourselves this is not a true vote on the question at hand. It's a political 'gotcha' moment. We're still not doing what we should be doing, Ladies and Gentlemen. We're still not addressing the real matters of the state, that matter which is a budget. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will Speaker Madigan yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields."

Sullivan: "Speaker, this Bill is being put forth to raise money for education. Can you tell me the nuts and bolts on how that money would be distributed out into the schools?"

Madigan: "It will be distributed on a per pupil basis."

Sullivan: "So, it raises x amount of billions of dollars divided by how many students and then you're going to get... then and... that's how it's going to be put out?"

Madigan: "We... we estimate that we'll raise approximately \$1 billion a year..."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Madigan: "...which would equate to about \$530 per pupil."

Sullivan: "And that's assuming that these millionaires actually stay in the state?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "There's another Constitutional Amendment that is being proposed by Representative Mitchell in regard to changing the way we tax in general, moving to what's considered a graduated income tax. Is that something that you support?"

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Madigan: "I would support the proposal to eliminate from the Illinois Constitution the language which provides that the Illinois income tax is a flat rate tax because I believe that where there is taxation the taxation ought to be based upon the ability to pay."
- Sullivan: "Okay. So, let's fast forward after the election and both of these pass, and they are going to become law. You have House Bill 693, by Representative Lang, that is a complement to the Constitutional Amendment of Representative Mitchell. And in there, presently there's embedded, a certain amount of rates. The rate for those making a million dollars or above is 9.75. Should all these somehow, magically, become law, how does your present Bill, that we're discussing, effect Representative Lang's rendition of what he would do to millionaires?"
- Madigan: "The Bill filed by Lang could be amended. So, it's filed.

 To my knowledge it has not been... maybe it is referred to a committee, but obviously, the... the Lang Bill could be amended."
- Sullivan: "So, magically, we could come in after the election and change it from just affecting 1 percent of the population to embedding people even lower than that down to whatever we so choose?"
- Madigan: "That would be the power and the authority of the Legislature, if the Constitution were to be amended."
- Sullivan: "Okay. My line of questioning wasn't going to go down that path, but I'm glad you brought it up. 'cause that's some of the concerns we have with what is being discussed as more of a political Bill on let's tax the millionaires and 99

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- percent of everyone else gets a tax break. But I want to stick on this because this is the one before us. So, if Lang's Bill would become law and it did not get amended, you, in essence then, would have a 12.75 percent tax rate on those people making over millionaires. Is that correct?"
- Madigan: "Well, your calculations are correct, if they were to all work out."
- Sullivan: "If... if they would all get on the ballot and they were...

 don't you think that 12.75 tax rate is a little disheartening
 to the people that are job creators in this state?"
- Madigan: "Well, maybe you can help me. How would it compare to other states?"
- Sullivan: "I think it'd be one of the top states around if we had a 12.75 tax rate. And I do not have that answer in front of me, but I'm fairly confident, I have not seen too many rates that high."
- Madigan: "If you're interested, California's currently at 13.30."
- Sullivan: "Okay. So, how about the ones that we are more comparison to in the Midwest?"
- Madigan: "I'm searching through this right now, but I know that in the case of Wisconsin, they're currently at 7.75 and Iowa is at a higher level also."
- Sullivan: "So, a person like r... like Mr. Uihlein who lives in my county, why would he just not move over into Wisconsin, like he did with his business?"
- Madigan: "Well, again, to re... fully answer your question.

 Wisconsin's currently at 7.65 and Iowa's currently at 8.98.

 Those are the current rates in those two states."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Sullivan: "Okay. But the difference is even without your Amendment, and Representative Lang's passes, we're at 9.75. So, we're already above them and so we're at a competitive disadvantage. If we add yours to that, then we're at 12.75, which is almost borderlining on obscene to the people that are creating jobs, that are creating you know jobs, for the middle class. So, well, thank you for your questions. I just wanted to bring up that these two are not in a vacuum. You have to look at them all together and see what we're doing to put out the projection of, we don't want you here, we want you to move somewhere else where you have a favorable tax climate and this is what this is doing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Mr. Speaker, I know you've already answered in the previous... one of the previous questioners that this is perhaps fairly unique that there is a \$1 million explicit number in your Resolution for the Amendment. As I read it, and correct me if I'm wrong, there's also nothing in here that would index this for inflation in any way. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Fortner: "So, when I look at the tables right now, I see that a million dollars of... if that were a household income... I assume that this would be applicable to household income in terms of how we would be doing the tax... that's about two-tenths of one percent of the households, at least using U.S. tables. Does that sound about right?"

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Madigan: "I'll take your word for it."

Fortner: "Okay. That's at least what it was... what was showing up when I did a... this is probably a few years old because these things are always updated every year, but to the Resolution. Inflation, as we know, is a thing that eff... that affects everything we do, the costs as we go forward. And a million dollars household income today is probably a couple tenths of a percent of the population. Doesn't sound like it affects very much, but there's inflation. The language in our Constitution that this would seek to amend was approved by the voters in 1970. At that time, the value of a dollar was much stronger than it is today. And in fact, you can go to inflation calculator and you could ask, well, suppose I had a million dollars in the year 2016, what is that worth... would that have been worth had this language existed in 1970 when the Constitution was passed. There's a number of different calculators you can look up on the web that use the CPI inflation rate, and the answer is about \$163 thousand. So, had this gone into effect and put an equivalent amount, that was two-tenths of one percent, in terms of that same buying power that's \$1 million today that would be a household income of about \$163 thousand. Well, again, going back to around 2010, that corresponds to the upper 5 percent. So, we've gone from two-tenths of one percent of the households looking forward over the time since our Constitution was passed that has grown to being 5 percent of the households. Is that ... well, you know, maybe that's not such a problem maybe that can be changed, but this is language in the Constitution. It doesn't change easily. It's hard to get the requisite votes to put

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

these things on the ballot, then they have to pass the voters. And I think there's an important lesson that we need to look at as to what happens if you don't account for inflation in some of your tax policy. In 1982, the Federal Government passed the alternative minimum taxes away to make sure that the very highest wage earners pay their fair share. Passed by Congress, everyone said this is the way to do it. They put in tables, but they didn't set up an index for inflation. By the 1990s, only 10 years later, they were struggling because of people who they really had never intended to fall under the rules of the alternative minimum tax were starting to be affected. And by the 2000s this was increasing, and Congress was finding itself having to do stopgap measures continually adjust the AMT because it kept grabbing more and more people. Because the power of inflation, people's household income was going up as it does both through their own hard work and through the power of inflation. Fi... It was only finally in 2013, that President Obama signed a real final correction to the AMT that says we are going to index this to inflation going forward. So that the eternal problem that Congress had been wrestling with to not catch people for whom it was not intended because of the power of inflation it was finally corrected. The problem with the language here is exactly the problem that the Federal Government faced with the AMT. The difference, however, is the AMT was a statute, an Act that Congress can change. And even though it was an Act that Congress could change, without going through a Constitutional process, it still took them over 30 years to finally get the correction in. Changing a Constitution is

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

harder still, and there's no easy way, as there was for Congress to put short-term patches and fixes in place to make sure that for a given tax year people wouldn't get caught inappropriately by the alternative minimum tax. That's not going to be an option if it's a Constitutional Amendment. The number one million, the number 3 percent are going to be hardwired there in a way that we cannot overcome because we said, oh, you'll get ... you know, we really wanted to get the people who had that really top income; and maybe 20 years from now we are stuck grabbing up 2 or 3 or 4 percent, not two-tenths of one percent. That's a problem that's inherent in the language and you know, it's easy to say, well, you know, million that's... that's so far off. But instead, think about an income of 162 thousand. 163 thousand. That doesn't sound maybe so far off as \$1 million. It might still be far off, but not so far off because that's what's happened over the time since we passed this Constitution. And I think we need to learn the lesson, that it took 30 years for the Federal Government to figure out, that if you're going to do this you need to have an inflation index. I think this language is fundamentally flawed for that reason. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Riley in the Chair. The Chair recognizes Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Speaker yield, please?"
Speaker Riley: "The Speaker will yield."

Kay: "First of all, I think we all owe you a hail and hardy happy birthday, Mr. Speaker. And I... I congratulate you on your 74th. Now after this speech, I'm not sure I'll make it to my 74th,

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

but I'm going to try. Let me ask a couple of... of just really simple questions 'cause I... I couldn't... I couldn't compete with Mike Fortner on... on his level. But is positive adjusted gross income good for growth?"

Madigan: "Could you repeat that?"

Kay: "Is positive adjusted gross income good for growth in Illinois?"

Madigan: "Well, I presume that it is, but if it's not, please tell me."

Kay: "Well, your answer is correct, so the opposite of that would be them the negative. If we had negative adjusted growth income, that would be very bad for the state. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. Speaker, would you rather pass or put this Amendment on next year's ballot or would you rather bring 100 thousand jobs into this state or keep them in this state, which equates to about \$7.5 billion of revenue to the state?"

Madigan: "Well, Mr. Kay, I wouldn't treat it as an either or. I would be for both."

Kay: "Okay. Well, let me see if I can't change your mind on that for just a moment. I... I'm sure as Florida hears this debate they're saying welcome to Florida for those millionaires who are in Illinois. Would it surprise you, Speaker, if I told you that since the year 2011 we've lost \$26.1 billion to certain states. Would that surprise you?"

Madigan: "Mr. Kay, I just wouldn't know."

Kay: "Okay. Well, it shouldn't because it's true. Six point two
went to the state that is listening to us today and really

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

interested in this because 6.2 billion went to Florida, 2.5 billion went to California, another 2.5 billion went to Arkansas, another 2 billion went to Tennessee, and guess what another 2 billion went to Wisconsin. So, I guess my question is just this, if we're losing billions of dollars to other states, and that becomes prevalent and continues, adjusted gross income no longer is a factor of being good. Is that not correct?"

Madigan: "Mr. Kay, growth in the economy is always good and deflation in the economy is not good. I'm in favor of growth in the economy. Growth in the economy is usually brought on by a multitude of factors. Some state policy, but primarily federal policy, emanating out of the Congress and the Federal Reserve and the Treasury of the United States, so it gets to be a rather complicated situation. But suffice it to say that we would all encourage economic growth."

Kay: "Well, and... and we do, I would hope so. I'm not sure I've seen really positive signs of that, but I... I'm glad you agree with that because I agree with you on that... that particular point. I guess by my... my point would simply be that, when we see money leave, we see adjusted income go from a negative to a positive, you're not seeing growth you're seeing something that's suboptimal, you're seeing something that's very bad for the state. And Speaker, what I'm trying to convince you of, and I know I'm not being very successful is, that this is just another signal to the job creators and those who I think provide great growth for this state to think again about whether they stay here or not. I'm sure you filed this with all good intention. I would respectfully though, since you

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

mentioned my district, let me mention your county. Do you know how many billions of dollars your county has lost since 2011?"

Madigan: "No."

Kay: "Let me give it to you. \$4.4 billion. That's growth out of Cook County. That's revenue out of Cook County. And I can tell you where it went, but I won't take the time. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think there's a lot of factual reasons that we shouldn't engage in this kind of conversation. I think everyone who is listening to this debate today and has a fundamental understanding of the economics of this state and economics period would reject this as out of hand and something that, quite frankly, is going to be debilitating to the state growth and the future of this state. Thank you very much."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Constitutional Amendment. We should call this the job destruction Act of 2016. And let me be specific, 83 percent of filers with over \$1 million of income have pass-through income that means from subchapter S corporations, from Limited Liability Companies, from partnerships, from sole proprietorships. Those are the companies that are creating the jobs. The big companies in this state, they get the big tax breaks, we have the EDGE credits, the special deals, the insider deals. The small businesses in this state are getting killed. This will kill jobs in the State of Illinois. The entrepreneurs who are trying to create new technologies in the City of Chicago, the construction companies, the trucking companies that are

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

creating jobs. This will result in an economic failure that's even greater than we are in right now. This will not solve the budget crisis; it'll just drive people, it'll drive jobs out of this state. Stop the madness. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Pritchard." Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will Representative Madigan

yield?"

Speaker Riley: "The Speaker will yield."

Pritchard: "Mr. Speaker, I assume you were a... a part of the Constitutional Amendment that we adopted in 1970. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Pritchard: "And you supported the component of that Constitution which said Illinois shall implement a flat tax system. What has changed in the last 40-some years?"

Madigan: "Let me step back. Point number one, the language in the Constitution which provides that Illinois is a flat rate tax was a part of the entire document. So, you know, the process of the convention was to consider multiple proposals to various Sections of the Constitution. In the end, the convention adopted a product which was submitted to the voters for their approval or disapproval. That tax Section was just part of a larger document. And so, yes, I supported the adoption of the main document. You know, there were side questions, but please understand, as will happen quite frequently, why my support for the main document was predicated upon multiple factors not just the language that dealt with the flat rate income tax."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Pritchard: "I... I just kind of assumed that you would've been in favor of that entire document to have supported it."
- Madigan: "W... well, again, when the convention concluded, I supported the document, as did the majority of the people in the state, but as will happen in... in these instances, why, there were some items in the document that you strongly support and some that you weren't so fond of. You looked at the entire document and decided that the proposed new Constitution would be better than the one that was in place at the time, which was then 100 years old."
- Pritchard: "So, I'll go back to my base question though. What has changed in the last 40-some years, when the people of Illinois supported a flat tax, to now entertain this concept of starting to segment our economy and have, if you will, winners and losers?"
- Madigan: "Obviously, there's been great change in the State of Illinois since the adoption of the Constitution in December of 1970. My point would be that we all support good, quality education for the people of the state. Good quality education is expensive. The essence of this proposal is simply that those that have done very well in the State of Illinois would be called upon to contribute more than others to the support of education."
- Pritchard: "Yeah. And I'm glad you brought up that issue of education. I understand what Constitutional Amendment 57 will be moving forward, which means that we'll even have perhaps a bigger obligation for funding education, so I guess we need all the money we can. But is there any guarantee that as you say in this... in this Amendment, that the money will be used

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

for education, and the assumption of a common person is that it will be incremental. How would you respond to that?"

Madigan: "Could you repeat the last part of your question?"

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

Madigan: "Just the last sentence."

Pritchard: "...I think a common individual when they hear the notion that this is going to be money for education that just like the lottery system they were assuming it would be incremental.

Is this going to be incremental?"

Madigan: "The language of this proposal is very specific in saying that the proceeds from this surcharge would be distributed to the local school districts on a per pupil basis. Our... our intent is very clear that the..."

Pritchard: "I understand that."

Madigan: "...the sur... surcharge on income over a million dollars is for the local school districts."

Pritchard: "And the intent when we passed the lottery was very clear as well, it would go to education. But we all know, from experience, that it hasn't been incremental. It's been dollars traded out, what we put into education has not been commensurate with what we were collecting from that tax. And my question is, how can the voter be aware and be assured that this is going to be something in addition to what we are currently investing?"

Madigan: "I would simply say that the enactment of the lottery was statutory. This would be Constitutional and since it's Constitutional on a much higher plane."

Pritchard: "But there's no guarantee that it's going to be incremental?"

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Madigan: "In the... in the scheme of statutes and Constitutions, why, the Constitution is far stronger than statute."

Pritchard: "Well, but again, I say that it will go to education, and I trust that it will. But again, the assumption is it's going to be incremental. To the issue that you just raised about how this will be distributed, it's on a per pupil basis. There's a lot of debate right now, both in the House and the Senate as you well know, that says our current formula isn't fair. And simply distributing more money per student isn't fair when some districts have a lot more backing up their education than other districts. So, why did you choose that kind of distribution rather than some other kind of needbased distribution?"

Madigan: "We chose a per pupil method of distribution because it's very certain. Now, the receipts might change from year to year, but the distribution method would be set. You're very familiar with the current method of distribution of school money; it's subject to change, it's subject to debate, it's subject to complaint. This is very simple. Each district gets its money per pupil. And as I said earlier, we estimate that it's in the neighborhood of \$530 per pupil."

Pritchard: "Could you give us a little insight as to how moving forward you think this might play into some change in the funding formula. If we're giving \$530 to every student, might you favor them giving less to those same students under a different formula?"

Madigan: "You know, you're a member of our task force. The House has a bipartisan task force, which has been receiving testimony from local school districts. Our desire in that

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

task force is to determine the instances where there are inequities in the method of distribution of the school money. And... and hopefully, you'll offer suggested changes in that method of distribution so that we would move away from the inequity and... and provide for more equit... equitable distribution of the money."

Pritchard: "So, this will give 530 per student, but those same well-off school districts should expect less going forward, in other words."

Madigan: "I'm not... I'm not saying that. Every school district would get... again, we estimate every school district would get about \$530 per pupil, every district."

Pritchard: "Yeah. So, there have been lots of discussions about the millionaires, and how people want to shift the burden of taxes to the millionaires. Can you give me any description of those millionaires? How many of them may be individuals, how many of them may be mom and pop businesses or small corporations that are filing as individuals?"

Madigan: "What I'm in a position to tell you, I hope, if I can find it. As of 2011 there were 13,675 people with taxable net income over one million."

Pritchard: "That was 2011..."

Madigan: "Yes."

Pritchard: "...you said? And you said individuals, but that's filing as an individual, correct?"

Madigan: "The... this would include all filers, 13,675."

Pritchard: "Do you also know by the research that's been done how many small businesses we have in Illinois?"

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Madigan: "I wouldn't have that available. But I'd like to point out that when you get into the question of whether people file as individual or whether they file as... as an LLC or as a Subchapter S corporation, why, the Illinois Tax Code provides options. There are options in the Code and I just presume that most people, especially high-income people, are very familiar with the options which are available to them. So as... as an example, one option available to business would be to incorporate as a Subchapter C corporation, which means they only pay the corporate income tax. They wouldn't be subject to this."

Pritchard: "But what about Subchapter S?"

Madigan: "Well, that's... that's one of their options. That's an option that they can exercise."

Pritchard: "But to do that they've, obviously, got to pay more to incorporate and to file annually and to do all the accounting that we require. So, it adds another burden to the small businesses that are the life blood of Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, I can understand the need for additional revenue, and this is one of many considerations. But I think, as always when we pass legislation, we've got to look at the unintended consequences. And I would ask that you consider those unintended consequences on this Bill."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill is going to take, by the Speaker's own estimate, \$1 billion annually and redistribute it to other parts of the state. Now, if you happen to be... reside in Lake, DuPage, Peoria or Cook Counties, you're actually net ought... net going to lose money on a per

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

student basis. You're going to lose money. If you're Lake County, you're going to lose approximately \$438, even accounting for the new dollars coming into your sta... your ... your district. The millionaires that are sitting in your district, they're going to pay more to the state to be redistributed elsewhere, your students are going to lose. Because those millionaires, they're the ones that provide for the not-for-profits, that spend money in your schools in other ways; that buy tickets to certain events after schools, that support the football teams and the soccer teams and the gymnastics teams and everything else. So, on that, if you're Lake, DuPage, Peoria and Cook, you're the largest loser on a per student basis with this goes into play. This is not a winner for the state. Last year, 3 thousand millionaires picked up and left. They just left. That was in Chicago. So, we're on... we... in fact, we lost more millionaires than the a... Athens in Greece. We lost more millionaires in one year, 3 thousand. Now those who are came most capable of leaving are those that have the higher income, and when they leave, you're never getting them back. They're not going to come back here. Now, I also argue that we currently have a graduated income tax system. 'Cause guess what? The more I make, or the more any household makes, the more they pay in taxes with not one additional service promised to them in any way. It matters not. We're supposed to have a flat tax, but that's not true, 'cause I don't just have to get assessed a certain amount every year. Every time a household does better, they pay more, and there's no promise for any additional benefit. One more thing that you should realize, is that when we actually went

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

down from a 5 percent tax to a 3.75 percent tax, we actually increased our state business climate index, and we rose up to 23rd. Under the graduated income tax proposal, the Tax Foundation has run the numbers, and they say under the graduated income tax proposal, which doesn't even include the millionaires tax proposal which would be an additional 3 percent on the higher income levels, we would drop from 23rd to 48th in terms of state business tax climate index. Does anybody want to go backwards here? I don't. This Bill sends us in the wrong direction, if we care about businesses and bringing businesses back to the state and keeping people here. You're fleecing people and they are leaving the state of Illinois. Now if your intent is to drive to the bottom faster, then go ahead and pass this Bill 'cause that's what's going to happen. We'll just get to the bottom sooner and then maybe we'll get reform. That's all that's going to happen with this Bill. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor." Speaker Riley: "Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I believe this... this Amendment... this Constitutional... this Resolution Constitutional Amendment is the same as was presented last year, no changes?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "So, the distribution of the proceeds is on a strict per pru... per pupil basis to every school district in the State of Illinois?"

Madigan: "Yes."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Harris, D.: "Okay. And that's separate from the General State Aid formula?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So, there's no, absolutely no benefit to the General Revenue Fund here, it's simply a pass-through. Money comes in, get passed to the student... or the school district on a per pupil basis, correct?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you. If I may, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I guess one of the guestions that needs to be asked ... or answered, are you feeling the burn? Because, you know, that's kind... that's what this does, and that's what I think the campaign emphasis of one of the leading Democrat candidates for President is, and that is, tax the rich. And a million dollars is a lot of money when you get down there and you do your tax increase and get down to that bottom line, that adjusted gross income and if there's a million dollars left down there, that's a lot of money. And we all agree to that. You know, I don't have a lot of sympathy for Mr. Easterbrook who's the... the CEO of McDonald's who, when he started last year his salary was just over a million dollars and this year his salary is \$1.3 million. He got a nice 30 percent raise. I venture to say that most of the employees in McDonald's didn't get 30 percent raises. I don't have a lot of sympathy for Mr. Oberhelmen, who's cash compensation is \$6.6 million, and that's just the cash compensation. Their total packages probably exceed 15, 20 million dollars. Mr. McNerney at Boeing who's got a 24 percent total compensation package increase from one year to the next. You know, those

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

folks can probably afford to pay more, and they're probably not going to leave. And I don't have a lot of sympathy because indeed if we taxed them additional three percent, their board of directors with their compensation committee would probably increase their salary even more to take... take advantage of that. So, but there's a question here. I mean, a million dollars is a lot of money, no question, but 900 thousand is a lot of money as well, as is 750 thousand or 800 thousand. Why just choose a million dollars? Because a million dollars, it sounds nice. Well, it's a millionaire's tax and we're going... we're going hit those ... those rich millionaires that don't pay their fair share. Now, last year when this came up I had a... a interaction or back and forth with one of the other Legislators from Chicago. We talked about 1871, which is that incubator down in Chicago that those young folks with all those great ideas. And their objective is to be the next Google, or the next Facebook, or the next Grubhub and they are motivated both by their creativity, but they're also motivated by the desire, in this wonderfully capitalistic system that we all operate in and that has provided and produced so much good here in the country and around the world, they are motivated by the desire to make the dollar. The desire to become that next Facebook or Grubhub or ... or whatever the case may be and have that million dollar salary, and I don't fault them for that. That's what makes us productive, that's what... that's what makes those ... those iPhones and... and Samsung phones that we all use so wonderful because of those... the creativity of the people down there at places like 1871. The difficulty is though that as was asked...

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

or was by... was mentioned by one of my previous speakers is that it's not just those people that this hits. Okay? It's those small businesses that have the Subchapter S, have the LLCs, that get down to that bottom line and have a million dollars that shows down there on the bottom line, and they're going to be hit with more taxes and they're going to say, wait a minute. I'm a small businessman, I'm a farmer, and now you... you're placing an additional burden on me and that's unproductive. So, it's not just those CEOs, it's not just all those rich individuals that... that met down to that bottom line and have a million bucks remaining. It's those small businesses that are going to feel a real impact, and it is indeed a disincentive to them to do more because they're just going to be taxed more. I will tell you that there are other ideas out there for a graduated tax in Illinois. Now, I don't know if the Amendment that's been offered by one of my colleagues to eliminate that requirement in the Constitution for a... a flat tax... to eliminate that. I don't know if that's going to pass. I don't know if that passes if the proposal that's out there now for a graduated tax will pass as well, but I will tell you, that tax as proposed by the Majority Leader is fairer than this tax. It is. Whether I agree with it or not, because we can ask a question as to whether or not a graduated income tax is the right public policy to pursue, but it is a fairer tax than this tax that has been of ... being offered here simply because this targets anyone who ha... ca... gets down to that bottom line on their tax form and then a... that adjusted gross income, that AGI, says a million dollars. It is truly a disincentive. This is the

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

wrong tact to take; it doesn't help us overall. Yes, there's going to be more money going to the schools, more money going to the school districts on a per pupil basis as a simple pass-through, but it doesn't help the state overall and it does send a message. It sends a message that Illinois, if you are really productive as an individual, if you try to get down there and you really... you really do well economically, and you... you come up with a million dollars, once you pass that million dollar threshold, once you get over that figure, you're going to be hit with an additional tax. That makes it unfair. The right vote, I think, is the same one or... that... that many of us cast the last time, which is a 'no' vote on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think before I address Speaker Madigan's Constitutional Amendment I need to clear the record on a few things that were said about my proposal, which is House Bill 689. And we'll get our chance to debate that, but I do want to set the record straight. Someone on the other side of the aisle referred to that as a 9.75 percent tax. It is not. For nobody is it a 9.75 percent tax because the tax is blended. In fact, a millionaire, a person that makes a million dollars a year under that proposal is only going to be paying 4.9 percent of their income in total taxes... total income taxes. So, to refer to it as a 9.75 percent tax is wrong and disingenuous, and I didn't really appreciate it being referred to that way. And in fact under that proposal, if you're married, you could make \$764 thousand a year and still be getting a tax cut. I want to say that again, \$764

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

thousand a year and be getting a tax cut. So, to refer to that as a tax increase proposal is, again, disingenuous. There was reference to some other states. Iowa and Wisconsin were referred to and there was a discussion about the upper level of their taxes being lower than the upper level of the fair tax, which was proposed. But let... rema... remind you that Iowa's tax is just under 9 percent, but it kicks in at \$64,000, \$64,000, not the tax structure we have in House Bill 689 at all. And in Wisconsin, which has an upper level tax of a little over what Iowa has, kicks in at \$244 thousand, so the notion that all of our millionaires are going to flood into the State of Wisconsin is ludicrous. In fact, if millionaires... people that make a lot of money wanted to avoid taxes they would've moved to Florida and Texas and Nevada long ago and the fact is that not... while some people that make a lot of money have left the State of California where the upper level tax is 13.3 percent, there's still a whole lot of people that make a whole lot of money living in that State of California, they haven't moved to neighboring Nevada. Why? 'Cause they like the State of California and people like the State of Illinois. So, let's get over the notion that that Bill that we're going to debate is anything like what was referred to on the Minority side of the aisle. As to the Speaker's Constitutional Amendment, I'm in strong support of it. We have an education funding problem in the State of Illinois; we've been talking about it for a long time. We've heard many proposals, particularly coming out of the Senate, a couple or three from Senator Manar talking about a redistribution of taxes to send that money down to schools in central and

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

southern and rural Illinois, mostly that have not done too well because their assessed valuation is low and he talks about taking money from some districts and sending it to other districts. The Lady from Wheaton who referred to sending money from certain counties downstate might have been referring to that and not to the Speaker's Constitutional Amendment. Those... and some of us have said that the way to deal with schools that don't have enough money is to get them more new money, not to take money from schools that are doing well. Not that people, for instance, in my district don't want to help downstate schools, in fact, they'll say raise their taxes so you can send it downstate, but don't take the money that's already going to their schools. And so the te... the Speaker's proposal would send money to every school district including those and may alleviate some of the problems that Senator Manar and others have been talking about. And the notion that this proposal would create a situation where dollars from those who do well, who live in Cook and Lake and DuPage, is going downstate, well, that's what all tax money does. All tax money goes to all places except property taxes for schools, they stay locally. So, the idea that some millionaire in Lake County or some li... millionaire living in Wheaton is somehow, magically, going to have all of his or her dollars sent directly to downstate districts is just way off base. And there was a Lady on the other side of the aisle that said, 'this Bill is not a winner for the state'. Not a winner for the state? How could it not be a winner for the state to improve education for the kids in the State of Illinois? Do we not have a responsibility to do that or are we just going

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

to be about dollars and cents? To say that it's not a winner for the State of Illinois says that you don't ... not interested in finding new money for the students of downstate districts that don't have enough money for their schools. The Lady couldn't have meant that. She couldn't have meant that she wants all the money to stay in Wheaton, and not go to Effingham or other places in the State of Illinois, can't have meant that, but it sure sounded like that to me. She also said that the gymnastics teams won't do too well, if we have a 3 percent surcharge on millionaires. I like gymnastics, but I would say to everyone in this chamber and everybody listening, that the education of the students in Illinois, all over Illinois, not just where I live, not just where the Lady from Wheaton lives, but for all of Illinois the education of our students all over the state is more important than jumping on a trampoline. Then I heard someone, who I respect greatly, say that he was very concerned that people wouldn't have the incentive to work hard because of this 3 percent surcharge. And I ask this simple question, would people work less hard for only 97 percent of a million dollars? Would they work less hard for only 97 percent of \$5 million, or 97 percent of \$10 million? You can't just look at this as a tax Bill although, certainly, it involves taxes. You can't just look at it as a revenue Bill where the money's just going wherever we decide it will go because that belies the point. The point of the Speaker's proposal has a lot to do with what everyone in this chamber has been saying, in fact, what the Governor has been saying, a Governor who I'm sure opposes this. We've been saying that the single most important thing

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

we have to do in the State of Illinois is educate children. The single most important thing we have to do, after we have a budget, in the State of Illinois is educate children. That's what this Bill will do; that's what this Bill will help us do. We're always looking for new ways to find dollars to school districts that don't have those dollars. That's what this Bill will do. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, the rhetoric about gymnastics teams and this isn't good for the State of Illinois and people will only... not ... they just won't work hard, and they just won't create jobs and they just won't expand those plants if they're only getting 97 percent of \$10 million. It's just a bizarre way to think. We have to assume our responsibilities as Legislators. Our responsibility is to educate the children of the State of Illinois. This Bill will help us get there. We not only have reason, but we have the responsibility to vote 'aye' on this Bill. Please join me."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Demmer."

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

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

Demmer: "Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions, and part of them build off of questions we've heard earlier. But just to clarify, is there anything in this Amendment that would prevent the state from taking the billion dollars that this would generate and simply replacing a billion dollars of general sa... revenue that goes into education today?"

Madigan: "Two part answer. As I said earlier, this is Constitutional; this is Constitutional, it's not statutory. Second part will be addressed by future people in the Legislature and the Governor's Office."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Demmer: "So, the short answer is, there's no quarantee."

Madigan: "The short answer is the one I gave you. Number one, it's Constitutional. Number two, those who will occupy these seats going forward."

Demmer: "There has been a great deal of discussion around the Capitol over the last couple of years about the school funding formula, and the differences in the cost of educating students in different school districts across the state, and how the state can best support that. Yet, this proposal suggests that the revenue would be distributed on a per pupil basis. Meaning that the wealthiest school district in the state would get the same amount of money as the poorest school district in the state. Are there other education funding proposals that you would support that would appropriate money on a per pupil basis?"

Madigan: "As I said earlier, the House has a bipartisan task force, which is at work. They're taking testimony from school districts from all over the state. Their intent is to determine whether there is inequity in the method of distribution of the school money. And in the event that they find that there is inequity, I presume that they will offer legislation that would creact... correct that inequity."

Demmer: "When you discuss inequity, you're not suggesting that the... the commission would come back and... and suggest that the state would allocate money on a per pupil basis, the uniform amount of money, an equitable amount of money on a per pupil basis, correct? You don't foresee the... the formula changing to per pupil?"

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Madigan: "I'm not precluding any recommendation coming from the task force. I would say that we all ought to acknowledge, and I suspect that not all of the students acknowledge, that it costs more money to educate some children than other children. I think we all ought to acknowledge that."
- Demmer: "And I would agree with you on that point, yet this proposal you're offering makes no accommodation of that point."
- Madigan: "Because this is just part of the method of distribution of the school money."
- Demmer: "The title of this Section is, 'A tax for education'.

 Does this proposal offer any support to higher education, to community colleges, to state universities, who are feeling a significant financial pressure this time? Is there any support for the higher education?"
- Madigan: "Not in this proposal, but we'd be very willing to call up another Appropriation Bill that you could vote for that would support higher education..."

Demmer: "I know of a...

Madigan: "...and community colleges."

Demmer: "...a great Bill that my colleague has offered to appropriate money. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker. To... to the Resolution. I think the important words to recognize in this proposal are the words, in addition to any other tax, in addition to any other tax. This 3 percent is not simply 3 percent, it doesn't simply look at the current tax structure that we have. It says, in addition to any other tax. Look at the other proposals that are on the table today. Look at the proposals that would... that, in addition to this tax, would

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

raise Illinois' top tax rate to over 12 percent. Now, it's easy to talk about taxing the rich, it's easy to talk about making the 1 percent pay their fair share, but let's look at what happens in states that are overly reliant on the rich paying their fair share, and on taxing the 1 percent. There was a case in New Jersey a couple weeks ago, a man named David Tepper is a billionaire, a hedge fund manager. He decided to move his residence, and his business from New Jersey to Florida. What did that do to the State of New Jersey? They had a special hearing in the New Jersey Senate to talk about how one man's departure, one man's departure from the State of New Jersey would affect the state budget in the following year. That's overreliance on taxing the rich. The proposal, by the way, in New Jersey was to raise the top rate to 10.75 percent. What we have on the table today in the State of Illinois would be proposals, which combined together, would bring Illinois' rate over 12 percent. So what was suggested earlier, this... this Bill, voting 'no' on this has nothing to do with having sympathy for a millionaire or a billionaire. Voting 'no' on this is ag ... is an acknowledgment that the decisions that we make in this chamber affect decisions and behaviors of people in the State of Illinois. They affect the decisions of millionaires and billionaires about whether they add a new job, whether they open a new location, whether they purchase a new piece of equipment for their business. We affect their decisions. The Speaker even suggested that we affect their decisions on how they file their taxes. So, if we believe we can come in and say, we'll skim 3 percent off the top and everybody go about business as usual, we're

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

fooling ourselves. The circumstances we have today will not be the circumstances we have tomorrow when we add tax upon tax to the decision-making that people across the state have. Mr. Speaker, should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes, I ask for a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. Your... your request is acknowledged, Sir. Chair recognizes Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Martwick: "Speaker Madigan, is it really your birthday today? It is? Happy birthday. Speaker, last time we talked on this Bill, I spent some time going over some tax rates. I don't want to belabor the point, I'll maybe sum up, because Representative Lang did a nice job of highlighting some states, but I did some calculations based on tax rates that I keep with me all the time for comparison. And by my ac... calculations there are approximately 26 states where, if a resident of that state was making \$2 million a year, they would still pay more taxes than Illinois under this current plan. I don't know if you remember that or not. And this is not an overreach by any stretch of the imagination. There were some states that were pointed out, and the... the interesting thing to point out is not just what their tax rates are but where their tax rates kick in. Because you know, if I could really live anywhere, there's a lot of states I'd like to live too. Hawaii is a beautiful state, great weather, tropical, I might want to live there. Their top tax rate is 11 percent, but it kicks in after \$200 thousand. So, Mr. Speaker, under your plan from \$200 thousand to \$1 million of income, a resident of the State

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

of Illinois would pay 3.75 percent on that income. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Martwick: "But in Hawaii, a resident of Hawaii, on income of \$200 thousand to \$1 million would pay 11 percent on that tax. That's a pretty substantial difference. And on... under your plan a resident of the State of Illinois from \$1 million on would be paying an additional 3 percent or a 6.75 percent on all money earned over 11 perc... over \$1 million. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Martwick: "And in Hawaii, they would continue to pay 11 percent on all of that income. There are many other states like this. Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, South Carolina, Vermont, just to name the obvious ones where it's a higher tax rate overall and it kicks in at a lower dollar value. So you would be substantially better off under this tax plan than we would be in those other states. There's a couple of other states that I thought were worth pointing out too. Montana, for instance. I believe our Governor owns a couple of nice ranches in Montana. Their top tax rate is 6.9 percent, that kicks in on all income after \$17 thousand. So, that means in Montana, from \$17 thousand to a million, they would be paying 6.9 percent in that state where our Governor owns a couple of ranches. Yet, in Illinois, from \$17 thousand to a million, we would be paying roughly half of that. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Martwick: "And then the issue was brought up about Wisconsin, which is interesting, 'cause I've got to tell you I think Wisconsin's tax rates are great. I think they're very fair. They're nice and smooth, they have a bottom rate of 4.7... 4 percent on income up to \$15 thousand and on income over a quarter of million, they tax at 7.65, certainly not the highest. An interesting story was brought up about how there are people who decide to relocate their businesses there because there are favorable property taxes there, but yet they choose to live in Illinois 'cause why not get away with paying the much less taxes on your income than you would have there. See we... the Governor talks go up competitiveness all the time and Wisconsin mentioned, and I agree, why not let's be more like Wisconsin? Why don't we adopt progressive rates like that? I asked COGFA, in fact, what those rates would produce, and they said \$10.3 billion above what we currently collect. Now, imagine this, a few facts for everyone to ponder while we're in this chamber. At 3.75 percent flat our income taxes are roughly the eighth lowest income taxes in the country. In terms of spending on K-12 education, we're dead last. In terms of spending on K-12 higher education and human services, we rank 43rd in the country. In fact, compared to 2002, adjusted for inflation we now spend \$6.6 billion a year less than we did in 2002, \$6.6 billion a year on education and human services less today than we did in 2002. So folks, we have a financial problem here, right, I think we can agree with that. We've got a financial problem, and that financial problem has led to structural problems. It's led to a disparity in our

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

property taxes and clearly a disparity in our income taxes, where we tax way less from the state. We can't afford to properly fund our schools, worst in the nation. So, what do we do? We do one of three things. If you're in a property wealthy district, you raise your taxes and then complain about them. If you're in a property poor district, you can't afford to provide a quality education for your children and so you cut back on curriculum and you fire teachers. We're not going to ever get more money to education if we don't address the problem in a financial matter, which means more taxes, unless you have some other way of finding money. We need to raise taxes. Now here's the kicker; the kicker is, I constantly hear from that side of the aisle how you won't ... don't want to talk about taxes and my favorite part of it is this, you have the Supermajority over there, Democrats, why don't you do it? Here you go. You asked for tax plans? Here they are. But I'll tell you something, if you don't like the way they look, engage in the process. Engage in the discussions. I know we have discussion, for all of those people listening, we had a very nice bipartisan dinner last night. Yes, we do talk very friendly with each other, and we have very respectful discussions, but in those discussions I heard something. Any sort of graduated tax is a nonstarter, we can't agree to that. Well, here you are. We can't agree to it, you go do it, and now you don't like what you got. Now the fiscally responsible thing would be to do is to represent the people you represent, engage in those discussions and come up with something we can all agree on. Remember, compromise? We've done it. We can do it again. Maybe we could come up with a system that gets money

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

to education and actually, instead of freezing property taxes, how about this? How about lowering property taxes? It's possible. It's possible, if you have the will and the courage. We do. Do you?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. Our colleague Representative Fortner is a very, very smart man. And the points that he raises about not indexing this measure are of extraordinary importance. To put into our Constitution a measure that is not indexed to inflation is putting a time bomb into our Constitution, because of the corrosive impacts on wealth and income by way of increasing inflo... inflation. So, to have no easy way to overcome that or to adjust for that but for changing the Constitution, I think it means that whether you're in favor of the measure or you're not in favor of the measure, we should all recognize the measure as flawed unless it has the provision to index inflation. And let me share an example of not just the corrosive impact on wealth. I believe it was 1989 when the Assembly did the flip side and we put into our pension system a 3 percent annual compounding of pensions, which is exactly the opposite of the threat that is proposed in this measure. And I think we could only all agree that one of the most significant problems that we have in the unfunded liabilities of our pension system is a consequence of that 3 percent compounding in the formula. So, whether you're in favor of it, whether you're against the measure, the measure should be amended if it's going to be proposed and we should all be very cognizant of the long-term implications of making law or Constitution... Constitutional...

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

enacting Constitutional me... measures that relate to one of the most powerful mathematical forces in the universe and that's interest... compound interest and inflation. So for that I would urge that the Members reconsider and vote 'no' on this measure."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to Batinick: the Resolution. It's been estimated that there's a billion dollars a year of revenue, but I want... I want to read what's ... what's not in... in that estimate. And I'm going to read our analysis directly. This estimate does not, however, include the consequences of tax strategies by potential taxpayers such as shifting of domiciles and shifting of income streams. Any implementation of these strategies could sharply reduce the potential positive fiscal impact of this proposal. I think that's an important things that's... that's missing from... from our analysis here and I'm trying to do some of it on my own. But I want to give you an idea of how fragile any potential benefit from this may be. This effects 18 thousand people. We had 3 thousand millionaires leave Chicago last year, third in the world; France, Rome then Chicago. We lost 3 thousand millionaires in Chicago. There's only 18 thousand people that are going to be effected by this tax. As Representative Demmer had pointed out, just one person in New Jersey, I believe the number was \$150 million hole it potentially... could put in their budget, which is one person deciding to make that move changes... changes the numbers on everything. So, I... I guess in closing, we're talking about a Constitutional Amendment and I don't care if it's your side or our side, I'll say it to

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

both. We're guessing at the long-term consequences. I would think if we're making a major decision like this that we'd have a little bit more analysis, a little bit more of, hey, what do the top hundred taxpayers pay in taxes? What if just 10 of those leave; what if 20 of them leave? What if five percent of the… of the people in top 1 thousand leave? Is this even a net positive? The other thing I'd like to add, when one of those people leave, they take a lot of jobs with them. They don't… it isn't necessarily who works for them directly. It's where they shop; it's where they buy a car; it's where they… the repairs they get done on their house. So, simply for the fact that we're making… we're making a decision here without proper information is enough of a reason to vote 'no'. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker just took some of my points and... and they're excellent ones, and many of the speeches on our sides have been very good. The points have been brought up, you know, Representative Leitch and Fortner bringing up the... the flawed nature of this Constitutional Amendment. Some of the other speakers on our side have talked about the detrimental effect on adjusted gross incomes in the state. And so, I just want to add a few more things, just to put in the record. I think Speaker Madigan mentioned that this was a bi... I think he said this was a bipartisan issue. So, I want to... I want to put one of our most highly regarded Presidents, his remarks, in the record. John F. Kennedy in a 1962 speech advocated for tax cuts as a means for growing the economy and I think his words

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

are relevant for us today in Illinois. And these are his words and I quote, this administration pledged itself to an acrossthe-board, top-to-bottom cut in personal and corporate income taxes to be enacted and to become effective in 1963. Now, I'm not talking about a quickie or a temporary tax cut, which would be more appropriate if a recession were imminent, again quoting, nor am I talking about giving the economy a mere shot in the arm to ease some temporary complaint. John F. Kennedy said the Federal Government's most useful role is not to rush into a program of excessive increases in public expenditures but to expand the incentives and opportunities of private expenditures. What President Kennedy understood is that a growing economy lifts all boats and that happens through private investment. The President went on to say when consumers purchase more goods, plants use more of their capacity, men are hired instead of laid off, investment increases, profits are high, corporate tax rates must also be cut to increase incentives in the availability of investment capital. And lastly, quoting from Kennedy's speech he says, an economy hampered by restrictive tax rates will never produce enough revenues to balance our budget, just as it will never produce enough jobs or enough profits. It is a paradoxical truth that tax rates are too high today tax revenues are too low and the soundest way to raise the revenues in the long run is to cut the rates now. If I could just summarize what he was saying, lower tax rates, more taxpayers. We all agree that the state needs more revenue but we're not going to get it if we continue to chase people out of the state. Those who can choose to leave and also those

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

who are forced to leave because they don't have job prospects here. An excellent website that I would encourage you all to look at is howmoneywalks.com. Look that up, look up Illinois and you can look it up county by county. You can see, using the IRS tax data where money and people are flowing. You know, the State of Maryland, not too long ago, tried a millionaire's tax. The Baltimore Sun editorialized that the rich in that state would just grin and bear it, but a year later they realized that people did move out of the state. We live in an dyna... dynamic economy. People and capital are more mobile than they have ever been before, and as I said, those who are most able to move do. Not all of them but a significant number, and of course, when they do they go from paying a 3.75 percent income tax to zero. And as Representative Batinick just brought up it does have a detrimental effect on the rest of the economy. And so with that, I would just ask the Body to think very, very... think long-term and what the long-term consequences of this will be, and please vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. We've heard a lot about the need for greater funding for education and human services. What we haven't talked about is how a greater economy... a growing economy with more jobs would help provide those funds. And since I'm a small business owner and I study some of these things, small businesses create more than 50 percent of all net new jobs. So we... we need more jobs, we need more small businesses that create those jobs. But small business owners who are getting started, those people

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

that just want to get going in their investors, they look at the whole concept. What does this state offer? What does every state that they could go to offer? Will this proposal in front of us today, will this help Illinois compete with our neighboring states and other states across the country when it comes to business creation, investment and the jobs we're looking for? Well, I did a little research here and for small business owners here's how our state ranks. The cost of doing business here puts us at the ... as the 48th best state in the country for business. Our work comp costs are the 7th worst in the United States. Our property taxes are either the worst or the second worst in the country. Our litigation costs are the third worst in the country. But currently our income taxes, well, they're only the 28th worst in the country. Notice, in no way shape or form are we in the ... in the top tier of anything here other than the bad factors. But if we go through the process we're starting today, and we change this, and we adopt another proposal that would give us an income tax rate at the high end... north of 12 percent, that puts us in the third worst income tax for small... for business in the country. So the one thing we can hold on to that was actually in the middle of the road, is now near the worst. So while this Amendment is being presented as a tax that would only effect millionaires, millionaires have already shown that they can leave. They have the ability; they're mobile. Chicago, in particular, has been mentioned before, losing 3 thousand millionaires recently. But they take with them more than just that money. They take with that tax revenue, and this increase will only accelerate the exodus. So, a lot of

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Illinois middle-class jobs that are supported... that support those middle-class families we all care about in this state, they depend on those high-income earners that created those jobs. But when those earners and their businesses along with those middle-class jobs leave, this state will look back at this Amendment and see that's what left the middle class worse off than they were before we passed what is about to be a massive income tax increase."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yield."

Kifowit: "Mr. Speaker, does this Bill implement immediately a
 tax?"

Madigan: "Would you repeat the question?"

Kifowit: "Does this Bill implement immediately a tax?"

Madigan: "This is a proposal to submit this question to the voters. If the voters at the General Election in November this year were to approve this proposal, then by action of the Constitution there would be a surcharge put on income over a million dollars."

Kifowit: "So, prior speakers are fundamentally incorrect when they say that this is a vote for a tax increase?"

Madigan: "I... I think your... your point is well taken, this is a vote to let the voters decide what they wish to do."

Kifowit: "And isn't democracy and local control funded on and foundation on the will of the voters in asking the voters what they choose?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Kifowit: "Can you please explain the process of the Constitutional Amendment as it is parlayed to the voters?"

Madigan: "If this Resolution were approved by the House today, then it would be considered by the Senate. If the Senate were to approve its submission to the voters, why then, at the General Election in November this year voters would vote on the question, shall this surcharge be imposed."

Kifowit: "Correct. So, all this pontification really is needless and not to the point of the Bill. There will be, I'm assuming, on the referendum a position for and a perso... and a position against for this debate to happen in front of the voters. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Kifowit: "To the Bill. This is an action of local control. This isn't an action... an action to bring a subject matter of education funding to the voters. It's been skewed; it's been misrepresentation throughout this whole debate that it is an action immediate and it's an action now. It is not. It is a referendum and we have heard the term referendum many times from the Executive Branch and on this floor to allow local control and local voters to be heard. And that is exactly what this is. Thank you, Speaker, for allowing me to speak."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "We are in the midst of a budget crisis, a school funding crisis and the only solutions that we hear from your side of the aisle, Sir, is on the revenue side. This Amendment increases revenues to the state by about a billion dollars,

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

under your estimate. Are there any reforms anywhere in State Government that you could come up with that would equate to a billion dollars in savings? What are those reforms? Are you interested in any reforms to State Government to that magnitude?"

Madigan: "Number one, if this were to be approved today by the Senate, by the voters, why, the money raised by the surcharge would not you know, inure to the benefit of the State of Illinois, it would go to the local school districts. Number two, in terms of the debt crisis facing the State of Illinois, I've said publicly for several months that my approach is we need a balanced approach to solving the deficit problem of the state, some cuts, some new revenue. And in terms of the new revenue, I'm prepared to negotiate with the Governor to determine what the sources of the new revenue would be."

Wehrli: "Are you willing to negotiate with the Governor on what the cuts are and what the reforms are?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. We heard a moment ago from the Gentleman from Palatine discussing how beneficial it would be to the state if only we could lower our income taxes. Well, we just did. We just lowered the personal income tax and the corporate income tax, considerably, from five percent to three and three-quarters for personal income taxes. I'm not sure anyone in this chamber would argue that lowering income taxes resulted in dramatic economic growth for the State of Illinois. Am I wrong in thinking that? Is there anyone in this room who's willing to

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

stand up and say that cutting those taxes really caused our state's economy to blossom and grown over the last 16 months? Quite the contrary, our state's economy is in much more dire shape and the idea that maybe we should bring our income taxes, gee, all the way down to zero percent. Can anyone in this chamber say with a straight face that that would improve the economic prospects of Illinois? I think what we've seen is a profound mistrust in the ability of State Government to pay for the things that we're supposed to pay for. I think when we talk about what millionaires want and what small business owners want and what people who are trying to invest in the State of Illinois want, boy, what I think those folks want is stability and predictability. And I'm not a small business owner myself, but I would defer to the many who are in this chamber, particularly on the other side of the aisle, that knowing what's coming next year and the year after that, that kind of stability is what people crave when they want to make long-term investments. What we're proposing here, what we've been proposing, the revenue options that we're going to be discussing over the coming days and weeks and months, all we want to do is make it easier for folks to predict what's going happen next year. What's going to happen 5 years, 10 years down the road. We believe in small business too; we want to see more investment in this state, but cutting income taxes clearly does not stimulate that kind of investment otherwise we'd be better off than we were 15, 16 months ago. So, I support this Resolution. And I look forward to having a discussion with folks on both sides of the aisle about how

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

we can fund the priorities of this state. I think this is a great first step. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Briefly, to the Resolution. Much of what I was going to say has already been said and I imagine we'll be having many discussions considering the Constitutional Amendment, that I'm supporting and sponsoring, about these things going forward. I just want to... just to respond to a couple things that were said, a couple from the Gentleman from Palatine. First of all, the Maryland example he cited was debunked. What basically happened was the Great Recession hit and they were no longer millionaires. The second thing I had noticed that the speech that was referred to about John Kennedy was a reference to a speech that was given in 1962 at the New York Economic Club noting that much of our tax policy had been derived from restraining growth for World War II to maintain our competitive advantage. What I'd also note is that many people have cited that Chicago has lost a lot of millionaires and that we've... we're bleeding more millionaires than Athens. But the city in Illinois... I'm sorry... the city in the United States of America that gained the most millionaires was San Francisco, which is in California, which has a top rate of 13.3 percent. So, clearly taxes are not the only reason that people are making decisions about where they geo-locate. Finally, I just want to read for a moment from a recent editorial in the Quad-City Times about some of the progressivity in the Tax Code that we are trying to bring on this side of the aisle. And they said, the wealthy reap the greatest rewards from public infrastructure, trucking

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

companies need roads, manufacturing requires water and rail, private business fails without and educated workforce. And I want to repeat that because what we are talking about here is one specific tax rate, marginal tax rate, to fund one specific thing, which is education. Private business fails without an educated workforce. It goes on to say that Madigan's plan to boost revenue to increase state aid to local school districts might just provide the property tax relief that Rauner rightly says Illinoisans desperately need. So, if your conscience tells you that you have to vote against this because you are sympathetic to the plight of millionaires, you can do that. Just know that the data does not, in fact, support what it is you are saying. If your conscience says, I want to vote against funding that could go to local school districts to make sure that the children in those school districts have the same chance to thrive as the children of those millionaires, you can do that as well. But don't say it's supported by the facts or by data or by flight from Chicago because the people are going to places that, in fact, have a higher tax rate. This is a good piece of legislation. It is one small step toward for progressivity in our Tax Code and fixing our... our problem of our local schools. You should vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you to everybody who participated in the debate. It was a very good debate, very informative. My purpose, as I stated earlier, is simply to provide the voters of this state with an opportunity to vote 'yes' or 'no' on the proposition that those who have done

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

very well in this state would pro... would contribute more to the support of local school districts and those that have not done so well. And I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan has requested an 'aye' vote. This...

Mr. Demmer has asked for a verification, so Members will be
at their chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor
of the Constitutional Amendment will vote 'yes'; opposed
'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record
yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On
this question, there are 68 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And
the Amendment fails. Chair recognizes the Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 20, 2016: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is House... Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 4477, Floor Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #36, Floor Amendment #2 to House Resolution 1118."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan is recognized."

Sullivan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Can you excuse Representative Sosnowski for the rest of the day please? Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. House Bill 6304, Leader Durkin. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6304, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6304 provides for a continuing... continuum of care license for organizations and

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

agencies that provide service for people with developmental disabilities. This Bill has been referred to as the Misericordia Bill. Organizations like Misericordia provide cradle to grave services organized in a campus setting. And I would ask for a... support from this Legislature."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6181, Representative Willis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6181, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This Bill will alleviate the black-out period for continuing ed. hours that teachers have to do. It will also allow... with the Amendment, it will allow them to carry over hours if they have over the amount of hours that are needed in a yearly basis. I'm willing to take any questions, but I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4486, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4486, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a small business Bill designed to encourage the growth of our burgeoning craft distillery industry. It increases the gallonage they can produce to 100 thousand gallons and it creates what we call a craft distiller's tasting permit. We've done this for other types of entities like the Homebrewers. It's a... this is a agreed Bill with WSDI, agreed Bill with ABDI. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4370, Mr. Davis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4370, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 4370 is an initiative along the lines of some other initiatives that we've tried in the past years or so with regard to supplier diversity in different sectors. We've done supplier diversity initiatives with regard to the energy field. This one is going to apply to hospitals. We've worked out an agreement with the Hospital Association that was the Amendment that was... that has been adopted to the Bill,

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

which became the Bill and that Amendment essentially did three things on their behalf. It made the initiative statewide, it raised the threshold for participation from 50 beds to 100 bed facility, and thirdly, it allows for the creation of workshops to help contractors who want to do business with hospitals. It allows for the creation of those workshops, but it suggests that the central... the Department of Central Management Services will conduct those workshops. Understanding some of the budgetary challenges that we have right now, it makes that subject to appropriation. So, we hope to be able to do those at some point in the future. That being said, I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, I thought I heard it, but just to reiterate with your Amendment all opposition's removed?"

Davis, W.: "The only opposition that we had in committee was the Hospital Association and we've eliminated their opposition. They are neutral."

Sandack: "Thank you. Last question, this doesn't get rid of the Health Services Review Board, does it?"

Davis, W.: "No, it doesn't... doesn't eliminate the Health Services Review Board."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6057, Mr. Harris. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6057, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was initially called, I pulled it out of the record because colleagues had questions. The Chair has been extremely courteous in calling the Bill; I am getting the answers to the questions. I'd like to once again pull it out of the record, and I... I'll come back to it. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair will continue to be courteous, Sir. Thank you very much. The Bill is out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 5540, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5540, a Bill for an Act to revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is the annual revisory Bill from the... the technicians on our staff and in the Legislative Reference Bureau. It's been thoroughly studied by all four caucus staffs. And I understand that it's really, really good stuff and makes no substantive changes. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

hereby declared passed. House Bill 4325, Mr. Hays. Read the Bill, please."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4325, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4325 is a very narrow Bill. It amends the Video Gaming Act to add craft distilleries to the definition of licensed establishments in the Act. It makes no other changes. The Illinois Gaming Board actually helped with the language here. This just allows a craft distillery who has under their license the ability to serve their own product, and only their own product, in a bar-like setting to be eligible for the same consideration as any other establishment as it relates to video gaming. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6013, Representative Cassidy. Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. House Bill 6109, Mr. McAuliffe. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6109, a Bill for an Act concerning domestic violence. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 6109 would provide or... the sup... would enable

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

the Supreme Court to establish a pilot program for filing of petitions for temporary orders of protection. And I'd be happy to answer any question and don't know any opposition."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, I'm reading our analysis and it doesn't show that the Supreme Court's in favor of this. It doesn't show anyone's in favor of it. Did you talk to anyone about this Bill?"

McAuliffe: "I... I had a discussion with someone from the Illinois Supreme Court, someone that lobbies for them. And I gave them time to see if they had any questions. That was two weeks ago. I went back and saw them earlier this week and he said that there were... there were no questions against it."

Franks: "How did you come up this Bill? What's the genesis?"

McAuliffe: "I was researching and the... the State of New York has a... has a similar Bill, so I copied pretty much the same Bill that they used in New York."

Franks: "Okay. I'm just surprised no one from the Bar Association or the Supreme Court weighed in. At least our... our analysis simply says it's a... there's no proponents, there's opponents, there's no position."

McAuliffe: "I have the proponents is the State Appellate Defender and State's Attorney Appellate... Appellate Prosecutors were supporters."

Franks: "Thank you. 'Cause we don't have that on ours at all."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Franks: "D... did you work with those two groups on this Bill?"

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

McAuliffe: "They just slipped that they were... that they were for it. They didn't have any problems against it."

Franks: "All right. Now, this is a creation of a pilot program.

How long will it last?"

McAuliffe: "I believe it was three years. And again, if the Supreme Court doesn't want to do this, if they find something wrong with it, they wouldn't have to. But I believe it was three years."

Franks: "So, this is just a 'may'; it's not a 'shall'?"

McAuliffe: "Yeah. It's just a 'may', it's not a 'shall'."

Franks: "All right. So, you're giving them the opportunity, if they wish to set up a pilot program, to evaluate this?"

McAuliffe: "Right."

Franks: "But nothing's mandating that they do it..."

McAuliffe: "No."

Franks: "...for any amount of time?"

McAuliffe: "There's no mandate at all."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you for answering those questions."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to the fact I may have a potential conflict here, I am, in an abundance of caution, voting 'present'. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Mike, I see this is a pilot program, but I'm curious. If there is an order of protection entered and is, for want of prosecution, or there's a nully proc... no one shows up after

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

the... the action is sought, how does it get off? Can somebody automatically take that name off the system or do they remove the... the defendant's name off the system?"

McAuliffe: "Yeah. If the person that filed it didn't show up, then I believe it wouldn't go through."

Kay: "I'm sorry. I didn't."

McAuliffe: "The person that filed it, if they didn't actually show up, then... then it wouldn't go through."

Kay: "Well, no, if they didn't show up it wouldn't go through,
but there'd still be a record out there, wouldn't there?"

McAuliffe: "Yeah. I believe... I'm sorry there's... there's some noise in the background."

Kay: "Yeah, it's hard to hear."

McAuliffe: "Again, I don't think, if somebody didn't show up and pursue this then it wouldn't go through."

Kay: "I know it wouldn't go through. Here... here's what I'm trying to get at, Mike. If you... if somebody goes in for an order of protection today and no one shows up to follow through on that, they didn't... the wife or the husband or the aggrieved party doesn't come in to court, then you still have a file. You still have a record out there. It's not expunged, it's not thrown out, it's not deleted and that's my question. What happens here?"

McAuliffe: "I think this would just be a temporary, again, I think this would only apply for a temporary restraining order."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you, Mike."

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. Phelps. Please

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "You may proceed, Sir."

Ford: "I would like to call to the attention of the Body that today it was announced that the abolitionist Harriet Tubman will appear on the front of the \$20 bill. I'm very, very excited about that for America. So, thank you for that."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. House Bill 4013, Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. House Bill 6261, Mr. Sandack. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6261, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 6261 is an initiative of DuPage County Health Department and it seeks to authorize County Health Department agencies to enter into contracts with health... health entities outside their jurisdiction. This Bill came to me by... from the DuPage County State's Attorney who thought the ability to exercise contracts and enter into agreements outside jurisdictions was a necessary clarifying requirement in the statute. I ask for your affirmative vote and welcome any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Franks: "Ron, I'm not sure I understand what you're trying to do.

 Are... are they not able to enter into contracts now?"
- Sandack: "Outside their jurisdiction, the state's attorney says, no, inside the jurisdiction. So, for instance, the DuPage County Health Department wanted to contract with Cook County's Health Department. The state's attorney in DuPage... and by the way they are doing it... the DuPage State's Attorney said technically that's a violation of existing law and wanted enabling law... a contrac... a clarification so that they could do so outside the jurisdiction."
- Franks: "In what instances do you see this happening? You... you just said one for DuPage and... and Cook working together. Is it on a specific issue, for instance?"
- Sandack: "I don't know that, Jack, but I do know, just so you know, not only does DuPage County approve this. Lake County, Cook County, the Department of Public Health, Lake County Health Department and Community Center, McHenry County Health Department and the Illinois Association of County Board Members. So, they... I think they all have recognized there may be a just missing component in the current statute."
- Franks: "So, it's more of sharing services it sounds like where we wouldn't have to have our own, but it'd be a way... instead of a consolidation but of a cooperation..."
- Sandack: "Correct."
- Franks: "...in order to save the people some money. It makes sense.

 Thank you, then."
- 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? Ladies and Gentlemen,

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 114, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 114, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 114 sets forth a standard in which the courts will be able to know if a child is in the proper services that is required. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you have regarding House Bill 114."

Speaker Lang: "Those in... Chair recognizes Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Sorry. A question of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield. I was waiting for you, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you. I appreciate that, Sir. I like your suit today, by the way."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you."

Sandack: "Representative, I apologize, I was in a sidebar conversation. Would you just kindly walk through what your Bill does, again, if you wouldn't mind?"

Flowers: "Yes, in one minute."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, can you take this Bill out of the record for one minute, please?"

Speaker Lang: "We'll get back to you, Representative."

Flowers: "Thank you."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be taken from the record. House Bill 4627, Mr. Tryon. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4627, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, essentially, requires that any veteran that's returning form deployment be allowed the opportunity to apply for admission to any one of our state universities at the next semester. We had a situation where I had a constituent who was deploy... wasn't going to re-enlist, President Obama said that anybody that wasn't going to reenlist could... could be honorably discharged six months earlier. He took that, wanted to apply to the University of Illinois at Chicago, was told that he had missed the application deadline. So, he said, well, could I apply for the spring semester and he was told that they would only take applications for entering freshmen in the fall. So, he would, in a sense, have to wait an entire year for that to happen. Upon further research, we found out there was only two univ... two university campuses that did that, UIUC and UIC. We appealed that, he was able to get in. But clearly, I think we would all agree that more effort should be done to make sure those returning from active duty could be processed and immediately, if they meet the admission requirements, admitted without having to wait. So, if there's any questions, I'd be glad to answer them. Otherwise, I would urge 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

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record show that on House Bill 4325 I had intended to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention, Sir. House Bill 695, Mr. Franks. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 695, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 695 is one that we've seen before. I think it's more relevant now than ever. This was something we've been working on for a long time. And what this Bill would do was to extend the applicability of the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law to all units of local governments in Illinois including Home Rule entities and cap annual increases and levy extensions at zero percent going forward instead of the lesser of five percent or increas... or the increase of the CPI. This freezes the extension but still allows the voters the choice to improve... approve an increase. And as we know, we heard about it today, on the floor on another issue, that property taxes are the biggest local issue facing Illinois residents today. And the property tax liability that taxpayers bear in Illinois is choking off economic recovery in our state. We have the second highest property taxes in the entire country. In the coun... in the collar counties, particularly, pay some of the highest taxes in the nation on a per capita basis. Additionally, Illinois

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

has around 7 thousand units of government, many with taxing authority which continuously pushes up our property tax burden. And as a result, Illinois has actually lost... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Illinois has actually lost population this decade. And in McHenry County, for the first four years of this decade, we've also lost population. I think one of the reasons why is because people can't afford their property taxes and we are, frankly, taxing people out of their homes. In many of the counties, the property tax bill is higher than the mortgage payments. And without immediate relief, our state is going to see continue out-migration of taxpayers and employers. And seniors, on a fixed income, can no longer afford to be near their families. And our property tax burden can be construed as being antifamily, which literally tears our families apart. And the problem with the automatic increases that we have now is that it's really a disincentive towards efficiency because governments will continue to spend the money because they know more was always coming. A guaranteed annual increase in tax levy sends the wrong message to local governments. And so, instead of putting the onus on the government to find new ways of being more efficient, they can do business as it's always been done without fear that anything ever needs to change. And this is a recipe for disaster, which is wreaking havoc in our economy. I can tell you in... in McHenry County, for instance, I was critical of huge surpluses based on property taxes at one of our institutions. I had gone on and... and complained that one group had \$35 million in surplus, more than four years of operating income. The ... I got roundly criticized for that, saying I

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

didn't know what I was talking about and I went and checked the numbers and they were absolutely right and I apologized, because right now they have over \$41 million that they're holding. So, this is something that needs to be done, I'd ask for your help. This would be an opportunity to vote for tax relief for all the citizens of Illinois. And I ask for your... your support. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Jack, I'm... I want to make sure that this Bill is something that we... we've had a few property tax Bills on the floor."

Franks: "Right."

Sandack: "So, I'm... this is on Third Reading as opposed to one of
 your colleagues that regularly brings up Amendments on Second
 Reading, right?"

Franks: "This is the final Bill."

Sandack: "All right. So, last Session, if I'm not mistaken, you brought was it... it an identical Bill?"

Franks: "We had similar ones... I had two similar ones."

Sandack: "So, remind me what the difference is to your previous property tax Bill... freeze Bills were?"

Franks: "Well, this one will... this one will be for the entire state, including Home Rule areas."

Sandack: "Okay."

Franks: "Six ninety... the next, that's 696 is all but Home Rule."

Sandack: "But I mean, in the 98th didn't you bring a property tax freeze Bill as well?"

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Franks: "It was different there because what I was... what I said back then, if... if we're talking a few years ago, was when our prop... what we found was a perversion in the law. Because when we passed PTELL about 20 years ago, we never envisioned the fact that our property values would fall."

Sandack: "Right."

Franks: "But as a result, when the property values were falling they were still getting the automatic increases..."

Sandack: "Right.'

Franks: "...so, what we saw were people lost 40 percent of their home values while their property taxes went up 50 percent. It was absurd."

Sandack: "I'm with you and I was with you on that. And I had a similar Bill at the same time."

Franks: "Yeah. We worked together on it."

Sandack: "That's right. And I have a Bill out this time, it's not out of Rules, which would address when values go down. It would be a zero percent rate automatically but with respect to your Bill right now on the board..."

Franks: "Right."

Sandack: "...how does it differ from Representative Bradley's Bill?"

Franks: "I'm not sure."

Sandack: "Okay."

Franks: "I don't remember the... I don't remember his."

Sandack: "Well, I just remember we kept voting on Amendments that didn't make any sense, but I'm glad we have an opportunity to vote on a real property tax freeze Bill. So, have you talk... who's got the Bill in the Senate if this passes out of here. Do you know who the Sponsor is?"

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Franks: "We're working on that."

Sandack: "Okay. Because we don't want it to get stuck with someone that won't move it, right?"

Franks: "Right. We've had that. I've..."

Sandack: "We have had that."

Franks: "...I've been sabotaged, yes."

Sandack: "I think that happened two times ago."

Franks: "Yes."

Sandack: "...where it was taken by someone only to hold it and not move it. And I agree with you that we are a highly taxed state overall, but with property taxes, we're either first or second with New Jersey and this is something that's important to my constituents. So, thank you for bringing the Bill."

Franks: "I appreciate your help. We've been working on this together for years."

Sandack: "Years. To the Bill. Mr... Mr. Speaker, I'm thrilled this is out for a vote. I... I kind of looked up a second, looked at my analysis and wondered if this was one of the previous Bills where we just voted on Amendments ad infinitum, but this is actually an opportunity to help people and so, I encourage folks to read this Bill, think this thing through. And if we want... and we talk about property tax relief, well, here's an opportunity to vote on it, for real, which is an amazing moment here in the 99th. So, I commend the Gentleman for bringing the Bill and I stand in strong support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Franks: "No. No."

Martwick: "Representative Franks..."

Franks: "No. Sit down, sit down."

Martwick: "...we've had some... we've had some discussions on this in the past and I just want to clarify a few things. So, would this freeze, this two-year freeze, this would apply to every property tax levying body in the State of Illinois. Is that correct?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Martwick: "Okay."

Franks: "But let... let me be clear."

Martwick: "Sure."

Franks: "No one's getting a penny less than they got the year before and nothing's prohibiting the locals to ask for more. This is just saying you're going to get the same as last year, you're not automatically going to get the increase under CPI, which as we've seen the last few years have been pretty low, the CPI."

Martwick: "So, what you're saying is they, the increase that they've been requesting, and they don't have to, right?

Franks: "Right."

Martwick: "They don't have to request the increase."

Franks: "But most do."

Martwick: "And you're saying the maximum there and it's not that much."

Franks: "Well, it's a start. It's not a cure all, but you know when you're in a hole the first thing you got to do is stop digging."

Martwick: "Yeah. I.. I."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Franks: "Notice how I dropped the 'g' on that?"

Martwick: "Sure. So, Jack... so let... let me ask you a few follow up questions on this. The... the freeze would then apply to townships..."

Franks: "It would afr... it would apply to..."

Martwick: "...school districts..."

Franks: "Yeah, all taxing bodies."

Martwick: "...park districts..."

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Martwick: "...fire protection districts."

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Martwick: "Okay. And... and non-Home Rule municipalities, as well as, Home Rule municipalities?"

Franks: "Yes. But understand the limitation does not apply to new property, or recovered TIF value, or annexed property and any voter improved increase."

Martwick: "Yeah, okay. And... and that's fair, but let... let... let's just say, for instance, that the... the freeze as it's applied, you know, when we were going over the hearings for the school funding formula, which is pertinent I think, we heard from some school districts that because of the... the reality of their... their communities that they lived in and the amount of their property tax base they were, year after year with the prorations, faced with devastating cuts. Devastating cuts. Firing teachers, firing or cutting programs, not being able to afford updated textbooks. Would you suggest that these people should not even be entitled, when they're already they're... they're so far underwater, would you, and struggling and they have no means to provide for their children. You

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

would suggest that, tough luck, you should have your levies frozen for two years."

Franks: "Well, it's a terrible situation we find ourselves in because of the dereliction of duty that we've done here in the General Assembly."

Martwick: "Agreed."

Franks: "Because we have not passed a budget, because we have not... because we have not fixed a broken s... a school funding formula that's designed to fail, that has schools deficit spending. So we can agree that there are huge problems."

Martwick: "Yeah, I agree with that."

Franks: "And we..."

Martwick: "...and in... in fact, wouldn't you agree that at... at least in most areas, I think in the City of Chicago, where I live, I believe it's about 55 percent of your property tax bill goes to your K-12 education. And I think in your area, Jack, it's probably closer to 80. Am I right?"

Franks: "Yes, it's incredible. And... and you're right, and it's so unfair. Mr. Tryon had talked about this a couple years ago. The same value house in Cook County, same value, say it's a \$200 thousand house, in Cook County and if it's placed in McHenry County, in McHenry County we're going to pay two and a half times the amount in property taxes then you will in Cook, for the exact same value house."

Martwick: "Yeah. And... and the reason for that is... is quite simple. We're dead last in funding education...

Franks: "Yeah."

Martwick: "...on the state level. And because we shirk our responsibility from the state level to properly fund

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

education, local communities that can pass referendum. They raise their own property taxes. Their property taxes go through the roof, where they can. Low performing property districts, they don't have the ability, so they suffer through their schools like the ones we saw that came to us. Or if you're from the City of Chicago, they just bankrupt the school systems. So..."

Franks: "You're right."

Martwick: "...so, we've... we've got this problem that could be solved, if we had the courage to actually bring the funding from the state level to the schools and lower the burden on the local districts. That would be a better solution, wouldn't it?"

Franks: "Absolutely. And that's why I support the Speaker's Constitutional Amendment to make funding a right in Illinois. Because we've only given lip service to it, and every politician says that education by far is the most important thing, but we're lying to them because it isn't. Because the budgets show what our priorities are. And it used to be that we used to talk about funding education more fairly, but then we got the tsunami of the pension issue, and then we had the tsunami of not doing budgets. So, all of a sudden, instead of focusing we... we lost where our focus should've been."

Martwick: "And... I agree with you, and I will join you in supporting the Speaker's Constitutional Amendment to make school funding a priority because I think that's exactly what people want from us and... and to the Bill. I... I know that we've had heated discussions on this in the past, I will try and be more respectful than I have in the past, Representative Franks. I

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

commend your efforts to try and find property tax relief. That being said, I don't think this is a fair measure. There are responsible local governments that are scrimping and saving and they're doing everything they can. When I served on township government we went, and I want you to hear this, Representative Franks, we went 20 years without increasing our levy by a penny, 20 years. So, to come in and have a broad-based approach that lumps the responsible government who might need a little bit of breathing room in a difficult time in... into the same class as people who may be responsible and running up unreasonable surpluses is not good policy, and it's not fair. I... I would urge you to consider finding some manner or some method in this Bill to address some sort of exemption for those districts that have acted responsibly with their money. And those districts that are going to be faced with the undue hardship, if they're running right at the line, this Bill could put them into bankruptcy. And it's the wrong message for us to send to our local communities while we can't be responsible here that we know what they're doing there. And... and for that reason, I... I'm going to urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. But I hope that we can, as a Body, realize that we've got a financial problem that can be solved with math. Let's get more money to the school districts and not provide a freeze, but real property tax relief. That's what our taxpayers want; let's give it to them."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Sullivan: "Representative, my reading of this Bill is different than the previous Bills in that in here, what you're saying is we're taking CPI, 5 percent, the… the smaller the number and we're just saying it's now going to just be zero…"

Franks: "Correct."

Sullivan: "...going forward."

Franks: "Correct."

Sullivan: "And so it's a permanent number that you're on... now instituting into law."

Franks: "And what I'm asking... exactly. Because..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Franks: "...and there's nothing here prohibiting folks from raising the taxes."

Sullivan: "Well and I want to kind of get to that point because it's kind of apropos of what has gone on in this chamber. We just voted on a Constitutional Amendment where people said, well, you're letting the people decide whether they want their millionaires taxed. So, this is very similar. If you want to raise your property taxes, go ask the people if they want to raise their property taxes. So, it's very similar argument."

Franks: "Correct."

Sullivan: "...wouldn't you think?"

Franks: "Yeah. It's the ultimate..."

Sullivan: "So, you should get a lot of votes here 'cause a lot on our side are going to vote for this."

Franks: "It's the ultimate local control. We're letting... we are letting the voters decide whether they want to raise their taxes. All we're saying is governments don't... shouldn't get

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

an automatic increase. Listen, we live in a new world. It's not like it was when we had PTELL 20 some years ago."

Sullivan: "Right."

Franks: "We didn't... no one anticipated falling property values. No... no one... Listen, real people aren't living nearly as well as they did at the beginning of this century. Their real expenditure income has fallen. They are not able to borrow as they could before. The banks had crises; they're not able to... to lend. People don't have nearly as much as they used to. So, there's no way that local governments or any government should be immune to the economic reality that its citizens face. So, because when the citizens have less, the government needs to have less. And that's all this Bill says."

Sullivan: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you love the millionaires' tax, you'll love this even more. This is the ultimate local control, as the Representative just said, let them vote whether to raise their taxes or not. I voted... I wish for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "So, you believe in... in local control?"

Franks: "I'm bringing this Bill."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. So, the local elected officials, you don't believe in... in their elected responsibility, you believe in just the individual?"

Franks: "No, I be... I think this allows everyone to have a say, because right now the folks don't have a say. They automatically get their taxes raised. If the citizens want

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

their taxes raised they can, and if the locals want it they can as well. All they have to do is tell them why and run a Bill... and run a referendum. So, I think it gives everybody a say, where right now only a few people have a say."

Davidsmeyer: "Are... are you going to do the same thing with revenue for the State of Illinois?"

Franks: "We're talking about this Bill right now, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "I realize that, but it's a very similar argument, my friend."

Franks: "Well, I tell you I haven't voted for a budget in quite some time. I do believe that we need to have balanced budgets."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I agree."

Franks: "I think... I think you know my... my history on that."

Davidsmeyer: "I agree. I was just making that point. Now, Home Rule, how does... how does Home Rule happen?"

Franks: "I think you got to... you get to be 25 thousand and then you run a... a referendum. I'm not sure it's automatic."

Davidsmeyer: "If... if you're under 25 thousand you're allowed to put Home Rule in by referendum. So, what about the communities that have made the conscious decision to become Home Rule?"

Franks: "Well, this will include Home Rule. I have another Bill, which you might like better, that doesn't have an... that doesn't include Home Rule. But I just... I'm trying to fix it all at once. I've got both. I'd like to running this one first."

Davidsmeyer: "So, what happens when the State of Illinois realizes that we don't have any money and we cut more funding for... for locals? Whether it be... what... whatever it may be."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Franks: "I find the taxpayer funded lobbyist for the locals seem to do pretty well down here in Springfield."
- Davidsmeyer: "Maybe your communities have taxpayer-funded lobbyists, but the majority, high majority, of mine do not have access to something like that."
- Franks: "Oh, you'd be surprised. I'll... we'll go through some line items; I'll show you where... where they're getting paid."
- Davidsmeyer: "I... I'd look forward to it. I... I know my... my home community has one and he's very focused on prov... doing a good job, but most of my communities do not. Now, so, my home community of Jacksonville made the conscious decision to pass Home Rule. Were it not for that, we would be a... probably a financial disaster at this point. Our pensions are over 70 percent funded, unlike the majority of the... of the towns in the... in the State of Illinois. And you look at many of these towns that are at 30 percent. We made the conscious decision to make sure we were fulfilling all the promises that we made and if it weren't for Home Rule, we would not be able to do that."
- Franks: "Sir, nothing in this Bill will take away one dollar.

 They will get the exact same amount that they got the year before. They're not taking away anything. We're just saying, if you need more, ask for it."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, police... police and fire are probably... oh, probably about 60 percent of my hometown's budget. What do they do every year when they've already got a con... four... three, four year contract and..."

Franks: "Then ask for it."

Davidsmeyer: "...it's already said in there that..."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Franks: "Then make that case and ask for it, but what I also see is that automatically... automatic increases is not fair to the taxpayers. I don't know if you've noticed, but people are leaving the State of Illinois. And when I... when I..."

Davidsmeyer: "And it's... it's not because of..."

Franks: "...and when I ask them that, one of the biggest issues they say is because they can't afford our property taxes. And they... they don't like the fact that we have so many levels of government and we are so taxed and they can't afford to stay here. I am... I want our families to stay intact."

Davidsmeyer: "And... and a lot of people are leaving the State of Illinois because of economic opportunity, because of jobs.

You know, we... we're not doing..."

Franks: "Sure."

Davidsmeyer: "...anything here to help the economy to create more jobs, to allow businesses to thrive. I think we should be focusing on that and... if..."

Franks: "So, we shouldn't put a further burden on them of higher property taxes automatically every year."

Davidsmeyer: "...If we had those things, those things would automatically offset, automatically offset the property tax burden by providing natural revenue growth, not forced revenue growth through property tax increases. I think we need to focus on... on the needs of the state and not focus on this. You're... you're telling the local school board, the local government that they can't make decisions to help out their own situation."

Franks: "No, I'm not saying that at all..."

Davidsmeyer: "And... and while I understand..."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Franks: "...not at all, not at all."

Davidsmeyer: "...while I understand that property taxes are high, I know my property taxes are extremely high, but I also know that I have elected local people that are responsible to me to make those tough decisions. And they are difficult decisions and... and I... I wish that my local governments would not automatically raise, but PTELL is a... is a false floor, not a false ceiling..."

Franks: "It's a broke..."

Davidsmeyer: "...not a ceiling."

Franks: "...the PTELL system is broken."

Davidsmeyer: "I agree."

Franks: "It is broken."

Davidsmeyer: "We should be working on fixing PTELL, I think. For... for the reason of local control, I will be... I will be voting 'no' on this. I appreciate you bringing this forward, but I think that a permanent tax freeze does not allow local governments to manage their own situations. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Lang: "Why don't you just turn to your right and talk to him? Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Listen man. You know, I really, usually, agree with him on a lot of things, but in this case, this one is a little more troubling for something one of our colleagues just mentioned, is the issue of local control. Our community, certainly a smaller community, has been doing a superb job actually managing the issue of the taxes for our property tax in... in the City of Urbana, and certainly in Champaign. We

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

have 90 percent funded our police and fire pensions. We have not actually raised our... in the time that I served on the city council, we actually did not raise, although we could and we didn't. And I think something that I wholly agree with the Sponsor on this issue is that there are many ways for us to generate revenue. He proposed, at one point, 11 corporate or 12 corporate loopholes we could actually close and then lower our property taxes as a result of that. He also, and certainly many of us support, the graduated income tax that would shift the flat tax to a graduated system where people who can afford to pay should pay their fair share in the state. You know, I think this is an issue, a serious issue of local control. Home Rule communities cannot survive under the model that's being proposed and in my estimation something that our illustrious Governor proposed earlier is to allow municipalities to file bankruptcy, which would actually happen if they don't have the opportunity to raise their taxes, if they need to for their communities. And so, with that, unfortunately, I won't be joining my colleague and seatmate on this. And I will be a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Have the greatest of respect for the Sponsor, and oftentimes on fiscal matters we see them very much the same. Concerns I have with what we're doing here today, if the State of Illinois had its fiscal house in order, if the State of Illinois had a budget, if the State of Illinois was properly funding education now, then maybe we should be looking at something like this. But we know the answer to that is the State of Illinois is not.

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

We don't even have a budget. So, the unit of government that's going without a budget is trying to tell local elected officials that they should be ... some restraints put on them and change in policy. There's not one of my local units of gov... units of local government, I don't think any of yours, that don't have budget. They've been adopting their budgets on time and not going deeper in debt. I've got school districts that are cutting millions out of their budget for the coming year because they know the revenue is decreasing. And now we're telling them it could even get ... get less. Look at the opponents of this. On our analysis, I think there's 24 or 25 and some of them are even just groups linked together. School, all sorts of education groups, fire protection, local governments are opposed to this. The one example that was used is some local government that had, I think, over \$40 million stashed away. That's the exception, and that was wrong and it should be brought out. If they were taxing beyond what they should, then you should go after them and I think the Sponsor did and tried to expose that. We have legislation called Truth in Taxation, so, you have to be honest about that levy and what it's doing. Maybe we need to look at on how much reserves, if you go above a certain percent, that you have to justify it and then we would avoid the excesses like the Sponsor mentioned. These are elected units of governments who are much more fiscally responsible than what we've been here in the State of Illinois. The right vote on this Bill is a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, I appreciate you bringing a Bill that seeks to provide some property tax relief. I think we often hear that the property tax burden is especially high in the State of Illinois and we... it's good for us to look for ways to help reduce that. I had a couple of questions for you. The first is, I know there's an opportunity for a local government to put to referendum in a deviation from this, should it be necessary in their area, and they would vote on that. My question is, being that this takes effect imme... is it immediate effective date?"

Franks: "Uh huh."

Demmer: "Do you know what the deadline is for a local... a unit of local government to put a question on the ballot for this year?"

Franks: "I'm not sure, maybe August, I'm not positive. Ho... how do you pronounce your name, is it Dermer or Demmer?"

Demmer: "Whichever way you'd like, Representative."

Franks: "Okay. I wasn't sure. Thanks."

Demmer: "Whichever way you'd like, please."

Franks: "Okay. Sorry."

Demmer: "All right but my... and the reason for my question is, you know, in order to make this a... a genuine option that we have for local governments to pursue, should the need arise in their communities and should they think the su... the taxpayers would be supportive of that, I want to make sure that we don't, you know, a... a Bill can take a long time to go through the General Assembly. Sometimes it can be held in the House, it can be held in the Senate, it can sit with the Governor

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

for a certain number of days. We should be cognizant during this process that there is a timeline that these units of local government are subjected to if they would like to bring this question before taxpayers."

- Franks: "Well, I'd like the local governments, instead of automatically increasing taxes every year, to stop. Because it's done in the cloak of night, it's not like people know what's going on."
- Demmer: "All right. I hear you, but there... there are legitimate cases. There are legitimate cases. And we want to make sure we're not, just because of a calendar that was established some place..."
- Franks: "Life is timing. You know, you can always find a reason you don't may... might not like the time. If you... there's never a right time to have kids, right? And so you, so there's never a good time."
- Demmer: "Representative, I... I like your Bill. Let's keep an eye on this. We'll keep an eye on that."

Franks: "Okay, good."

- Demmer: "The second question I have for you is, you and I had the opportunity to serve on a... on a task force and a lot of what we talked about was the impact that the units of local government have on property taxes across the state. Do you believe that right now units of local government have all the tools they need to manage their budgets appropriately? Or are there things that we could do to help give them better tools to manage their budgets?"
- Franks: "I really appreciated spending time with you on that task force that the Lieutenant Governor put forward 'cause we

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

learned a lot; we did a lot of good work together. And no, they... they need more tools and that's some of the Bills that we came up with. We agreed on many of them, not on all of them and I filed some of those, and I know you have as well and other friends here in the General Assembly have as well. So, we do need to continue to empower them because we know it's very easy to create a new government; it's almost impossible to get rid of it. So, we need to... to allow the citizens the ability to do that and Mr. Yingling passed a Bill here a few days ago that will help do that, very grateful for that. But we certainly do need to give them more tools but at the same time we have an obligation. Who's our first obligation is to protect our taxpayers."

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I just want to encourage Members to understand that if you're voting 'yes' for this you should also give very close consideration to those Bills that restore control to local governments, to make decisions for themselves. We can't take the... the situation and unbalance it further by saying we're going to put further restrictions in here but then tie your hands on ways of accommodating that. Remember, if you're willing to vote 'yes' for this, if you're going to vote in favor of the property tax freeze and come back to local governments and say this is a great thing that I just did for you, also be willing to commit to give local governments the kind of flexibility they need to be able to make these budgets work. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

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

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Tryon: "To the Bill."

Franks: "Oh, why'd I yield?"

Tryon: "Living in the suburbs, especially the collar counties is and watching what's happening to almost every piece of residential real estate pro... property in this economy is very, very, very difficult. To sit here and watch state policies that were put in place back in the 1980s cause property tax increases that are so much people can't afford to stay in their homes. And let me give you an example of this. In a township that I represent, Grafton Township, it's 4 percent of the value of the house, fair market value. If a person puts zero down payment on their house and they get a three and a half percent mortgage, they're paying more for the property than they're paying... or paying more in taxes than they're paying for the property, and it can't go on. The tax cap was designed and did its job at a time period where the assessed valuation was rising at 5 and 10 percent and where we had rapid inflation, and it said you can't go over the rate of inflation. Everybody said that's probably something we could live with, the rate of inflation. The fabricators of the tax cap never envisioned a time where the EAV would be going down and the CPI would be going up. So, let me give you an example. In Huntley, Illinois, where the school district was entitled under the tax cap to take almost 2 percent more money, doesn't sound like a lot of money, 2 percent more money. They had to raise their tax rate 16 percent to get 2 percent more money. Now here's the interesting thing. My good colleague, Representative Moffitt, brought up the truth in

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

taxation hearing. Well, what's different in a tax cap county is they're not required to have a truth in taxation hearing unless they raise the levy more than 5 percent. So, if they raise it... but they should have a truth in taxation hearing... any unit of government should have a truth in taxation hearing if you're going to raise the tax rate 16, 15, 14, 20 percent. So, what's happening now is units of government, when real estate is deflating, all they have to do is manage the levy to where they were last year and they'll drive the tax rates up substantially. We should, at the very least, agree on some type of ... of requirement that the tax cap has to inform every single taxpayer through public notice that you're going to have substantial increases in a tax rate. It was designed for a different time period. Well, it still has value in... in managing our tax rates. Where you have these huge declines in EAV, it is actually working against the taxpayer. Maybe we send this over to the Senate, we continue to work on it. Maybe it's sunsetted out, maybe it's put in with a clause for a truth in taxation hearing. What... every... most of us have been on some city council, township board or something like that. Who in the world would vote to raise the tax rate 16 percent if you had to make that vote at one time? But you don't have to make that vote 'cause all you have to do is say we're not going to raise our levy and the clerk will automatically make that calculation. So, we ought to be able to agree that if you're going go up more than 5 percent in your tax rate, not just the levy, that you're going have a truth in taxation hearing. So, I'm going to support this, this can continue to be worked on in the Senate, but I think it's time that we

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

take a hard look at the tax cap, make some modification that put the taxpayers in a position to be able to have more of a say on their tax rate. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wehrli: "Representative, first and foremost, thank you for considering the taxpayers. That's sort of a refreshing, fresh breath from that side of the aisle, so thank you for that."

Franks: "That's sort of backhanded. We all care about the taxpayers on this side too."

Wehrli: "Well, you so more than others. So, here's my question to you. Right now, as we look at our budget crisis, and we're coming up with different solutions, LGDF, the pension cost shift, the school funding re-formula, those either take or they either move responsibilities to the locals or they take revenues away from the locals. If we implemented all three of those things in my district alone, in fully implementation, it's \$80 million on an annual basis. Under your proposed legislation, would my residents have to go to referendum to absorb the impact of those three, or any one of those?"

Franks: "Well, first of all, you... you're speculating that we're going to pass any of those. Okay? I mean... how many, by a show of hands, I mean, how many people think we're going to have a budget by the end of May? Come on, everybody, don't be shy. All right, all right, we've got four. So, it's rampant speculation I... so, we don't know what it's going to be. But we do know... we do know that our taxpayers are suffering now. We do know that the automatic increases are crippling our

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- taxpayers. So, I think we need to deal with what we do know and help our taxpayers now."
- Wehrli: "Well, that was an articulate answer that didn't answer the question. What... what are my locals supposed to do if we shift burdens onto them and they don't... do they... does this automatically mean they have to go to referendum?"
- Franks: "Well, what it says, the way this Bill is written, is that they will get the same amount as they got the last year. From... from whatever the tax levy is, okay, whatever they... whatever they got this will not... this will not reduce it. Now if the state does something different that's in... then we may have a different argument, but the... the Local Government Distribution Fund is not something that's, you know, that's part of this. It's not part of like a... a PTELL, for instance. Would... would you agree?"
- Wehrli: "Well, I am concerned about LGDF I mean, as a member of the Naperville City Council I sat in Senator..."
- Franks: "But it's not part of this."
- Wehrli: "...Senate President Cullerton's chambers frequently saying that we were never going to touch LGDF. Now, under a new administration, somehow LGDF seems to be on the table. So, I'm con..."
- Franks: "Well, you ought to go to the second floor and talk about it, then."
- Wehrli: "I am concerned with my local elected officials the... of not having the ability to absorb the mistakes that we make."
- Franks: "I don't think there's a lot of people on this side of the aisle going after LGDF. I... I put in House Bill 4300, a 5 percent cut. I think your... I think the Governor is the one

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

who wanted to cut it significantly, so I'm thinking that argument ought to be made downstairs."

Wehrli: "To the Bill."

Franks: "Okay."

Wehrli: "This is nothing more than a responsibility shift from here to the locals, and it ham tie... it hamstrings them the inability to react to what we do to them, whether it's LGDF, pension cost shift, anything that we do that either takes revenue away from them or puts more fees or costs on them, they will not have the ability to absorb those. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you, Sir. Jack, couple questions. I... and I had a hard time hearing, not because I'm hard of hearing, unless I want to be, but I couldn't hear your response to Representative Moffitt. Who... and his question really was, as I understood it, what do you do about the locals who've already passed budgets and we impose this on them? What... what was the answer that you gave him?"

Franks: "Well, every... I'm not sure it was the Gentleman who asked about the budget; I think it might have been another individual who asked about it."

Kay: "Okay."

Franks: "I think there's time. You know, it's a good question, Dwight, because yesterday one of your seatmates had talked about the promises we had made to others, you know, and then decided to go borrow money to... to take us deeper into debt to

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

pay for a broken promise, right? There's been a lot of promises that have been broken to a lot of people. That's very unfortunate because the taxpayers deserve... deserve much better."

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, I... I can't hear a word here. Thank you, Sir."
Franks: "So, the taxpayers deserve much better. People will have to adjust their budgets if its... if it falls within a time frame. Assuming this comes... this passes both chambers, it'll take effect, I believe, in January of 2017."

Kay: "So, you have a one-year grace period..."

Franks: "Right."

Kay: "...so to speak, in here that they can take a look and adjust and... and maybe go back to the people, if they want to, because they can do that. Is that correct?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Kay: "Yeah. I have, in Madison County, Illinois, one of the bigger counties in the state, in my district we've lost almost 3 thousand people... excuse me... in my county we've lost almost 3 thousand people. In my district, the sole reason has to do with the fact that they can't pay their tax bill."

Franks: "Yep."

Kay: "They cannot pay their tax bill. Now, having said that, here's... here's the reverse side of what I heard one of my previous colleagues argue for local control, and I like local control, as long as it works. But in... in my area we've had a couple of scenarios where it hasn't. Let me give you an example. So, you run up \$125 million worth of debt building this and that that you don't need in the school district. And all of a sudden you have 125 million debt... million dollars

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

worth of debt and you can't pay for it and so everybody in Madison County has now got, guess what, a huge increase in their tax bill, and they're livid. I understand local control, I get it. But for 10 years, and two administrations, or three, they have failed the local taxpayers and so... you say, well, that's... that's a local problem. Well, it is, but they're not going to be able to do anything about it because they can't borrow; they can't bond and so right now they're trying to figure out how they're going to operate. And they want local taxpayers to bail them out. And I'm sorry, I just don't think that's right. I think this is a good Bill and I'm going to vote for this Bill. The only thing I would tell you is, I'd like to see it come back, and I'd support a Bill that says, you know what, PTELL needs to go, really needs to go. Because PTELL is nothing more than allowing one county to subsidize another county, and forgive me, but I think we're... down in southern Illinois we're tired of subsidizing. So, this... this is a Bill I'm going... I'm going to vote for. I think you put a stopgap in there, I think you've got some safety valves in there and maybe people don't like it, but I will say this, and I'm going to say it to the Bill in closing, Mr. Speaker. We have a pool of taxpayers that is shrinking in the State of Illinois, exponentially shrinking, and it's happening quickly and it's happening at a rate that's going to do nothing more than force the local people to increase taxes evermore, evermore. And I think if we don't do something to step in and stop that we're going to be... I mean, we're at risk now, but we're going to be at risk at losing hundreds of thousands of people because they can't afford to live here. So, I'm going

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

to vote for this Bill. I hope... I... I really hope it does, Jack, what you want it to do, but I'm going to give you full support on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to dovetail on some of Representative Kay's last comments. So, he was describing a situation with his local schools where they're building and building and building. I want to describe something in... in one of my local school districts, you may have seen this in the news. The board just passed a 10-year contract... 10-year contract. In the first four years of this contract, there will be two and a half percent annual increases, in the last six years of the contract, four percent annual increases. And so, I attend some of these school board meetings as a private citizen and also sometimes with wearing my State Rep hat on, and I hear what the local taxpayers are saying, and they're screaming for relief. And they come to me and... and I remind them, I say look at your tax bill, look at where the majority of the money on your tax bill is going. There are some local units of government that are acting in the taxpayer's best interest. Some of my municipalities, Palatine, for example, has actually dropped its levy, and is finding efficiencies. They're... they're training their employees to do multiple jobs within a department. So, they're doing the right thing. I want... I don't want to say that everybody in my local area is ... is acting badly. But I just had a conversation with our village manager, he said, look, if this passes this is going to be very hard for us. It's going to make things difficult for us. We also need to pass real pension reform. And so,

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Representative Franks, I am going to support your Bill. But I... I think it's important that we talk about some of these other factors that are raising the costs on our taxpayers that are forcing some of these levies up. Sometimes it's ... it's due to reckless behavior, or in our opinion, reckless behavior. Sometimes it's because of the laws that are passed here in Springfield and our local units of government are forced to raise their levies because of the rules we put on them; the unfunded mandates, workers' comp costs, all these additional burdens that we put on our local units of government. So, I want to support this, acknowledging though, that there are some units of government that are doing the right thing, and if they need more money they can go and ask for more money in the form of a referendum. And I think the taxpayers are smart enough to identify which of their local units of government are doing a good job, are providing a good return on... on the taxes, and which ones need to be reined in. So, I support your Bill, and thank you for bringing it forward."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Mr. Franks, so, Wheatland Township, last year, had a zero
 percent levy because they sold a building, had a surplus,
 didn't levy anything. Now my understanding the... your Bill
 looks over three years at the highest levy. Is that right?"
Franks: "No, I'm not sure what you're referring to."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Ives: "Okay. Then maybe it was interpreted wrong. So, what would you do in that situation where they levied nothing last year because they didn't need to."
- Franks: "They had a zero. They... they didn't increase their levy, but they got X amount of dollars. So, they..."
- Ives: "No. They literally had nothing. They didn't levy anything,
 zero."
- Franks: "I'll ch... I'll..."
- Ives: "They sold a building, they had a surplus, they didn't need to levy any money. So, they used all that and they literally levied \$0."
- Franks: "Give me a minute, I'm not sure on that."
- Ives: "Okay. Well, that just... you know what, I'm actually in favor of your Bill. It's fine. Maybe we can just do a small Amendment on the Senate side for the, you know, looking at..."
- Franks: "Yeah, I'm happy... Yeah I don't... I'm not trying to punish anybody. I'm just trying not to... I just want there to be more accountability and I don't... I think that the governments have got what they got before. If they need more, they should have to ask for it, that's all."
- Ives: "I agree with you 100 percent. Okay. The other thing is that you're putting this on a time frame where if... if they wanted to run a referendum they would still have enough time to put it on the November ballot and take it to the voters for a vote and have that money remitted to them under the normal cycle of property tax collection. Is that correct?"
- Franks: "Absolutely. And they can run it again next year as well during the municipal elections. They can run it... there's

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

nothing... there's no prohibition on how many referendums they can or when they can run them. Nothing changes."

Ives: "I... I'm just trying to fill in the gap here. 'Cause if we freeze it now they still have time to run..."

Franks: "Oh, absolutely."

Ives: "...a referendum and ask others, right?"

Franks: "Absolutely."

Ives: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill then. You know, I stand in strong support of this Bill. This... property taxes are easily the number one issue in my district. I will tell you that when people are selling homes these days the value of that home and the... the sales price that they get is heavily discounted for the amount of property taxes that they're looking at to pay. If you talk to any realtor in my area they will agree that that is exactly what's happening. We need to rein in property taxes, but we do need the reform. I mean, Wheaton, Naperville and other cities around, not just my district but the entire state, have raised property taxes and the number one reason that they're raising property taxes is to pay for pensions at the local level and I'm talking about municipal police and fire and even IMRF pensions. These costs are enormous. But I thank Representative Franks for bringing this Bill 'cause this may be the Bill where reality hits Illinois. Where people realize what they're funding and how much it costs and then we start to get the reform that's necessary. So, vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Wheeler, K.: "How many votes will this take if it supersedes Home Rule?"

Speaker Lang: "This Bill preempts Home Rule and it will require 71 votes."

Wheeler, K.: "And is that the case here?"

Speaker Lang: "I just told you it is the case."

Wheeler, K.: "I... I'm sorry. I'm referring to the Gentleman in... from Marengo."

Speaker Lang: "Would you like him to yield?"

Wheeler, K.: "Yes, I would appreciate that."

Speaker Lang: "Yes."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you, Representative, for bringing this Bill.

To follow up on my question, or my inquiry of the Chair, this...

to be totally clear, this Bill will require 71 votes. Is that
right?"

Franks: "Correct."

Wheeler, K.: "Thank you. To the Bill. According to the measure of average effective rate as determined by a proportion of the value of the home that is paid in property taxes, I represent the number one and number seven highest property tax counties in the state, Kendall and Kane Counties. Remind yourself this is in the state where it is either the worst or the second worst, depending on how you measure property taxes in the country. This property tax relief is a... is a big deal. To echo my colleague from Dixon, we have to be ready to give our local units of government the tools to address their costs, especially, those unfunded mandates that come from the State of Illinois. I see a long list of opponents to this Bill, many of which are good friends of mine, I think I even belong

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

to a couple of those organizations, but there is a critical proponent that we need to take into account, one that needs immediate relief, the overwhelmed Illinois property taxpayer. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really appreciate the debate and understand... I understand the worries that some folks have, but Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't think there's a bigger issue that we can do, locally, for our homeowners than this Bill. I know that the... the Governor had talked about this as well. You hear it every day when you're home in your district. I've had seniors, literally in tears, sitting in my office because they don't know what to do. They can no longer afford to stay in the home that they've had for years, and the fact is that they're buying their home twice from the government because our taxes are out of control. We have an opportunity today to stop... to stop what's going on with the ever-increase in property taxes. This isn't going to solve everything, but it is a start, and it is a way to reset the entire dialogue that we find ourselves in. Because we always hear that government needs more, and more, and more and they always get more, and more, and more, regardless of what the citizens can afford to pay. Now, I'm not insensitive to the fact that there will be some disruption, perhaps locally, but the fact is, our CPI has been low for the last few years and it's... and it looks as though it's going to stay that way for some time if you believe the feds. So, if there was ever a time to do it, the time is now, because the CPI is low. This is the time to do this Bill. We have a unique opportunity right now, where we

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- will have the least impact on our local governments and how much will actually be frozen, but we will have changed the dynamic. We will have changed how it goes forward and then we will finally, finally, finally, demand real accountability with our tax dollars. Please vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Lang: "Those... a reminder to the Members, this Bill requires 71 votes. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 56 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And the Bill fails. Chair recognizes Mr. Anthony."
- Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect on HJRCA 26 my intention was to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. The record will reflect your intention. Mr. Clerk, HJRCA 36. What is the status of that Constitutional Amendment?"
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #36 has been read a third time on a previous day and is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Phelps. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Phelps, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm sponsoring this Amendment on behalf of the Illinois

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Department of Transportation. Our good friend Rich Brauer and his staff came to me and this is more or less a technical Amendment. It cleans up some language that they wanted so they could be... so they could support the Bill. So, I just ask for its adoption."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please place this on the Order of Third Reading. So, Mr. Clerk, my understanding is that this is now on Third Reading, but according to the Constitution this has to be read three times on three different days. So, Mr. Clerk, please place HJRCA36 on the Order of First Reading and read it in full for the first time."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #36, as amended.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to add Section 11 to Article IX of the Illinois Constitution as follows:

ARTICLE IX

REVENUE

SECTION 11. TRANSPORTATION FUNDS

(a) No moneys, including bond proceeds, derived from taxes, fees, excises, or license taxes relating to registration,

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

title, or operation or use of vehicles, or related to the use of highways, roads, streets, bridges, mass transit, intercity passenger rail, ports, airports, or to fuels used for propelling vehicles, or derived from taxes, fees, excises, or license taxes relating to any other transportation infrastructure or transportation operation, shall be expended for purposes other than as provided in subsections (b) and (c).

- (b) Transportation funds may be expended for the following: the costs of administering laws related to vehicles and transportation, including statutory refunds and adjustments provided in those laws; payment of highway obligations; costs for construction, reconstruction, maintenance, repair, and betterment of highways, roads, streets, bridges, mass transit, intercity passenger rail, ports, airports, or other forms of transportation; and other statutory highway purposes. Transportation funds may also be expended for the State or local share of highway funds to match federal aid highway funds, and expenses of grade separation of highways and railroad crossings, including protection of at-grade highways and railroad crossings, and, with respect to local governments, other transportation purposes as authorized by law.
- (c) The costs of administering laws related to vehicles and transportation shall be limited to direct program expenses related to the following: the enforcement of traffic, railroad, and motor carrier laws; the safety of highways, roads, streets, bridges, mass transit, intercity passenger rail, ports, or airports; and the construction,

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

reconstruction, improvement, repair, maintenance, operation, and administration of highways, under any related provisions of law or any purpose related or incident to, including grade separation of highways and railroad crossings. limitations to the costs of administering laws related to vehicles and transportation under this subsection (c) shall also include direct program expenses related to workers' compensation claims for death or injury of employees of the State's transportation agency; the acquisition of land and the erection of buildings for highway purposes, including the acquisition of highway rights-of-way or for investigations to determine the reasonable anticipated future highway needs; and the making of surveys, plans, specifications, estimates for the construction and maintenance of flight strips and highways. The expenses related to the construction and maintenance of flight strips and highways under this subsection (c) are for the purpose of providing access to military and naval reservations, defense-industries, defense-industry sites, and sources of raw materials, including the replacement of existing highways and highway connections shut off from general use at military and naval reservations, defense-industries, and defense-industry sites, or the purchase of rights-of-way.

(d) None of the revenues described in subsection (a) of this Section shall, by transfer, offset, or otherwise, be diverted to any purpose other than those described in subsections (b) and (c) of this Section.

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- (e) If the General Assembly appropriates funds for a mode of transportation not described in this Section, the General Assembly must provide for a dedicated source of funding.
- (f) Federal funds may be spent for any purposes authorized by federal law.

SCHEDULE

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

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please place HJRCA36 on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 114, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 114, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 114 would require the Department of Juvenile Justice to file a critical incident report when a child in the custody of the courts either cause harm to himself or is harmed by others. And it would also require a follow-up by DCFS. And I just want to, just give a brief history that over the years there has been several scandals involving treatment of young... of youth incarcerated in the Department of Juvenile Justice. The scandals included: sex abuse, failure to provide medical care, failure to provide education and inappropriate use of isolation. As a result, the Department of Justice is under a court order. House Bill 114 will set forth quidelines

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

where the critical reporting of what is happening to the children that's in our system will be filed, the parents would be notified, as well as DCS... DCFS, as well as the courts. These are the people that's responsible for these children. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Clerk?"

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry."

Reis: "What are the... what is the status of the Bill, and the Amendments?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The Bill is currently on Third Reading, but previously Amendment 1 was adopted in committee, Floor Amendments 2, 3 and 4 were all adopted."

Reis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, our analysis shows that represen… or excuse me, Amendment 2 becomes the Bill, Amendment 3 becomes the Bill, and Amendment 4 becomes the Bill, but you adopted all three Amendments."

Flowers: "Well, and one just happened to build on the other. And they all become the Bill."

Reis: "Mr. Speaker, back to the Clerk. I mean, I'm not sure procedure... I have nothing against the gentle Lady's Bill, but I'm just not sure she needed to approve Amendments 2 and 3 when 4 became the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair's response is that, if the Bill is now in proper form then that's all that really matters, Sir."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Reis: "I'm not sure it is in proper form."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative, each of these Bills becom... each of these Amendments became the Bill. The last one became the Bill. So, the very last Amendment was what we would call a gut and replace and it became the Bill, everything before it went away. The Chair rules that the Bill is in order and in proper form."
- Reis: "And we respect the cal... the ruling of the Chair. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please take the record. There are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4362, Mr. Unes. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4362, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, out of the record. House Bill 6073, Mr. Harris. Out of the record. House Bill 1380, Mr. Phelps. Out of the record. House Bill 854, Representative Reaves-Harris. Out of the record. House Bill 6020, Mr. Yingling. Mr. Yingling. Does it... Out of the record. House Bill 5017, Representative Wheeler. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5017, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler."
- Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5017 amends the Juvenile Court Act. It provides that whenever a juvenile has

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

been arrested, charged or adjudicated that a person may petition the court at any time for expungement of records. A minor eligible would be one who was arrested and no petition filed, a minor that was charged and dismissed, a minor that was charged and found not guilty, a minor that was placed under supervision and successfully completed the supervision, a minor that was adjudicated for Class B, Class C misdemeanor or a petty offense. Something I'm going to repeat, if I'm allowed to do two Bills today, is that multiple times 96 percent of juvenile arrests are nonviolent offenses. Juvenile expungement is critical for minors to not... linger in their mistakes, impeding opportunities for education, employment and housing. Currently, our expungement laws are complicated and burdensome and expensive. This Bill eliminates the confusion, the delay and the expense. It clears the past for the minor to move on with his or her life. Something else I'm... if I have the opportunity to do to my college Bill, that I'll repeat multiple times a day, is that education and employment, meaningful employment, reduces recidivism. I'll be happy to answer any questions. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4446, Representative Wheeler. Please read the Bill."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4446, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4464 (sic-4446) creates a College Admission Inquiries Act. It provides that during admission process colleges may not ask the applicant if he or she has a criminal background. However, after the applicant has been admitted as a student, a college 'may' inquiries regarding the student's past criminal activities. It is important to note that a college can purposefully use this information to offer support counseling and services, provide opportunities for a work-study program and limit activities and housing, if necessary. By removing the barrier to the higher education faced by people with past criminal justice involvement is proven in a powerful way to reduce recidivism. For the Bill, it's important that we recognizes facts, data and evidence. Fact, education is the greatest way to provide opportunities and to improve one's economic level. Six out of 10 U.S. jobs require a postsecondary degree and credentials. Over 65 million Americans have misdemeanors or felony convictions. And again, 96 percent of juvenile arrests are of... are nonviolent offenses. According to the data presented in the study for the Center of Community Alternatives, two out of three people with the criminal convictions who begin an application process never complete the process. Unfortunately, this drives a large number of people away who present no danger to campus safety and are capable of succeeding academically. Some can even argue that while hindering entrance to college it could

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

actually negatively affect public safety. The evidence... the empirical evidence to indicate the criminal history screening makes campus safer. Approximately 60 percent of colleges today ask about criminal history in the application process. Compared campus crime with the 60 percent of colleges that ask with 40 percent that don't ask, there is no significant difference between the two groupings. Let me... me repeat this. Verifiable data shows that schools that require criminal history are no safer than those who don't. On the surface and first blush, this Bill appears to say that I'm simply suggesting colleges would be forced to educate and house excons and more importantly, the fear of the unintended consequence would mean campus crime rate would increase exponentially. However, I urge you to make an educated vote based on the facts, the evidence and the data. Research shows our fears are unfounded. Happy to ask ... answer any questions. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Just a couple questions. Is it in law now where they must ask this question on applications? Do they have to ask it?"

Wheeler, B.: "No. They do... they don't ask; 60 percent of them do, 40 percent of them do not."

Ives: "Okay. And in the State of Illinois, what universities have
 this box?"

Wheeler, B.: "Well, for starters the ones that use the common application. Some of the community colleges use it. Some of

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

the trade schools use it, some of them don't. I don't know though, specifically."

Ives: "But our public universities or private universities they could decide not to ask. Is that correct?"

Wheeler, B.: "Most of them use the common application. It's on the comlin... common application."

Ives: "And if, even if they did have this box on there, most universities could decide to ignore it?"

Wheeler, B.: "Yes."

Ives: "Okay. To the Bill. I just think that, you know, I... I'm interested in this Bill. However, I think that we're asking private universities to do things that they may not be willing to do. And I think that there's no current law in place right now, that says that you have to ask this question anyway. We could petition our public universities to not do it, to get away from it and we should give them the freedom to do that without mandating that they do one thing or the other. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler to close."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you. If we are sincere about the criminal justice reform, economic independence and creating pathways out of poverty and reducing the reliance on incarceration, then the college door should all be... should be open to all. We need to create more meaningful and thoughtful inclusive admission policies and we need to start thinking out of the box. Please vote 'yes'."

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

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

record yourselves. Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6041, Mr. Moffitt. Please read the Bill. I understand there are Amendments, Sir. Mr. Clerk, please put the Bill back on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6041, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment 1 is offered by Representative Moffitt."

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

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to withdraw Amendment 1."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 1 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Moffitt: "And I would like to move to adopt Amendment 2."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 has been off... has been approved for consideration and is offered by Representative Moffitt." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt on Amendment 2."

Moffitt: "Thank you. This... I'm pleased to report this is now a... an agreed Bill, which removes all opposition. This language is worked out with the Governor's Office on Amendment 2, so when we adopt it, it will be a Bill with no opponents. And it changes two... two things in terms of how... what percent of the re... the voters you'd need to... to consider withdrawing and what percent of the tax base would create a... actually be a... a danger in terms of making it a hazard. So, this is language

121st Legislative Day

- that the Governor's Office agreed to. We think it still does what we want it to. So, I urge adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5995, on the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Sullivan. Out of the record. House Bill 46... well, excuse me... 4362, Mr. Unes. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 5602, Mr. Unes. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5602, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Unes, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."
- Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt commime...

 Committee Amendment #2, which very simply changes the amount of days that the department would have to respond to an IDR from 75 to 60. I know of no opponents and I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On the Order of Second Reading,
 House Bill 5973, Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans. Out of the record.
 House Bill 5201, Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Gordon-Booth. Out of the record. Returning to Mr. Evans, House Bill 5973. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5973, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Evans."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

Evans: "Yeah. Floor Amendment 1 offers some clarifying language.

And I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack is recognized."

Sandack: "Thank you. Marcus, could you elaborate a little bit on what your Amendment does, please?"

Evans: "Yeah, I have a couple of Amendments. Amendment 1, the department felt as though it wasn't clear with regards to their discretion. So, Amendment 1 just cleared up some of the ambiguous language. It didn't get to removing the opposition. That's going to come up in Amendment 2 in which we kind of started that real progress. But this is just that first Amendment, so I wanted to include it."

Sandack: "And just as a prelim. Amendment 2 will take care of opposition?"

Evans: "Yeah. Amendment 2 removes the majority of the opposition.

I think the only remaining opposition, once we get to

Amendment 2..."

Sandack: "Yes, Sir."

Evans: "...was with the department."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just quickly, I... I'm supporting this Bill. I'm asking the Body to support it. As a former employer, I'm seeking people who have learned from mistakes and want to better themselves and want to provide for themselves. And I think that we need to do that in this state. And I just... I support this Bill and I thank the Sponsor for bringing it to... to my attention. And again, let's give people a chance to provide for themselves. It's uplifting; it's the right thing to do. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Evans and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

Evans: "As men... yeah, as mentioned to Leader Sandack. Amendment 2 removed two of the occupations. My initial Bill had five occupational categories, CPAs, realtors, barbers, the funeral home industry and cosmetologists. We removed the realtors and the CPAs; I think it was a little too ambitious. We're going to just focus on three categories of licensing and that's the roofers, the funeral home industry and barbers and cosmetologies, and none are opposed. So, the only remaining opposition is the department. I'm continuing to talk about details. Hopefully, we can straighten some of those out. We have a parallel thought, but just working on some of the details."

121st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5762, Representative Harper. There's some... Yes? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5762, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A Fiscal Note and State Mandates Note are still requested but not filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 1190, Representative Kelly Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 6013, Representative Cassidy. Representative Kelly Cassidy. Out of the record. House Bill 5010, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5010, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment #3 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Feigenholtz and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz on the Amendment. Mr. Riley in the Chair."
- Feigenholtz: "Tha... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is an Amendment that takes all opposition off this Bill. And I thank you... I'd like to thank the Minority spokesperson of this committee for letting me bring this straight to the floor."

121st Legislative Day

- Speaker Riley: "Representative Feigenholtz moves do adopt Floor Amendment #4. All those in favor state by saying 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 5010 is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Riley: "Third Reading. House Bill 689, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 689, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Riley: "Leader Lang on Floor Amendment #1."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 1 to House Bill 689 embodies the fair tax Amendment that, if we can adopt it, we can debate it thoroughly on Third Reading. I would ask your support to do that."
- Speaker Riley: "Leader Lang moves do adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6... Delay that, we have Representative Sandack."
- Sandack: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."
- Sandack: "Leader I... I certainly appreciate having a Third Reading debate, but what does... what's the Amendment doing? What's being amended in the Bill?"
- Lang: "This is the fair tax Amendment that has different levels of taxation based on ability to pay. This works in conjunction with a Constitutional Amendment that we may see in the next several days that would take the Constitution away from a flat tax."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Sandack: "Okay. So, insofar as what is amended, the... the tax rates are different than the original filing?"

Lang: "I'm not understanding your questions."

Sandack: "What's... what Amendment in... what... what's changing in the Bill?"

Lang: "This is... so we... many people in this building know we've been talking about the fair tax. During Speaker Madigan's Constitutional Amendment, people alluded to certain tax rates. That comes from this Amendment."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Riley: "Leader Lang moves do adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 689. All those in favor state by saying 'aye'; all those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 689 is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Riley: "Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. I love that.

House Bill 1191 on the Order of Third Reading, Mr. Riley.

Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1191, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1191 is a Bill that allows Will County to acquire property... actually properties in Romeoville, through a quick-take. What this Bill will do is relieve traffic congestion and safety issues. This project is known as the I-55 Interchange and

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Weber Road Reconstruction Project. This is a... a Bill and a project that is really needed in that area. And I'll be glad to answer any questions you have and I encourage 'aye' votes on this very important project."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. A diverging diamond interchange was recently put in at the intersection of Route 59 and I-88 and it... it improved the intersection tremendously. Yesterday, I spoke with the City Manager of the City of Naperville and due to that interchange improvement there have been less calls for police due to con... accidents both on I-88 and Route 59. What this Bill does is allow that exact same type of intersection to go in at Weber Road and I-55. And anybody that's driven northbound on 55 on a Friday, and needs to exit there, you know that you can be waiting literally on the Interstate to exit. So, this is a good bit of legislation. I'm typically not a fan of quick-take, but the delay of five years is one that is simply not acceptable here. And I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, is there any individual residences...

personal residences involved in the... the property that would

be taken under quick-take?"

Riley: "No, not to my knowledge. Actually, this process has been going on since about 2009, so all of the vetting and public hearings and all of that has taken place. And there's no

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

adverse environmental impact. There's no impact to the rest of the community. So, I would say that since then everything is... is okay as far as the community is concerned."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Just very briefly, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the previous speaker said quick-take is a tricky piece of legislation, and which... which many of us are opposed to. However, there are times when it's appropriate to use it, I firmly believe that this is one of these times. If anyone travels on I-55 and tries to get on or... or tries to get off at Weber Road, either going north or south, that... that back-up can be extremely long, extremely hazardous and well worth... well worth taking... using quick-take to correct the problem. So, I stand in support of the Gentleman's Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, I... I agree with, you know, I rarely support quick-take, but I think there are times. Just a question. Would you just explain, very briefly, is it the standard or the protocol set for establishing value of any land that would be taken this way, and you knew IDOT would be involved. And is it pre... it's already set up with what procedure they follow though isn't it?"

Riley: "Well, yeah. You know, that valuation has already been...
been done. As I said, this project is not exactly a new one.
So, all of those things have been taken into consideration."
Moffitt: "How much area is this going to take? I don't find that

in... in our analysis."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Riley: "I'm sorry?"

Moffitt: "How much area, acres, how much land is it going to take?"

Riley: "I think it's about an... an area about a mile and a half total a mile long"

Moffitt: "And just how wide? I mean, I just wonder how what it would be the equivalent of?"

Riley: "Well, it's... I'm not exactly sure how wide it is, but it's... like I said... about a mile long. Basically, in terms of streets... in terms of streets it goes from about 119th Street to 135th. So that gives you an idea."

Moffitt: "In... Representative, are there... are there any opponents?

We... we're not showing any, but."

Riley: "There aren't any."

Moffitt: "Okay."

Riley: "Like I said, this... this project has gone through a long vetting process. And we're just ready to... to move forward."

Moffitt: "It's almost like quick-take's almost not a correct description."

Riley: "I never liked that term. But no, it's not in this case."

Moffitt: "Okay. Well, thank you. And again, it's... I think this is one of those times when it has... has merit to support. Thank you."

Riley: "I would say so. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

- Thapedi: "Leader, just quickly. I... if I understand correctly that you said that the subject property is roughly about a mile long. Is that accurate?"
- Riley: "Somewhere around there, it's all commercial frontage property."
- Thapedi: "Okay. You know, roughly, about what the fair cash market value is of the property?"
- Riley: "I... I really couldn't say. I really couldn't say. And... and again, this was all determined, like I said, this is not a new project. This has been going on for quite some time. There is a value. I... I just, you know, couldn't tell you exactly what it is."
- Thapedi: "And... and when you say that it's been going on for quite some time, I'm assuming that they're litigating now in an eminent domain action, correct?"

Riley: "Yes, they are."

- Thapedi: "So, obviously, the... the case is not going that well so the condemning body wants to utilize quick-take authority to try to get acquisition of the property and then determine... make a deposit for whatever the fair cash market value is now, continue litigating the case and let a jury decide what the fair cash market value of the subject property is at its highest and best use, correct?"
- Riley: "Well, I think... Yes, but I think you know how quick-takes are... are done. I'm not exactly sure or I'm not sure that it's because there's a... a problem in litigation. It's just something that would just move the process forward."

Thapedi: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to go straight to the Bill. This is in... in my neck of the woods and Natalie Manley's neck of the woods. And being a commercial real estate agent, I know this area extremely well. Just imagine, almost all the property's developed, you've got easements, you have no homes. You have a situation where the businesses that are getting the property taken away from them are probably going to do much better off because of the fact that all the congestion that is at the inter... at the intersection is removed. I avoid that intersection as much as I can and it's the next intersection off from where I live. So this is an important, incredibly reasonable, situation. Ι understand if I was in anybody else's situation. When I hear the word quick-take I would pause, but if there's ever a... a situation for this to be used, I strongly believe that this is the time. I know the property well. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 85 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Postponed Consideration there appears House Bill 5771, Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

This is a measure that codifies a Supreme Court ruling that...

it is actually totally technical in nature. We adopted a Bill

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

a year ago that we thought did everything we were supposed to do to make sure our statute was in good working order, we didn't. This is one tiny clarification that we need in order to be... to be consistent with what is the... the Supreme Court ruling. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Postponed Consideration there appears House Bill 6037, Representative Reaves-Harris. Please proceed."

Reaves-Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is House Bill 6037 and as I indicated, last week, that this Bill would amend the Code of Corrections by adding that the court may consider the defendant's mental illness as a factor in mitigation at sentencing. The language is very specific. It just says that at the time of the offense the defendant was suffering from a serious mental illness, which through... though insufficient to establish the defense of insanity, substantially affected his or her ability to understand the nature of his or her acts or to conform his or her conduct to the requirements of the law. This is permissive and not directive. It came out of committee 15-0. There is no opposition to this Bill. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's a reason why NAMI and why Mental Health America are so strongly in favor of this Bill and why you should be too. Our prisons are loaded up with mentally ill people. Jails are filled with mentally ill people. And what this important Bill does is give some more flexibility to the judiciary in determining sentences and hopefully directing mentally ill people to get the care instead of jail or an emergency room. I strongly support the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Sp... Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we talk about what we do with people that have mental illness in our jails. Well, let's start at the front end and keep them out of jail, if we can. This is a permissive Bill that will basically say, hey, let's take a look at sentencing and does mental illness have a factor in sentencing, and if it does, maybe we can put people in a diversion program, maybe we can give them treatment that they need. Let's find out these facts on the front end, before they get into the system where they're not going to get the treatment that they need. And once again, it is a permissive Bill. I think it's a very good idea, very timely that, while we work on these issues with our criminal justice system, this should be at the forefront of that discussion. I real... I urge everybody to vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Harris, D.: "Representative, just so I understand exactly what the Bill does. The Bill adds the phrase 'serious mental illness' to the list of existing factors, 15 factors which a judge may consider. Is that correct?"

Reaves-Harris: "That's correct."

Harris, D.: "And so, the judge still has discretion in terms of what can... what sentence can be imposed. We're simply saying that serious mental illness is one of the factors that needs to be considered in his imposition or her imposition of a sentence, correct?"

Reaves-Harris: "Absolutely correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. And I think there was... I know we voted on this Bill on a previous day... I think there was some misunderstanding about that in terms of what the Bill really did. But it simply adds the phrase 'serious mental illness' to that category of... of factors that can be considered by the judge. Fair discrip..."

Reaves-Harris: "That's... that's correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. And based on that, I think the Bill deserves a 'yes' vote and hope it will pass out of here with a large Majority."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Tryon: "Representative, essentially the judge will be able to look at the... the sentencing and be able to provide maybe a more tailored sent... sentencing to that individual in the form

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

of maybe a therapeutical-type sentence. Would that not be correct?"

Reaves-Harris: "That is correct."

Tryon: "And... and we just did this for veterans courts to allow a veteran to have the opportunity to be able to essen... essentially exchange a criminal sentence for a therapeutical sentence if the judge had a court-ordered therapeutical sentence that they could work with. And in many cases, this would actually be the right kind of rehabilitation for the... for... for the individual. Is that not correct?"

Reaves-Harris: "That is absolutely correct."

Tryon: "And we have other examples of this. And... and many times when you take a court-ordered therapeutical sentence and... and you work with... with the individual and their health care providers, we could have a much better outcome, not just in a way of the right types of justice, but one that's right for our communities and our taxpayers. And therefore, I support your Bill and I'm going... going to make an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative Reaves-Harris, I want to thank you for bringing the Bill. I was actually shocked when I read it that this isn't already a factor. In my mind, it should be the first factor that we take into account. In this state, in this country, mental illness is an undisclosed epidemic. It is an absolute epidemic that we don't want to talk about. This forces the dialogue, at least in one setting. So, I just want to rise in full support of it. And thank you for bringing the Bill, it's long overdue."

121st Legislative Day

- 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 94 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Bennett."
- Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to have my vote on House Bill 695 be recorded as a 'yes', please."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. On the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 5580, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5580, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5764, Mr. Andrade. Mr. Andrade. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5764, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. A fiscal note and state mandates note has been req... requested but not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 4492, Representative Mayfield. Representative Mayfield. Out of the record. On the Order of Third Reading, House Bill 3755, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

121st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3755, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Please... Take it out of the record."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, take the Bill from the record. House Bill 6086, Representative Kifowit. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6086, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill talks about the prioritization of needs list. All it says is that if there are two individuals on the list that are completely equal that consideration be given to the one that's been on the list the length of time. It is not a mandate. It does not force the department to slight that person. It just asks them to give consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Ammons is excused for the remainder of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you Representative. House Bill 4528, Representative McAsey. Out of the record. House Bill 5576,

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5576, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered Representative Nekritz."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1 changes the Bill in a couple... Bills in a couple of ways. It... to eliminate the objections of the... of the Department of Central Management Services and the Department of Insurance."

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

Sandack: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, I... does... does that take care of all opposition then?"

Nekritz: "No, Sir. No, Sir. But it does remove the oppo... the opposition of the state agencies."

Sandack: "CMS and who else, the Department of Insurance?"

Nekritz: "I... Insurance, correct."

Sandack: "Thank you."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Nekritz and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

121st Legislative Day

- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a... an Amendment that also deals with some objections from the Central Management Services and says that the cont... that the copay can still exist for the... for a contraceptive if the... the provider is out of network."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 5785, Mr. Turner. Leader Turner. Out of the record. Returning to House Bill 3755, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3755, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3755 is a simple Bill. It would require, with regard to freight trains and light engine locomotives, that they must be operated by a crew of at least two people. I ask for a favorable vote."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting 'yes', 35... excuse me... 39 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Bryant. For what reason do you rise?"

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Bryant: "Mr. Speaker, please let the record reflect, it was my intention to vote 'no' on that previous Bill."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Mr. Clerk,
House Bill 4477, on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Davis.
Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4477, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Davis, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #3 represents an Amendment that should eliminate the opposition from this Capital Development Board, should eliminate opposition from Central Management Services, as well as IDOT. This Bill... this Amendment specifically puts this on road construction projects, not vertical construction. Only applies to IDOT and it moves it to the appropriate Section of the Code, again, which eliminates the opposition from CDB as well as CMS."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Will, with... with the Amendment and the opposition you've described going away, is there any remaining opposition to the Bill, as amended?"

Davis, W.: "To my knowledge there is no remaining opposition."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

121st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Resolu... House Resolution 1118, Mr. Yingling. I understand you have an Amendment, Sir. You're up."
- Yingling: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment makes a technical change and corrects a misspelled word."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6136, Representative Wallace, on the Order of Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6136, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."
- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that will create what is known as an Advisory council for At-Risk Students. At-risk is defined by socioeconomic status, being a foster child and several other instances that impact learning. I do encourage the chamber to support this. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6044, Representative

121st Legislative Day

- Chapa LaVia, on the Order of Second Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 6044, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Sandack is recognized."
- Sandack: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."
- Sandack: "While we're at kind of parade rest, is there any information that the Speaker knows about as to Friday's activities?"
- Speaker Lang: "I assume that information will be forthcoming, Sir."
- Sandack: "Well, it's not assumed. Why don't you inquire? Is that okay?"
- Speaker Lang: "Well, I will inform the Speaker that inquiring minds wish to know."
- Sandack: "That would be beautiful. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolution. House Resolution 1177, offered by Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees are meeting immediately after Session. Meeting immediately after Session is Appropriations-Public Safety in Room 114, Appropriations-General Services is in Room 118."

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack, an answer to your inquiry, Sir. There will be Session on Friday. Thank you. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until Thursday, April 21 at the hour of 10 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 2157, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2219, offered by Representative Bryant, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2221, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2228, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2252, offered by Representative Wallace, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2271, offered by Representative Guzzardi, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. Senate Bill 2294, offered by Representative Anthony, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2343, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning the use of cell site devices. simulator Senate Bill 2357, offered Representative Sullivan, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 2358, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2359, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2362, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2363, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2368, offered by Representative Wehrli, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2371, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2386, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2397, offered by Representative Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning the lottery. Senate Bill 2407, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2416, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning State agencies. Senate Bill 2420, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 2427, offered by Representative Riley, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2435, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2440, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2450, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2461, offered by Representative Stewart, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2467, offered Representative Butler, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 2468, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 2523, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 2532, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2533, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2825, offered

121st Legislative Day

4/20/2016

by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2963, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills House Bill 6560, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. First Reading of this House Bill. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4312, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4323, a Bill for an Act concerning fantasy contests. House Bill 5417, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 5628, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of these House Bills. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."