138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Tom Goodell who is with First United Methodist Church in Pontiac. Pastor Goodell is the guest of Representative Brady. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting laptops, turn off cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Goodell."

Pastor Goodell: "Let us pray. Gracious and loving God, I pray for the men and women who are elected to represent the great people of the State of Illinois. I pray for wisdom for them as they navigate through countless pages of Bills, direct staffers working to help constituents balance the needs of so many residents of this great state. I pray for compassionate hearts for them as they approve budgets that help schools and small businesses, care for our seniors, care for the working poor. I pray for courage for them to vote their conscience, to serve according to their principles, and to remember the rich legacy of service that they have inherited. We remember, also, this Memorial Day weekend and pray we will keep hallowed the memory of those who have served and whose sacrifice enables us to meet this day. We call You by many names and traditions, and we close our prayer with this heartfelt benediction. Let our work glorify You and bless this great state. We pray all of these things in Your name, Amen."

Speaker Lang: "Be led in the Pledge by Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz - 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."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Monique Davis, Evans, Jones, Reeves-Harris, and Riley are excused today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representatives
 Anthony and Stewart this morning. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you. I missed to mention that Representative Acevedo as being excused today, as well."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leader. We have 100... Mr. Clerk, take the record. We have 110 Members answering the Roll, we have a quorum. Chair recognizes the Clerk. Mr. Batinick is recognized."
- Batinick: "A quick point of personal privilege. I bought... brought oranges for anybody who wants a healthy snack today on the floor."
- Speaker Lang: "Now, that's not in replace of the red noses, right?

 It looks like about the same size. Mr. Harris is recognized."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a very special guest… actually, two special guests here today which, hopefully, you will recognize. My son, who is a West Point graduate and a veteran of both the Iraqi Freedom, as well Enduring Freedom deployments. He and his bride are up in the gallery to the left here. And I'd like you to give them a warm Springfield welcome."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Nice of you to join us today.

Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Bellock: "Thank you. Representative Manley... Manley and I are going to be passing out invitations to the COWL Members for the new leadership is coming up the second week of June, the phenomenal program we have for developing women leaders in Illinois. And as of last year, we had graduated 200 women... new, young women leaders in Illinois and this year, we will be adding 20 to that. And the dinner that is going to be at the Union League Club is going to have a fascinating new speaker, Judge Arnette Hubbard, who has been involved in the Civil Rights Movement, she was the head of the Bar Association, and she also went to... Representative... President Clinton appointed her as one of the people to go observe the Nelson Mandela election. So, she will be our key note speaker. And we would love to have all the COWL women there that night. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Hurley is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Hurley: "I would like to welcome a special Page for the day too.

This is Matt Walsh. He is from St. John Fisher. He's a sixth grader and he's a Falcon. And then, his parents Suzie and Brian are up in the audience there, if we could give them a welcome."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thank you for being here with us. Mr. Zalewski, who has returned."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like... point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Zalewski: "I wanted to introduce, and the camera's not quite catching him, but... there he is. This is Henry, my son. He's here for the day in Springfield. And I just wanted to wish him a hello and he's being... and enjoy his day."

Speaker Lang: "Hello, Henry. Glad you're here with us. Keep an eye on dad. Page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 1016. Representative Willis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1016, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1, 5 and 6 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Willis."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Do not want to present Floor Amendment 1. I only want to present Floor Amendments 6, please."

Speaker Lang: "Do you want to withdraw Amendment #1?"

Willis: "Yes, please."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Amendment 1. And Mr. Clerk... And you want 5 withdrawn, as well, Representative?"

Willis: "Please withdraw Floor Amendment 5."

Speaker Lang: "Please withdraw #5, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #6 is offered by Representative Willis."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis on Amendment 6."
- Willis: "Amendment 6 is a rewrite taking in the constructive criticism from the committee. And I would prefer to discuss it on the actual vote on Third Reading, please."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy is recognized. Are you here to... are you talking on this Amendment, Sir?"
- Smiddy: "It is. I'd like... I'll yield my time to Representative Phelps."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps on the Amendment."
- Phelps: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Phelps: "Hey, Representative Willis, did you make a commitment, if you don't mind, just 'cause I know we're still talking but, did you make a commitment to bring this to committee, and if so..."
- Willis: "If the..."
- Phelps: "...could you please take it out of the record so we can go through the committee process?"
- Willis: "It... it did go through the committee process yesterday and it passed from committee yesterday. We had a robust discussion in committee yesterday afternoon."
- Phelps: "And I don't think it's your fault, but how many Amendments are we up to now? 'Cause I know I had that drone task force and I think there was like 97 thousand Amendments. I think you're getting there right? So, what's going on? Can you explain how many Amendments... what's going on?"
- Willis: "This is Amendment #6. And we have done total rewrites to make it very... much more easier to figure out instead of going

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

line by line. We did not adopt any other Amendments. We started with Amendment 1, which because we started out as a shell Bill and then went into this. This has all of the changes that were asked throughout the entire thing. We... difference between Amendment 5 and Amendment 6 was Amendment 5 accidently went straight to the floor and did not go through the committee process, which is why we decided to go and put in Amendment 6, so that we could go through the committee process and give it due time."

- Phelps: "Well, I know Representative Reis is over there,
 Representative Brown. We're all waiting to see how many more
 Amendments are coming. Do you think there'll be any more
 Amendments come to this?"
- Willis: "I do not anticipate at this point. Certainly, no complete rewrite Amendments. There is some discussion on a small technical change due to the manufacturers, but I think we're pretty damn close with it right now."
- Phelps: "So, if you do this Amendment today, you're probably going to run the Bill, probably what? Sunday, Monday or Tuesday? And I got to say something. Kalyn, you done a great job. I just wish you would quit doing Amendments for this because I really am worried, Representative Willis, in all due respect, I'm really worried this puts our little mom and pop gun dealers out of business. And that's the only reason why I'm up here today."
- Willis: "I would be happy, when we get into a full discussion on Third Reading, to address that. We tried very hard... and that's why we did the complete rewrite... to protect those small mom and pop shops."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Phelps: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "It is my understanding, Representative Willis, that there is another Amendment coming out. Amendment #7."

Willis: "There is no Amendment #7 at this point."

Kay: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We would request a Roll Call vote on this Amendment and then I would also request... and a verification. Sorry."

Speaker Lang: "Your request on both are acknowledged.

Representative Willis to close on the Amendment."

Willis: "This Amendment put in a lot of work. The reason it is #6 because we made sure that we took everybody's is considerations into language. I'd be happy to go over, briefly, what those changes were, if you'll bear with me a second while I pull that up. Okay. So ... we took in ... making sure we added additional exemptions, we put in the manufacturers of firearms are exempt, and that is, in fact, one of the reasons we had so many making sure that we listen to their language and put their language in there directly. We also put exemptions in here for those that were selling off parts or all of their collections. We also put exemptions for collectable firearms that were defined by Federal Laws; curios or relics. We made sure that we put in additions for those that were selling firearms, but they're not considered firearm dealers. We added... we made sure that we went from 8

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

to 10 on this. We put in the exemption for retiring law enforcement officers that oftentimes buy their firearms from their employer when they retire. That does not make their employer a firearms dealer. We took into consideration businesses that only a small portion of their business may be for firearm sales. Those businesses that sell less than 20 percent in firearm sales are exempt from this. We looked at the various... we looked at the various areas where we... we originally... in the original Bill had a number of different levels of licensing for the firearms dealers, and we looked at that and took a lot of constructive criticism regarding that. And we removed the requirement that employees of gun dealers must obtain a license. Instead, we streamlined the process. We allowed them to go and make sure, as long those employees have a valid FOID card, or a CCL, and the employer kept adequate records on that, that is what we allowed to be as part of their background checks. We felt very strong that that was what we were going for. We didn't need to have that. We removed from the Bill the requirement to have a written exam requirement to make sure that you... in order to do that. We extended the period in which the dealers may reapply for their license before it's expired. We changed that from 30 days to 90 days. And along that route, we also made sure that there were not going to be any problems when... if there was a delay not due to the dealer or the applicants fault. We clarified that a dealer could stay open during this time, and also open during the time if there was any hearing for any... any type of appeal required while they were going through either the licensing or the relicensing process, or if there

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

was any issues or problems when we were going through, if it posed a threat to public safety. That would be the only time we would require them to be closed. One of the sticking points in the original Amendment was surveillance. We removed that requirement to require a video surveillance from the dealership. We also specifically removed the requirement, which was... in the original Bill, to require videotaping of the actual sale itself. We also went through and looked at the implementation process and we put in a delay, not starting this until January 1 of 2018. And we would... that originally was at January 1 of 2017. We changed that. Took into consideration, the concerns of the IDFPR, which will be the licensing... body and we clarified what they would be expected to do. Their main concern was to how long it would take to have this happen. That was why we extended that. We also gave them an additional amount of time to make sure that current licensees would have time to go and look at this and work through. We changed that time from originally it was going to be that you could go and apply for a license only 30 days prior... your renewal only 30 days prior. We now changed that to 90 days prior. We also make sure that if you were in any... if there was any type of delay by any means at all, we would make sure that that would not cause you to stop your business. We grandfathered in many, many of these requests so that current gun dealers, and this really goes to my Representative friend from the south, those that are in business now, we do not want them to have to close down. We want to make sure that they can continue to run their businesses the way that they are. We made sure we listened to all of that. There was

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

a lot of changes and a lot of discussion regarding who would be making up the IDFPR4 board. We do have a board of five in there and we made sure that they would be not having... could not go in and do inspections without any type of a request for more than one a year unless there is due cause. There was a lot of discussion on what makes up a quorum of the board and who can actually make the voting. Well, obviously, we decided you had to have a quorum of the board, but we made sure that the vote actually had to be a quorum of the board not a quorum of the quorum. That was one of the major concerns that we had on there. We also made sure that the board would not be able to be overdrawn the way it is, so we're just going through that. Also, we put some clarification in on the placement of gun dealers. We do, obviously... there was in there originally saying it had to be 1000 feet away from a school. We lowered that to 500 feet by the requests of members of the committee. We also made sure that we went through and we made sure that we grandfathered those existing businesses, so nobody would have to move their business at all the way it is. We also put in a final clarification regarding the secretary... I'm sorry... regarding the sheriff's office. There had been in there a request for the sheriff's office to make confirmation, we put that in. But it had to be confirmation and... with due cause, would be the only reason that we can go with it the way it is. We made sure, also, and this is the big thing between 4 and 5, is making sure that we follow the federal definition of what a... I'm sorry... what a gun manufacturer is. And that was one of the most important things that we did. One of the other major issues on this was

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

clarifying where the gun manufacturers and gunsmiths were on do feel that we're... we took into a this. I consideration trying to make... take constructive criticism the way it was, working through it to the best, listening for the concerns that we had. We had made sure that our main issue on this is not to put anybody out of business, to work to the best that we can on it, making sure that we have everybody covered. We... as I stated, this is not a Bill to put people out. I would truly appreciate that we could go to a robust debate on Third and have this Amendment go through. I know it's been changed a lot. I know there's a lot of Amendments that come through, but I really think that we've listened to everybody's concerns, tried to address them as best as we could without having anybody have to be out of business, making sure that we would do what could be done to listen to what they're at. We're okay? Okay, granted. Making sure that we got everything... I was looking where you were at. We wanted to make sure that we did not affect our southern friends on this, our small businesses. As I said, we took a lot of consideration in on this as we redid it, making sure that we did not have to have anybody change their location, change where they are. I do hope that you will accept this Amendment and allow us to do complete debate on Third. I would move for the adoption of this as we are. Thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser, for what reason do you rise? The Lady has closed on her Amendment."

Beiser: "I was going to yield my time to Representative Phelps."

Speaker Lang: "It's going to be a little too late to do that.

Those in favor... there has been a Roll Call... there has been a

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Roll Call and a verification requested. Members will vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Lady's 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. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 43 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And the Amendment fails. You wish to... Out of the record? Mr. Clerk, out of the record. Page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2300, Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2300, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2300 makes just some small changes to the Lead Poisoning Prevention Act. It requires correction of lead-based... lead-based paint hazards before renting of a housing unit to a new tenant. So, this is in units that where a child has been identified as being lead poisoned. This new requirement just says that the lead has to be removed before the apartment is rented again. We worked... I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Representative Gabel, I know that the realtors were initially in opposition to your Bill. I don't quite understand why, especially after we vetted it through and we talked about the... the harsh affects that lead poisoning can have on

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

infants. Have you resolved their concerns? Not that that's really relevant to me 'cause I'm going to vote for it regardless. But have you at least resolved their concerns, whatever they may have been, as credible or as uncredible as they may have been?"

Gabel: "Yes, we have. They just wanted some clarification on new lease versus old... versus continuing lease. Those are resolved."

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

Gabel: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, yesterday I received a... an e-mail from the Illinois Renter... Rental Property Owners Association.

You may be familiar with them."

Gabel: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "They had a question about the definition on renewal of the leases and when this requirement kicks in on the renewal of the leases. Do you know, has... has their opposition been addressed, or is it still there?"

Gabel: "Yeah. Their opposition came very late in the game and it was already passed when we could put in Amendments to this Bill. So, I told them we would look at it as a trailer Bill to see what we could clean up. But basically, they were concerned about automatic renewal leases..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Gabel: "...and how that... how that notification would go. As I said, this is really for... this is specifically for apartments where

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

a lead poison child has been identified. So, notification... I mean, obviously, the people know that their kid's been lead poisoned. But I told them, and I will commit to looking at this and seeing what we can do as a trailer Bill."

Harris, D.: "Well, I wish you would do that because I think their observation is valid. As an example, if the lease is renewed, conceivably, on a monthly basis, then it would be next to impossible to give the kind of notice that you're giving. So, I think their opposition is valid. If you would look at it..."

Gabel: "I will."

Harris, D.: "...and try to address it, that would be appropriate.

Thank you."

Gabel: "I will. I think they wanted a 30-day period, and that's fine."

Harris, D.: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "And, Representative, I was in favor of this Bill in committee, still am. I might suggest that... an easier way would be for us to just, for the purposes of legislative intent, just in case we can't get a trailer Bill going, that... that when you say before the renewal of an existing lease agreement, here, it... a month to month agreement is not contemplated as... to be swept into that... that language. 'Cause I... I don't think that was what... that wasn't your intention, to sweep in the month to month arrangements that are just... that just proceed until they're canceled. Is that correct?"

Gabel: "I... I think that it was... it's mainly for new leases."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Breen: "Right. See I... and I think we would... we would perceive that a month to month arrangement where you just stay until you decide to terminate, that that is not the renewal of an existing lease..."

Gabel: "Correct."

Breen: "...that is merely just a continuation."

Gabel: "I... I..."

Breen: "At least that was your intent."

Gabel: "I... I think so."

Breen: "Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Gabel: "I know that's not as solid as you would like for the record, but..."

Breen: "Well, I just like... well, in case, you know."

Gabel: "I mean, I..."

Breen: "Again, I... I can see a written one-year lease being something that we regularly renew, and there's a period there to deal with it, but you know, there are plenty of folks that are living on, you know, they're living on just an arrangement, maybe a handshake or what have you, and technically under law, that might be a 30-day lease, but that wasn't... we don't consider every... every month that you pay your rent to be a renewal."

Gabel: "No. I'm... No. No."

Breen: "Okay. Thank you."

Gabel: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick. The Gentleman does not wish to speak. Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "I'd just appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 88 voting 'yes', 20 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Wehrli is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

 Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Wehrli: "I'd like to introduce my two Pages for the day. We have Amanda and Sean Brennan from Naperville. Amanda is a junior at... or at, yeah, Metea Valley, and Sean is a 6th grader at Hill, joined by Mr. and Mrs. Brennan up in the gallery. If we could give them a warm Springfield welcome, I'd appreciate it."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to all of you. Senate Bill 2357, Mr. Sullivan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2550... excuse me, 2567, Mr. D'Amico. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2567, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2567 just eliminates the repeal date of the existing mandatory insurance verification program. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those is favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2585, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill. Representative, I understand you have an Amendment. You wish the Bill moved back to Second Reading?"

Fine: "Yes, please."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2585, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Committee Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Fine, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "The Amendment simply changes the due date of the report to November."

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

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2585, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill amends the Governor's Office of Management and Budget report and says the fiscal report must include economic and fiscal intentions for four years instead of two years. And it must include any assumptions about tax rates and fees used to determine revenue and expenditures for future fiscal years. And if there is a

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

difference between revenues and fees, we need to know what that difference is and how we can make that up."

Speaker Lang: "Mr..."

Fine: "I know of no... the legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks. Sorry to interrupt you, Representative."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, do we ever use these projections? I mean, have we seen any of these reports in the past?"

Fine: "They're all online."

Franks: "Apparently, we're not using them very much, though."

Fine: "Well, and what we're do... hoping with this legislation is the report will be more specific and give us more details so we can look more into the future."

Franks: "Okay. Because I've just seen the... what the budgeting that we've done; I mean, even the Governor's introduced budget was three and a half billion dollars unbalanced. I'm just wondering the utility of even having numbers or, for that matter, even having Appropriation Committees anymore. So..."

Fine: "So, what this would do... Oh, I'm sorry to interrupt."

Franks: "Yeah, it's okay."

Fine: "Is if it is unbalanced, there would have to be a way to show us how to balance that."

Franks: "So, they would have to show either cuts or revenue, and would it have to be specific on what... on what the recommendations would be?"

Fine: "Correct. How they would make up that shortfall."

Franks: "So, that would change what we have now?"

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Fine: "Correct."

Franks: "Well, that... and that's... we need to change what we have now. So, hopefully, this will work."

Fine: "I'm hoping so."

Franks: "All right. Thank..."

Fine: "Move this forward."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, I don't oppose your Bill necessarily, I'm just wondering if it sets up a standard which we move to General Accepted Accounting Practices for analyzing our, I guess, the fiscal reports that you're looking for."

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

Kay: "I'm sorry. Does your report, with these fiscal reports that project out four years, will it also use General Accepted Accounting Practices so that we have an accurate fiscal report as to what our status really is within the state, whether it's the first year or the fourth year?"

Fine: "That's what the intention would be."

Kay: "To set up general accounting... Accepted Accounting
Practices?"

Fine: "Well..."

Kay: "Is that in your Bill?"

Fine: "I'm not quite sure what you're referring to when it says common practices. Right now, we already have this online..."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Kay: "No, no, no. Excuse me... excuse me, Laura. Accounting
practices."

Fine: "Oh, accounting practices. It would... I'm... from the Governor's Office of Management and Budget. So, what they are doing right now is they have this fiscal year planned and this puts more details into that plan and also projects out more. So, my assumption would be they would be using common accounting practices."

Kay: "Is that in your Bill?"

Fine: "I would have to look more into detail into the legislation, but when I talked to the Governor's Office of Management and Budget, they felt comfortable..."

Kay: "Now just..."

Fine: "...doing it this particular way."

Kay: "...just a suggestion. I would say you probably have a good idea here with your Bill. But I'd also assert that you don't have any way of really managing and looking at a budget, nor the consequences of a budget, positive or negative, unless you have some accepted accounting practices, meaning keeping the books. And we don't do that very well here, so I might suggest that to you in your Bill."

Fine: "Right. And I would hope that we keep the books tighter and more clearer as a result of this legislation."

Kay: "Very well. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I'd just, you know, for a year's time, I've been asking you for just one simple number and I

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

think this might be part of this so I'm just going to ask you this. Is the revenue estimate hidden somewhere inside this Bill?"

Fine: "It would be written in this report, whatever the revenue estimate might be."

Wheeler, K.: "So..."

Fine: "And if there is a shortfall in the budget, we would have to find out, through this report, how would we make up for that shortfall."

Wheeler, K.: "Okay. I appreciate that. I actually appreciate you bringing this forward, and maybe someday, someday, this Body will actually take advantage of this report and adopt."

Fine: "I think we're closer than you think."

Wheeler, K.: "Ah. I tell you what..."

Fine: "You've got to be optimistic."

Wheeler, K.: "There's a light at the tunnel. Anyway, thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill, if I may, just very briefly to address some of the comments by the previous two speakers on my side of the aisle. The Bill had a full hearing in the Revenue Committee and fully discussed regarding the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles that the previous speaker referenced. There are Generally Accepted Accounting Principles for different types of entities and there is a GAAP, or Generally Accepted Accounting Principle for states, which the government… excuse me, the Governor's Office of Management and Budget follows. So, in that respect, the Bill

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

would do that. And the other one, the projection that is put out by the government... excuse me, by the Governor's Office of Management and Budget indeed does give a both revenue estimate as well as... as well as expenditures. The problem is this House has not adopted a revenue estimate, which we, indeed, should do. But this Bill doesn't... doesn't force us to do that. It does require the Governor to stretch... or Governor's Office of Management and Budget to stretch out that projection more than two years out to four years under the accounting principles which were in place for states. It's a good Bill. And I would hope you would give it a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, I think this Bill is a very, very good idea. I find it interesting, however. Did... how did you vote on the budget proposal that we took up yesterday and the day before?"

Fine: "I voted for it. And I have to say that we would need to sit down with the Governor's office based on this legislation, as well, and figure out what our revenues, what our expenses, and where can we come to a common ground in that. And this legislation would help us perform that."

Hays: "Do you think it's a little ironic that the Bill that came before us just yesterday had expenditures that were \$7 billion over the revenue estimate. I just don't know how the two concepts intersect. I mean, this seems to be an extraordinarily good idea, what we should be doing, yet it is

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

pretty remote from what we did yesterday. I mean, it's almost Dilbert comic strip worthy."

Fine: "Well, if you look at what the working groups are doing, this could be accomplished."

Hays: "I agree with that, but I would also say that, you know, it was a pretty healthy bucket of cold water that was thrown on their work when you bring such an absurd concept forward. I just think it's... it is a very ironic commentary that a Bill of this nature, which makes perfect sense, which is how we should be doing business and operating; this should pass overwhelmingly; that it would be at the farthest outpost in the most desolate place that we could possibly go as the General Assembly as it relates to, and compares in contrast, to what we did a couple of days ago. So, I applaud your effort today. It's a head-scratcher why you could possibly have voted 'yes' on that nonsense from yesterday. Thank you."

Fine: "Like I said, this would put us in the right direction and enable us to enact the proper reforms that'll get us to our goal."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine, time to close."

Fine: "I think this is a good Bill. And I ask for your '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, 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hammond is recognized."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Hammond: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, if I may, on Senate Bill 2300, I would like to be recorded as a 'yes'."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Thank you, Representative. Senate Bill 2820, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2820, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation does two things for the Chicago Fire Pension Fund. First is it allows them to maintain their records digitally and electronically, rather than on microfiche. And the second part of it is identical to a Bill that Representative Tabares carried earlier this year that passed over to the Senate with regard to allowing the Chicago Fire Pension System to do what, I believe, almost all the other pension systems in the State of Illinois already has statutory authorization to do, which is to lend out the equities that they have to third parties and get a fee back for that. Ask for your support."
- 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. Mr. Clerk, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2825, Representative Mayfield. Representative Mayfield. Representative Mayfield. Representative Mayfield. Out of the record. Thank you. Senate Bill 2833, Mr. Martwick. Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2833, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2833 amends the County Code. And what it does is it allows counties to recoup additional fees associated with collecting a debt. It provides that judgement relating to a County Code violation is a debt due to the county and that the findings, decisions and order of the hearing officer may be enforced as the same manner as a judgement entered into by the court. This is already something that municipalities have. It's an enforcement tool. We are seeking to apply this to the County Code. This applies only to... give me a second here. It only applies to Cook and collar counties. In Cook County, there are currently 750 cases pending, and under this, that would be affected by this. I'll be happy to answer any questions. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Sandack: "Representative, we had some dialogue in committee on this and I just want to break it down a little bit so that there's a little more clarity on what the Bill does and what it doesn't do."

Martwick: "Sure."

Sandack: "So, with respect to attorney's fees, what is now in the… what does this Bill do: the fines, fees, costs, et cetera? What does this Bill do with respect to that?"

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Martwick: "So, it's... it's still part... it's part of the enforcement."

Sandack: "Right."

Martwick: "What it does is it removes a step in the process that we did for municipalities where currently under the law, the fees and costs associated with the enforcement of a judgement, the county can pursue those but they have to go... once they've gotten a judgement, and now they have fees associated with the collection, they would then have to go back to court to get an order to collect those fees and fines associated."

Sandack: "That's what the law is now?"

Martwick: "That's what the law is now."

Sandack: "And what does your Bill do? It takes that..."

Martwick: "It removes that step. It just allows them to collect that as part of the enforcement."

Sandack: "So, the... so, the administrative proceeding, its provisions can be appealed, though, correct?"

Martwick: "That is correct. It can still be appealed. Right."

Sandack: "All right. So, there's... no one loses any rights to contest the underlying propriety of the decision."

Martwick: "That's correct."

Sandack: "And so, if this goes to the courts on appeal?"

Martwick: "Yes. That is right."

Sandack: "All right. So, the only thing I wasn't understanding, Rob, is does it go to the Circuit Court or does it go to the Appellate Court?"

Martwick: "It's administrative, so it'd go to a Circuit Court."

Sandack: "And that... and that would... they would act as a, I guess, an Appellate or a review board, right?"

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Martwick: "Right. They would review the findings of the administrative review."

Sandack: "And then of course, the advantage to the system is if someone wants to appeal thereafter, they have those rights."

Martwick: "Then they have the Appellate and the Supreme if..."

Sandack: "And again, this is for Cook County and the collar counties?"

Martwick: "It is. Cook County, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry and Will."

Sandack: "Thank you for answering the questions."

Martwick: "Thank you."

'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 77 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Dunkin is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Dunkin: "Yeah. I'd like to introduce my oldest child, Sacha Dunkin, who's joining us today. Stand up."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Glad to have you with us. Senate Bill 2835, Representative Scherer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2835, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I'm presenting Senate Bill 2835. This Bill clarifies when you have to stop behind a school bus. There are no changes to the rule of... rules of the road. It's basically just a clarification. It passed the Senate Floor in committee unanimously and I know of no opponents. I request an 'aye' vote, please."
- 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? Tabares. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2839, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2839, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."
- Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the preventing violence in Higher Education Act. It says sanctions for a violation of an institution's policy may include, but are not limited to, suspension, expulsion, or removal of the student if that student is found to be in violation. The current law does not prohibit this. This just clarifies that it can be done."
- Speaker Lang: "Those is 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? Gabel. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2840, Mr. Franks. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2840, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill will waive fees for homeless children who will need to take the GED test. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'... Sorry. I was a little too quick for Mr. Sandack. Mr. Sandack is recognized."

Sandack: "May I have an inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes, Sir\."

Sandack: "Is there a Floor... a Floor Amendment on this Bill that is yet to be adopted?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, are there Amendments pending?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1 was referred to a committee."

Speaker Lang: "It's in the Rules Committee? Mr. Franks, you're not moving your Amendment. Does that answer your question, Sir?"

Sandack: "It answers that question. An inquiry of the Sponsor, then."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. Jack, obviously, we had a different status and we thought there was an Amendment coming. Can you just speak to what was filed and not presented?"

Franks: "I was... someone had wanted to make an Amendment on there to make it subject to appropriation on some of these fees.

I'm like, well, if we make it subject to appropriation,

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

nothing would happen. So, what this Bill will do is simply take off the \$13 fee that the Regional Office of Education imposes on homeless individuals to take the equivalency test. Unfortunately, we're unable to... and I didn't want to change it this way, we would have... there's a fee that the under... the company would provide... that charges to take these tests, we couldn't waive that part..."

Sandack: "Right."

Franks: "...and I didn't want to make that subject to appropriation.

But the part that we could have control over, that \$13, that's all this will do is waive it for the individuals who wish to take a GED."

Sandack: "So, it waives it outright or does it make it permissible for the regional superintendents to make that determination?"

Franks: "It waives it outright. It's \$13 per. There's not that many individuals who are involved but, figuring folks who are homeless, who are trying to better themselves..."

Sandack: "I can't imagine someone actually seeking a fee from someone that qualifies as homeless..."

Franks: "Exactly."

Sandack: "...in the first instance. I just... it's an interesting issue. Thank you for the clarification."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, in this Bill are we specifying what kind of General Education Development test that is being taken?"

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Franks: "I don't think so. I think it's just for a high school equivalency certificate."

Pritchard: "Because there is a company that has patented rights to a certain test that is charging \$120."

Franks: "I think that's the one, and that's the one we couldn't waive, Mr. Pritchard. I was trying to do that..."

Pritchard: "Well, but there may be other tests that come along and I just don't want us to be codifying a certain test that may be more expensive."

Franks: "That's not the intent. What I'm trying to do is waive the portion that the Regional Office of Education will be charging. I don't think that we would have the ability to require a private company not to be able to get their fees and that's why..."

Pritchard: "No."

Franks: "...I didn't want to change the law that way."

Pritchard: "I understand that and I'm not suggesting that. I'm suggesting, do we name a certain test in this Bill that would be required; and therefore, locking ourselves into a higher test... cost of a test."

Franks: "I don't think so but we could check that out if it needs a trailer. I don't think we're doing that."

Pritchard: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Moffitt: "Representative, you... some of the responses so far have gotten at part of my question. I had a call from a superintendent, and I think that's when the initial thought

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

was they were going to be asked to waive the fee and yet it was the company fee that they had no control over."

Franks: "Correct."

Moffitt: "The only thing this would do would be the fee that they, in effect, do have control over that would've been going to their office. Is that correct?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir. There's an equivalency certificate, which is presently \$10, and a transcript which is 3. So, cumulatively, it's \$13. I wish we could do more, but I know with the financial straits that the state is in, I didn't want to add another mandate that would be unfunded that would require us to pay for the underlying test. But this is something that we're simply just waiving a fee that our own Regional Office of Education is collecting."

Moffitt: "Potentially a small loss of revenue for Regional Superintendents Office, though?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Moffitt: "And any idea how many of these there are a year around the state or in any given region?"

Franks: "I think it's in... it's in the hundreds, if..."

Moffitt: "Total, statewide?"

Franks: "...it's a... Yeah, it's a small amount. I wish it was more.

And yes, it's a small amount. I think we're going to help a
small group of people who are trying to help themselves and,
frankly, I wish we could do more. This will just help a little
bit."

Moffitt: "Okay. Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks to close."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Franks: "As... I got this from Senator Silverstein and he called it the rachmones Bill. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Are you going to explain that to people, Sir?"

Franks: "Later."

Speaker Lang: "I know what it means."

Franks: "Later. I did it for you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you very much. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2861 Mr. Harris. Mr. Harris. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2861, a Bill for an Act concerning military justice. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill deals with the Illinois National Guard. It establishes a Uniform Code of Military Justice for the Illinois National Guard. Many provisions of the Illinois Code dealing with justice or dealing with military justice goes back, actually, to the early 1900s. This Bill is similar to the Uniform Code of Military Justice at the federal level. Many people assume that anyone in uniform is subject to the UCMJ, and that's not the case. Guard personnel are under a different statute than active duty personnel. Recognizing this a number of years ago, a model State Code of Military Justice was drafted by the National Guard staff judge advocates, subsequently endorsed by the American Bar

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Association. And Illinois is one of only three states that has not adopted as least part of the model that was recommended by the American Bar Association. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and would encourage your 'yes' 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? Tryon. Please take the record. There are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Senate Bill 2870, Representative Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2870, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2870 allows a Circuit Court to establish a program for electronic monitoring using a vendor. It expands the meaning of electronic monitoring device to include monitoring of alcohol and drug consumption. This was an issue we had... we had an issue with the Bill earlier. I had a House version of this Bill and we agreed to work out the differences. And the Senate version of language you have before you is the result of that work. And I know of no opposition and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Sandack." Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Sandack: "Representative, if you could elaborate a little bit better 'cause I, frankly, have forgotten. I know we had discussion in committee. What was done post-committee to make it, I think you're saying, an agreed Bill?"

Sims: "The current... there was an issue with whether or not this program would allow for the privatization of these services. And we addressed this issue to make sure that this would not allow for the privatization of those services, and there was... some of the individuals who are working in this area had some concerns. We addressed them and this is the product of that agreement."

Sandack: "Thank you for that and you did refresh my recollection.

Is your Bill applicable statewide?"

Sims: "It is."

Sandack: "Thank you, Sir. I appreciate the answers to the questions."

Sims: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sims to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2870 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all oppose vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 88 voting 'yes', 20 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2870, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2842, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2842, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill amends the Trust and Trustees Act both dealing with revocable living trust. Based on a court ruling, Senator Silverstein prepared this Bill that would require that when there's a transfer of real property to a trust, legal title must be evidenced by a written instrument and acceptance by the trustee. There was no opposition in committee."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2842 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2842, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2845, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2845, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2845 is a series of changes of the Civil Practice Act, all technical, dealing at the revival of judgement, the order in which attachment proceedings take place, the charging of electronic filing fees, the dealing with vacation of judgement and eliminating the levy on corporate stock as a method of judgment enforcement. There was no opposition in committee to any of these provisions."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2845 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2845, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brown. Senate Bill 2872, Representative Sims. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2875, Representative Sandack. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2875, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2875 does two things. One, it permits electronic transmission through video and audio between a requester and a judge to get sworn testimony in order to get a warrant and also expands, on a limited basis, the Freedom from Location and Surveillance Act. It's an agreed Bill. It has the support of DuPage County and ISP. I welcome any answer… any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2875 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2875, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Senate Bill 2885, Representative Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2885, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let my computer catch up with me. Senate Bill 2885 amends the Code of Civil Procedure to provide that a upon a reversal of conviction by finding of actual innocence, and after the judge determines what the costs are to be refunded to the defendant, the clerk of a court will then finance as a refund which he and she determines the requisite funds are available. This is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Court Clerks, and it's a trailer Bill to a piece of legislation we passed several years ago. And it's a cleanup from last Session. I know of no opposition and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2885 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 106 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2885, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2906, Representative Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2906, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wallace."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that would allow individuals who receive TANF benefits to complete their GED as part of their Core requirement. As of now, there's been some uncertainty. We've actually had individuals denied access to the hours necessary to complete the GED because it was not considered Core to their employment plan. We're just saying that this should be an option. I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2906 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2906, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Batinick, for what reason do you seek recognition? Representative Mitchell, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mitchell, B.: "Yeah, thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Mitchell, B.: "In the gallery behind me, directly behind me, is Madison Cripe. Madison's 15 years old. She's from Monticello, Illinois and she's a member of the Monticello Marching Sages. So, it's... there she is. I hope she's up there. Give a big welcome."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Senate Bill 2929, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2929, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hold on here a second. This is an agreed Bill. We worked this out. And it basically, between the long-term care facilities and the department, that we solved a... looking at solving a problem with the people being released into nursing homes. We're going to collect some data and come back to try to fix this problem."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is... We have Mr. DeLuca with a late light. Go ahead."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

DeLuca: "Representative Rita, it was brought to my attention in committee yesterday that something that was on my desk, you know, we found that it was missing. I'm just wondering if you would have any idea where it might be."

Rita: "Does the camera have that?"

DeLuca: "What was that?"

Rita: "Can you see on the desk here?"

DeLuca: "Well, I think I see something over there, but I can't tell for sure."

Rita: "What brand is it?"

DeLuca: "Okay. All right. Thank you, Sir."

Rita: "A Titleist 3?"

DeLuca: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Franks: "Representative, I apologize. I'm not sure I understand what your Bill does. Can... can you help me understand? I know it's on discharge."

Rita: "It does three things."

Franks: "Okay."

Rita: "First, it requires case coordinator units to notify the Department of Aging if they're unable to comply with the hospital's request for an assessment prior to discharge to a nursing home."

Franks: "Let... let me stop you there. I'm not... When would that occur? When would they be unable to comply with the hospital request?"

Rita: "Well, what's happened is we see a number of cases that people are being discharged without having this assessment done, and we don't want to point the finger at is it the hospitals is that the CCU unit people note of doing it and/or the nursing homes. So, what we want to do is... we put in some checks and balances to if they can't be done that they would... the Department of Aging would then track this status so that we could come back to see is it the hospital not being, you know, do they need more time to do it. Right now, they need 24 hours prior to a discharge to do it or are... is the paperwork getting lost or are they not doing the assessments at all. So... so, we're trying to figure out where the problem is..."

Franks: "Okay."

Rita: "...in this. Secondly, it... going in it secondly... so first, it requires the Department of Aging to work with the CCU units to notify Aging. Secondly, it requires Case Coordinator Units

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

to send a... the documents directly to the nursing homes prior, you know, when completion of that."

Franks: "So, it's really more oversight, trying to figure out why some of these discharge documentation's not being done prior to discharge?"

Rita: "Exactly. It would... So, right now, we don't know if it's the hospitals not doing it. We don't know if it's the coordinator's case unit not doing the assessments, or the paperwork just getting lost in the process. So, we... we looked at the three areas that it possibly could. It'll all be... the data would all get collected through the Department of Aging. And then at that point, it may even just be with the assessments getting sent directly to the nursing home. That might be the issue, directly, right there."

Franks: "Well, thank you for explaining that. And I apologize I didn't understand it. Sounds like it makes sense."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Bellock is recognized."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Initially, this Bill had a lot of problems and there was a lot of issues with it. The Sponsor has worked out those. Everybody else has gone neutral on the Bill, all the agencies and the Governor's Office. It is... I questioned it at the beginning, but the whole process is about long-term care rebalancing. So, it's very important that the screening be done before the people go in the nursing homes. This is working together with that screening and making sure that the people that go into the nursing homes are screened. And the Sponsor has worked well with everybody. And as far as I know, there are no opponents at this time. Thank you."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Turner: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Leitch: "I'm noting here in our analysis that it says costs incurred during a pending Medicaid application are to be paid back in the event the resident whose application is pending passes away. What costs are you referring to?"

Rita: "So... so, we amended the Bill. That was on the underlying Bill. When we amended it, it just does the three points that I explained to Representative Franks: of notifying the Department of Aging, on certain instances; the Case Coordinator Units sending it directly to the nursing homes; and then the nursing homes notifying the Department of Aging if they received a... someone... you know, someone ends up at the front door of a nursing home that doesn't have the paperwork. So, that... your analysis was from the underlying Bill, that was all taken out."

Leitch: "So, what happens when someone is applying to be in a nursing home on Medicaid and the individual passes away before the Medicaid application is approved? Who pays? See, we have... we are having a lot of issues in our office with people who are applying for Medicaid but because of the failure of the system to be able to process these applications in a timely way, people wind up being required to pay to put their loved one in a nursing home. And then they're approved, and then they go through an impossible process to get their money back."

Rita: "So, in the underlying Bill, they had language to work on...
to do exactly what you're talking about. It's my understanding

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

that all the parties are going to work within the rule-making process of how to address that issue that they've agreed to that. And we've taken that out of, you know, when we amended it, we took that out of the underlying Bill. There... that was originally part of it, but they've agreed to try to work through the rule process to address that issue."

Leitch: "But I mean, they... so, you're telling me the situation I just described remains or is up to rule-making?"

Rita: "Yes."

Leitch: "I guess, why? I don't think someone should have to do anything other than..."

Rita: "This..."

Leitch: "...being reimbursed by the agency, if they've paid and their loved one is finally determined to be eligible."

Rita: "Well, and it is an issue. It's a big issue. And it was agreed upon, all the parties, to take the route that they're taking in taking it out of the legislation so they... we could move forward with trying to figure out... there was a number of parts that they were trying to address, and my understanding is that it was all the parties that wanted to... interested parties in this trying to figure that part out, what you described. And it is an issue."

Leitch: "I mean, this... this to me is a really big problem right now because the agency's so far behind in approving Medicaid applications that for individual residents, all manner of complexities are showing up which require, in your constituent offices, a great deal of intervention to finally get someone to do what makes common sense. And I'm just concerned that this Bill may not address that issue as fully

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

as it might. But you're saying it's going to be dealt with in a rule-making process..."

Rita: "So..."

Leitch: "...as opposed to a declarative statement that someone who is in a nursing home, who has been... whose family has put up the money to put them in the nursing home, who is later found to be eligible for Medicaid does not get their money back."

Rita: "Again, it is an issue. There was a number of issues from the underlying Bill. And working with all the parties in it, this is what... the Bill that they put together that they wanted to move forward that everybody would be in agreeance. I'm not saying that it's not an issue. It's something that we're going to continue to work on to try to figure that out. I was going at the direction of the..."

Leitch: "But this Bill does not make the provision cleanly that the individuals would be paid back if they're subsequently approved?"

Rita: "No. No, it doesn't."

Leitch: "So, I... I would wish that it did 'cause I think that that should be clarified because what... in the absence of clarification, there's a great deal of back and forth required to assist the constituent who's in that situation."

Rita: "In going forward, that would have brought up some... that would have brought opposition to it that we... couldn't agree on that. And what they wanted to do was to go forward with... with the data and notifications in sending the assessments to try to figure out the problem in terms of people ending up at nursing homes without having the assessments whether they

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

were done, whether they were lost, whether they weren't done, whether..."

Leitch: "Well, I..."

Rita: "In moving forward, this is what they... all the interested parties have come up, the Department of Aging, the HFS... all the departments are... went in agreeance on the Amendment, which then became the Bill. And I do understand what you're..."

Leitch: "Yeah, I..."

Rita: "There is an issue. I do understand that."

Leitch: "I don't want to belabor the point, but I think it's a... it's a weakness not to clearly define that point in the legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita to close."

Rita: "I'd like to thank Representative DeLuca. I'd ask for a favorable vote on this one."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2929 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote "nay." The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2929, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brown. Representative Brown."

Brown: "I yield my time to Representative Sandack."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Just wanted to do a point of personal privilege. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the gallery, over me, I don't know if they're standing up, Mr. Hoffman's class from Edgebrook School. And a young man I've known my whole life... his whole

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

life, Deklin Dunham and his classmates from Edgebrook School.

Let's give them a nice warm welcome, please."

Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol. Representative Brown.

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus in Room 118 for one hour. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Republicans will caucus in Room 118, and the House will reconvene at 10:50."

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Page 7 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading. Senate Bill 2956, Representative Williams. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2956, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the Environmental Barriers Act passed in 18... 1985 to incorporate recent changes made at the federal level with the ADA. And if you're familiar with the Environmental Barriers Act, you know that it is the state version of the ADA and allows enforcement of ADA and accessibility provisions on the state level. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fine: "Representative, will the revisions to the Environmental Barriers Act apply to existing buildings?"

Williams: "The updated version of the EBA and the Illinois Accessibility Code will apply only to new construction alterations that begin after the enactment of the updates to

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

the law and the Code. Since the EBA was enacted in 1985, the law has required buildings to comply with the Code in place at the time of construction. Buildings built prior to 1988, or between May 1, 1988 and May 1, 1989, when the first version of the ISC was released, must comply with the prior version of the Illinois Accessibility law, the Facilities for the Handicap Act and its implementing regulations, the Illinois Accessibility's standards illustrated. They must almost comply with their obligations under the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act. If construction commences within 12 months of the enactment of a new Code, buildings can comply with either the prior version or the new version."

Fine: "Thank you. Will the existing buildings have to make alterations to comply with the new standards in the Illinois Accessibility Code?"

Williams: "Existing buildings will only have to comply with the new standards if they make an alteration. The elements being altered shall comply with the existing Code. In cases where the alteration effects the primary function area, the alteration may not diminish accessibility. It must comply with the alteration provisions from the Illinois Accessibility Code, which will now be aligned with the federal standard."

Fine: "How do the revisions to the Environmental Barriers Act effect buildings that were constructed between May 1, 1988 and May 1, 1989, specifically regarding the exemption if the planning for the building was contracted for prior to May 1, 1988 and the construction began by May 1, 1989 since in the

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

current Act, these buildings would be exempt from compliance with the Illinois Accessibility Code?"

Williams: "Representative, that's an excellent question. The intent is that these buildings will still be exempt unless alterations to these buildings were made after the original construction. Then those alterations would be required to be compliant with the IAC."

Fine: "Thank you, Representative."

Williams: "Sure."

Fine: "I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Kelly Burke."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Burke, K.: "Representative, I see there is new language prohibiting waivers of the Illinois Accessibility Code. What is a waiver?"

Williams: "Well, Representative, a waiver is an exemption from a provision of the IAC that applies to a particular building. In other words, a waiver is a statement from a Code official or other governing body that a building owner or architect does not have to meet certain requirements even though the Code may say it does."

Burke, K.: "Does that include interpretations or determinations about applicability of certain exemptions within the Code?"

Williams: "It does not. If a government official reviews architectural plans and makes a determination that the plans meet a certain exemption spelled out in the Code, they are not providing a waiver. They are, instead, providing guidance about how the Code applies to a particular property. For

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- example, a determination by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency that an alteration would impact a historic property and therefore, is not required on the Code, is not a waiver but rather an implication of an existing provision of the Code."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you for that explanation. Is this a change from existing law?"
- Williams: "Representative, it is not a change from existing law. Currently, no party has the authority to issue a waiver. Existing authority to provide interpretations to review plans under the permitting process or to provide guidance about applicability remains unchanged. We believe it was important to include this provision so that architects and building owners understand that the guidance they receive from local Code officials and state agencies does not excuse them from complying with the law for new construction and alterations."
- Burke, K.: "I notice in your Bill that the definition of owner includes a tenant. How is it determined who is responsible for compliance with the Code?"
- Williams: "Responsibility will be determined by looking at any leases or contracts that designate authority to make a structural change to a facility. Does that answer your question?"
- Burke, K.: "It does. Thank you very much. I urge an 'aye' vote." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Sandack: "Representative, I don't have a piece of paper and so we can't have our colloquy orchestrated, but I would like..."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Williams: "Darn it."

Sandack: "I know. I would've been happy to say things like, 'what's a waiver' or 'thank you for that explanation'. But because we just got in and the proceeding started, would you do me a huge favor because my colleagues just walked in? Can you give us a 30-second explanation of your Bill just so that the record's complete with everyone here."

Williams: "Absolutely."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Williams: "This Bill... you may be familiar with the Illinois Environmental Barriers Act, and what this does is provide for state level enforcement, basically, of the ADA provisions on Federal Law. So, it allows the AG to go in and enforce these provisions. So, of course, it needs to be updated as the ADA gets updated and this Bill, basically, provides for those updates. It deals with some definition, updates definition, clarifies which version of the Code applies. Right now, architects and builders are having to refer to several documents. This, hopefully, is a one stop shop for them."

Sandack: "Excellent. Are there any opponents to your Bill?"

Williams: "I'm unaware of any opponents."

Sandack: "Thank you, Representative."

Williams: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phillips."

Phillips: "Yes. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Phillips: "I just have a few questions. I'm actually a builder in the State of Illinois. How would this affect me as a builder in the State of Illinois?"

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Williams: "Well, it shouldn't make much of a difference to your...
 any current projects. You have to comply with the ADA now and
 you'll have to comply with the EBA as well once it's updated.
 So, it's really not going to make a difference as a practical
 matter because if you're in compliant with ADA, you'll be
 compliant with the Environmental Barriers Act. The issue... the
 reason we're doing it on the state level is to provide for
 enforcement on the state level by the Attorney General. And
 of course, that enforcement happens through the Accessibility
 Code which is the rules and regulations. I'm guessing if
 you've been a builder for any length of time, you're already
 compliant and aware of all the provisions."
- Phillips: "Did the Illinois Builders Association contact you for...

 did you have any talk with them and are they... have they been
 contacted for their opinion?"
- Williams: "I know that the Illinois Attorney General, who is advocating for this proposal, has interacted with them. As of my last interaction at committee, there was no negative... there was no opposition to the Bill. And they... oh, apparently have no position now officially. And no, I've personally have not heard from them and I've been carrying the Bill for some time. So, I think we are good from their perspective."
- Phillips: "So, in essence, the projects I'm involved in now, and the future, as long as I am within the ADA requirements that are currently on record, I should still be okay. This is not going to add any extra costs or any other project..."
- Williams: "Well, let me read... I read in the legislative intent portion, but I'll reiterate for you. The updated version of the EBA and the Illinois Accessibility Code, which of course

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

is the rules and regs, will apply only to new construction, alteration that begin after the enactment of the updates, if that clarifies it at all. So, depends on where you are at in the process. But since the law has... but since... in 1985, the law has required buildings comply with the Code that's in place at the time. So, this is no change to that. Once we update the Code, the Illinois Attorney General can pursue people that violate the Code, but that's no different than it's always been."

Phillips: "Okay. Thank you."

Williams: "Sure."

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? Feigenholtz, Soto. Please take the record. There are 102 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Durkin: "Thank you. I just wanted to update my friends on the other side of the aisle about the progress, or lack thereof, on a budget. We have a Leader's meeting this morning. I have felt over the last few weeks that we're making great progress. That's the message that I've been receiving from the working groups and our designees for the working groups. I think all of you have probably read the little tweets and the things that we see on the computer that pretty much the idea of having a balanced budget, one that's negotiated between both

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

sides of the aisle, and also with the Governor, pretty much abandoned. that's been And to me, disheartening, terribly disappointing. My request to my friends on the other side of the aisle, despite what was stated earlier today, my request is that you don't give up. Keep working with us. We've got four and a half days to finish our work on behalf of every taxpayer, every Illinoisan who wants an end to this impasse. Don't give up; work with us. You've done it before. We had a great example not too long ago about when the rank and file states enough's enough. We did that with higher ed. Four and a half days, folks. You know, I hear excuses about, well, we can't get this to LRB in time. Of course we can. We've made progress. I've heard statements, well, the Republicans have not been persuasive on many of the reforms. I'm hearing just the opposite, just the opposite. We're making great progress. And I will tell you this, we are close. We are close on the reforms and all the items that we have said are ... must be in a comprehensive budget that will bring, finally, an end to this impasse. Before you go home, my request for you, now think about this, demand that your Leadership gets back to the table and not abandon our desire to finish our work by next Tuesday on behalf of Illinoisans. Demand that from your Leadership. We are willing to work with you and negotiate on any issue, but don't let this opportunity pass. That's why you were elected. That's why you took that oath of office. Let's get it done."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Sandack: "So, following up on that sentiment, I'm a member of some of the working groups on reforms. And as I said before, in each endeavor my colleagues from the Senate and the House, whether Republican or Democrat, have been fully engaged and we have made progress. And there's still time to finish the job. There's no chance our citizens will accept us going home early if we don't extend every opportunity to conclude our work. So, I'm going to ask my colleagues, stand up, stay here and let's work. I'm going to ask everyone that wants to continue to work to sit ... literally, stand up. If you're interested in working towards a bipartisan conclusion, stand up. And if you're sitting down, that leads me to believe that you don't want to do the work; that you don't care about what needs to be done. Thank you, Representatives. Stand up. Stand and deliver or sit on your... Those who stand, stand for progress and purpose."

Speaker Lang: "All right. Here's what we're not going... here's what we're not going to do while I'm in the Chair. We're not going to do what's happening now. Mr. Sandack will finish his comments..."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "...and we'll move on to the next speaker."

Sandack: "I appreciate that. Thank you. Maybe it will go on uninterrupted. Stand and deliver. Stand and be counted. Show your constituents you're willing to work through the weekend to get a deal done. Come on. You know it's the right thing to do. It's the right thing to do. Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

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

Wehrli: "Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle worked in small units of... or local units of government before they came here. I'm joined here on this floor by former and aspiring mayors, former and aspiring county board members, school board members, councilmen and aldermen. To those I ask, the process that got us here, is that the process you saw in your local units of government? Now we hear that these working groups are actually getting towards a solution to the problems we face. The rank and file process is working. For too long we've gotten Illinois wrong. Now it's time to get Illinois right. Please stay. Please work with us. The time is now to get Illinois right. Let's not abandon the process that's working."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to address our Leader Durkin. My question is, I know that we've been working back and forth in collaboration, but do... are we guaranteed that we're going to get a 'yes' vote as we work together to craft a legislation that will work for the State of Illinois?"

Speaker Lang: "So... we're not doing this. We're not going to address each other back and forth."

Soto: "Oh, I... Okay."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. So, I respect the Leader on the other side of the aisle, but I just think his statements were not well thought out and here's why. Here's why. I'm staying all weekend. I

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

just left a meeting... a 10:00 meeting. We're going to have another one at 2 on worker's compensation. We're meeting tomorrow morning at 10:00 on the issue of collective bargaining. I anticipate we'll meet on the issue of worker's compensation tomorrow, also, and Sunday, and Monday, and Tuesday. And I'm doing that at the request of the Speaker. Okay? I'm doing that at the request of the Speaker, and because I believe that we should be working to try and come to an agreement. I'm staying here. I'm not leaving. I'm not going anywhere. And the people who have been assigned from our caucus to these working groups aren't going anywhere. We'll be here. We'll be here to work with you. I promise you that."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Brady: "Following those remarks, as a member of a working group as well, there is dedicated commitment from us and from your Representatives on your side of the aisle on those committees. Where there's not dedicated commitment is from Leaders, a couple of Leaders. And what we need on those committees is our colleagues, you and you alike, to stand with us. So now is the time, Ladies and Gentlemen, as rank and file, we're either going to lead, we're going to follow, and for those who can't make their mind up for those two, to get out of the way 'cause we've got to get this done on behalf of the people of Illinois. They are depending on us. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Yield my time to Leader Durkin."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Lang: "Well, you didn't need to do that, but... Leader Durkin is recognized."

Durkin: "Thank you. And I'm just going to say, folks, there's been a lot of emotion in this chamber over the last week and particularly the last few days. All right, let's move past it. We have ... we took a solemn oath when we get sworn in and this is an attempt... this is an opportunity for us to execute on that oath. And to my friend from Chicago, yes, we're willing to work with you on the grand bargain, which has been stated time and time again at what the Governor states he will do. That means we both give in. We make ... we make compromises, we negotiate. That means your priorities will be met; our priorities will be met when we do that. The state will be in a better position. So, that's my commitment. So, just to reiterate it, folks, we feel so strong about this issue, but getting past... going through next Tuesday without having a budget that is balanced and one that has been negotiated will further deteriorate the confidence that Illinoisans have in this chamber and in this building, and that will be shameful, and it will be a very dark moment in Illinois's history."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

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

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

Mitchell, B.: "We've all... every one of us, 118 Members, for the last 12 months have witnessed chaos. The people of Illinois are just tired of chaos. Why are we going home on Saturday? We shouldn't. We should be here and do the work of the people.

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

In the gallery, behind me, I have my 9-1-1 coordinator from Piatt County. He's worried about his appropriation line. Got an e-mail from the school superintendent in Bement, Illinois. She said, how's the education budget coming along? Everyone in this chamber is getting those kind of messages and we can't answer them. We can't answer them because we say, oh, we're going home on Saturday. We have time. We have four and half days to get something done. Let's work and get it done for the people of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, in the 12 years I've been here, I can honestly say that not only do I consider everybody in this chamber my colleague, I consider you my friends. And it's been a challenge for me as a Member because I have served my entire 12 years in the Minority. And when you are in the Minority, our job is to challenge the Majority; to challenge you to a better budget, to challenge you to a better policy, to challenge you to help work with us to do things that are good for the State of Illinois. And I would like to submit to you that after 28 years of an elected official, whether I've served on the county board, I've served as county board chairman, I've served in the House of Representatives. The one thing that I have learned is the power isn't in the position of Governor: it's not in the positon of Speaker: it's not in the position of Member. The power is in the process. And if we can make the process work, then we can get something done. But to go home... to go home on Tuesday without a budget, without the commitment to a budget that works for our state, our citizens next year, the process

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

will have failed. We can't have round two of what happened last year. And let me give you an example of this budget that was passed. This budget has not addressed the problem in the social service community with the fact that we have only a 46 percent appropriation from last year in 2016. This budget says that the 2017 appropriation can also be used for 2016. Together, it doesn't provide enough money for those social service agencies. I have a social service agency, it's owed \$5 million, has laid off 200 of its employees, has gotten out of behavioral health care, has spun that off to other agencies. This isn't going to help them because there's not enough money. There's no money to pay them, so they're going to be faced with making a claim to the State Court of Claims and trying to get their money. When it apparently comes out, there's not going to be any money. That doesn't work. It won't work for your district, it doesn't work for my district. It won't sell back home. So when... if we leave here without a budget, the barbershop conversation, the beauty shop conversation, the restaurant conversation was going to be, once again, how we failed Illinois. Our job is to come here and get things done. And we need a budget and we need it to work. I need social service agencies to be funded just like you do. Lutheran Services laid off 700 people. Those aren't coming back under the plan that's there now. So people aren't getting their services. We want higher ed funded entirely. In Illinois today, a college education is becoming out of the reach of the average Illinois family. That needs to be fixed. We need to fix those things. And I will tell you, I have said this before, I'm here to work for a budget that's balanced.

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

One that has the revenue in it as well as the expenditure side. I'm willing to make that vote. So, I support Leader Durkin's call to stay or to do what we have to do to come together for an agreement to at least make a commitment to come that Tuesday, or July 1, the state's going to have a budget that works, that's balanced on the revenue side and expenditure side, has a lift for everybody in it, and we need to talk about making that. So, I urge you to help... to help the process do what the process is supposed to do, generate a budget for the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would just reiterate some of the thoughts that have been said previously, but especially to those of us, the rank and file Legislators, that I really do believe both sides of the aisle, that we have worked on genuinely together, to try to come up with a budget and all the other committees that have been working. These are committees that were appointed by our Leaders for us to move into rooms together and work on these things. And I think that everybody was a little cautious at first in all the groups as to really how sincere everybody was going to be. But after just one meeting, I think I, along with the Members on my side of the aisle, realized that all of you were very genuine in what you wanted to bring up with us and move forward in a budget. We all know that the people of this State of Illinois are frustrated by this budget impasse. They want a budget in place. They're tired of the status quo and they're tired of a tug-o-war, and they want to see the rank and file Legislators of both the Democrats and the

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Republicans, which I think has happened in the last four weeks, to move forward into the solution for all Illinoisans. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I join my colleagues on this side of the aisle asking that we stay here; we continue to work. I, too, have been privileged to be a part of one of those working groups, and I would reiterate what my colleagues on this side of the aisle have said. Those have been very good meetings. They have been very productive meetings. Are we finished? Not by any stretch of the imagination. We have a lot of work yet to do. We could spend every day that we are here between now and Tuesday completing that work. All of my colleagues, rank and file Members on both sides of the aisle, know it can be done and I urge you to please join with us and get it done. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Franks: "I'm listening to my friends on the other side of the aisle and I agree with much of what you say. I do think we should stay here. I don't like secret meetings though. I... I hear what these groups are. I think if we're going to do this, let's do it on the open... out in the open because, frankly, I don't agree with a \$5.4 billion tax increase which you're asking us to do. So, if we're going to be discussing that, let's stay, let's talk about it. There's a way to get that done. The Governor, as soon as we... as soon as we adjourn, I

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

presume that's going to be happening soon, can call a Special Session. Immediately they can commence after we adjourn and he can keep us here tomorrow. And I'd invite the Governor to come down to the well and let's talk about what his ideas are, his revenue ideas are, and what we'd like to do. And so, let's have an open discussion. Let's have it on the House Floor. We'll invite our Senate colleagues to join us. And let's take this out of the shadows, out of the darkness, and let's hear what the Governor has to say and how we can work together. So, I agree with you. We should stay. We have time. I'll ask... I'll make a call to the Governor now and ask him to keep us in. I hope you would support that. And I'd ask him to address the General Assembly here on the floor, starting as soon as we adjourn, five minutes afterwards. So, I hope you'll agree with that and I'm going to make that call now."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I know some of us have already gone home. A lot of us have plans for this weekend. We've put our confidence in our Leaders and in these working groups to come up magically with a difficult solution. So, as we go home, I would just challenge all of us to talk to your friends and neighbors, talk to your school leaders, talk to your community college and university Presidents and ask them what they think we ought to do, given the fact we're, what, three, four days away from scheduled adjournment with a budget that's certainly going to be vetoed, and then what? All of us are

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

afraid to talk about revenue and what citizens may say because they know we haven't had reforms. We haven't had budget cuts that's necessary in the three-legged solution that's going to get us a balanced budget. So, let's talk about what some of those tough decisions are and let's come back ready to make some hard decisions. It won't be by Tuesday. We'll be back here later and over the summer, but we've got to do it soon. As you've heard, as you've, I'm assuming, have heard from your constituents. Seeing lots of agencies ready to fold, schools that may not open, universities that are losing students to other states because they don't think the university's going to stay open. This state is in crisis. Rome is burning. We can't continue to just sit by and say, well, we've got too many differences. We don't agree with the Governor or with the Speaker of the House or the President of the Senate. It's time that all of us come together and make some real tough decisions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phillips."

Phillips: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From my perspective, I came here for a couple of reasons. One, was to save the jobs that I have. And two, the possibility of maybe adding more jobs. To me, I think that's the ingredient that we've missed here in this entire conversation. I've talked with many of you. You know, Marcus, we've talked. You know, the main thing you want in your area is jobs. And how do we get those jobs? That's what I think we should be sitting here talking about is. How do we save the jobs we've got now? We've got a constant outflow every single day out of our state. I think that's sad. I don't care if you're Republican or Democrat or what

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

you are, we need to come together to stop that. We need to grow jobs in your area. I definitely need jobs in my area. The poverty rate keeps growing in the State of Illinois and we have a constitutional obligation to complete this budget before we go home. That's what we were sent here to do, for the people, by the people, and I'd really like to see us do that. It's not by choice, it's by design that we do that. And then, the other part of my equation is, our educational system, our higher educational system. The damage that we're doing to it now in my hometown, Eastern Illinois University, saving those students, bringing more students, saving the jobs of professors, keeping our best and brightest here. It's a priority. So, I ask that we do what we need to do for the people. And like Mike, I've gotten to know several of you, and especially in the freshman class group and I've really appreciated that. And I urge us to stay here to work together in a bipartisan manner. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the previous speaker, I'm not afraid. I am not afraid to talk about revenue. I want to talk about revenue. As a matter of fact, every day almost, on this floor, I do talk about revenue. I ask you every day to help me bring forth more money to this state. Now, if your idea of negotiating is taxing the poor, no, I'm not going to talk about that. If your idea of negotiating is closing day care centers on babies, no, I'm not going to negotiate nor agree with you on that. If your idea is making it more difficult for the working people that have to work three or four part-time jobs so you can protect your friends, no, I'm

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

not here to satisfy you and your friends. If you really want to negotiate, I voted on some budgets. I have a plan put on the table. But some of you want to feel like some of your friends, and neighbors, and corporations, and business are untouchable. Well, the same way you feel about them, that's the same way I feel about my constituents. That's the same way I feel about the schools, the educational system, and the lack of jobs that we are creating here because you are trying to protect your friends. So, anytime that you want to talk about raising more money, I said it last week, come to my office, I'll come to yours, and we can talk about raising more moneys. There's a group of people that do not pay any taxes on their transactions. They do not pay any taxes on their transactions. The children that goes to school... the college students pay more in college loans than they pay. They pay... the people on Wall Street... or LaSalle Street pay zero transactions on their... on their purchases. But in order for these kids to purchase a good education, they have to pay high premiums. That is unacceptable. When a mother go buy food for her child, she has to pay a transaction tax. When we want to buy anything, a car, clothes, food, whatever it is we want to purchase, we have to pay a financial transaction tax. Tell the guys on LaSalle Street to pay their fair share of transaction taxes. So, anytime you want to talk to me about that, that will bring \$10 billion... \$10 billion to this state that could help us deal with the infrastructure. We don't have to worry about cutting people's pay. We don't have to worry about age, blind and disabled people going without the services that they need. So, anytime you want to do so, I'm

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

staying here this weekend, and I'm not on your working group. I have my own. Anytime you want to join me, please feel free to do so. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Hays: "You know, you... all of us have forged, I think, very, very positive relationships with many people on both sides of the aisle. I'm confident there's not a single person in this room that hasn't had great success on the local level or you wouldn't be here. You've been a uniter. Some of you come from local government or county government. Some of you come from social service backgrounds, labor backgrounds, business backgrounds. Regardless of where you come from, you've been there and done that. That's the only reason you're here. It's certainly the only reason that I'm here. Your constituents have confidence that you can come here and reasonable people can agree to disagree on some things, but we can find the common ground. We can find the things that unite us all. Who among us don't have similar goals for our families, and our loved ones, and our friends, and our neighbors? We may have different perspectives on how we're going to get there, but we are joined, all of us, and united by success back home in making the process work. I would submit to you sometimes it's okay to speak truth to power. Sometimes it's okay to speak truth to power in your own Party. On the higher ed Bill that was being negotiated, the Governor's Office wanted more. The people negotiating for us said, we have reached an agreement.

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Get back in your lane. This is what we're doing. And sometimes it's okay to say that and sometimes it's way overdue that that be said. Sometimes it's okay when groups of you from the other side of the aisle get together and say, Mr. Speaker, it is time to cut the deal. And everybody knows that those discussions and meetings have taken place. God bless you for doing it. This is not a one-sided discussion. The time for finger pointing is over. We have to get this done. And if we don't get it done, we are not worthy of the seats that we hold, as simple as that. If we don't get it done, stay at home and do something productive. The time is now. The time is now. Let's be honest, for most of us, if you're not the Speaker or the Minority Leader or the Governor, et cetera, as time goes by, they'll forget you were ever here. They damned sure won't ask your opinion about anything again the minute you leave. So, history is going to judge us, not by individual accomplishments, they're going to judge us by did we make the process work for the collective people that we represent. That is going to be how we are remembered. Is this going to be the darkest hour in the state's history that all of us, collectively, have facilitated or are we going to move past that? Are we going to move to those private conversations that many of us have every afternoon once we adjourn? Maybe those of us who are going to be around this weekend will have again. The State Treasurer... the current State Treasurer was my State Senator when I first came to this Body. And so, we, as you do, were on the platform, the public platform, together often. And it's no coincidence that we didn't spend much time throwing each other under the bus or criticizing one another.

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

We focused on where we could agree in the best interest of our collective constituents. And he would say once in a while, you know, if it were up to Chad and I, we could work through most of this stuff quickly. If the people in the big offices sometimes understood that collectively we're the ones who put them there, we could get this done quickly. That was true then. That is true now. Speak truth to power. Let's get it done."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Reis: "I'm sorry Representative Flowers went off the floor, but bless your heart, Mary. You speak your passion. You do it every day. And I figure somewhere in-between Representative Flowers and myself, there are 60 votes to pass a budget. There are 60 votes to talk about revenues. There are 60 votes for real, structural reforms that are going to help all of us. And bless her heart for speaking her side and those of us, but fact of the matter is, is there's 60 votes in-between. We've heard it from you guys the last few weeks. And all I did yesterday was ask that the Speaker keep us in over the weekend. No response. Adjourned. So today, all we asked was that anybody that wanted to stay the weekend to stand up. Anybody that wanted to stay the weekend to stand up. Not if you want to agree to something, just stay here. Stop the madness. You heard the Chicago Public Schools. What are you going to go home and tell them? I left for the weekend. Many of you speak about the homeless and the vulnerable and our most needy. What are you going to tell them? You passed a

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Bill that the Governor's going to veto and went home instead of trying to work out a deal. We heard it from the Majority Leader. This is just an insurance policy. We're going to work. We still have time to come to an agreement, but then you send us home. And I know we can't ask for a recorded vote on this, but you're voting right now by sitting on your hands for all the people to see, blue stream. All we asked was that you stand up and say to your Leadership, stop the madness, keep negotiating and try to come up with a deal in the last five days. As was brought up the other day, this vote the other day wasn't an insurance policy. It was an assurance policy that you really didn't want to deal."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Point of personal privilege, Speaker. And you... you look amazing today, by the way. What I... I'd like to start off with, and I haven't spoken much this year, is I want you to stay standing if you want to do a revenue increase. Stay standing. Okay? Stay standing. Okay? I also want... it's important that, you know, the Leadership wants to talk about this \$5.4 billion... this grand bargain. And we don't have... and I adore you guys, you know. I'm not picking sides, okay, right now. I'm just talking. I'd really like our Governor to come down to the House Floor. I want to agree with Jack on a lot of things because this is what we're missing. We're missing someone in the center that's going to try to bring us together in the aisle. We need to know exactly, for the \$5.4 billion that we're going to come up with that's this grand bargain, is what are the new taxes going to be? What are the services? Our founding fathers of this country were pretty amazing

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

people and there were a lot of amazing women behind those men. These seats aren't ours forever, everybody. We have to take some tough, tough votes sometimes to... to feed into the next generation, and that's on both sides. Because I've been here about 13 years, going on my 14th year, and I've had to take some really bad votes of tax increases that sunsetted. But that was like a 3 point whatever billion dollar hole, we blew into it. Right? So, we're trying to deal with what we have now and we really came to grips with reality. These seats are not ours forever. And we're going to have to take a vote that our citizens don't understand to come to a compromise and that's why I asked. If we're going to talk about real solutions, it's got to include revenue. Leadership needs to be here. The Governor needs to be here to pull this stuff together. And I agree. I want to work with you guys on something. I have my heart and soul into this. I'll stay, I have no problem. But to make us look silly on TV is not going to get us any closer to working together. Okay? We want to work with you. Us sitting down, Dave, doesn't mean that we're not for staying here and come up with a solution. Okay? So ... so, I'm here to work with you, but it's got to be a give and take. And also, we need... Governor Rauner, if you could please come down and talk to us on what your solution is and we'd love to work with you. I haven't seen a budget from the Republicans showing how they're going to pay for what they need to pay for. We've put something on the table... and, Governor, you're a great business guy, but you have to learn how to work with us on social issues because we can't turn people away. It's not like a business where we can just say,

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

you can't afford us. You can't come to us. Our job is to take care of the neediest of the needy. And that's on both sides. We don't own those issues just like we don't own whether we're Christians or not. Okay? We're all here for the... for a reason to move our country and our state forward. So, I would hope, Governor Rauner, with all due respect, we could just... come and address us, all of us, the whole entire General Assembly and find out where we're going. Our citizens really need us right now. So, I agree and we just really need to know where the taxes are going to come from so we can get to a compromise. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Winger."

Winger: "To bring a budget back to our districts and for the state, and the time is now. It's been too long. Let's stay and work. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

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

Ford: "Thank you. I think that I'm excited that you opened up the dialogue so that we all could come together and speak about how we're feeling. But first, I want to make sure I say thank you to Representative Mary Flowers also for her passion because she stands for something and that's very important. But to say that we should stay, I think everyone in this chamber would stay for the right reasons, but to stay for show is ridiculous. We've had so much time to put together a budget, and you recommend that we just stay away from our families just to be here to act as if we're doing something. Why would we do that? That cost taxpayers money. So, why don't

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

we go home, enjoy our families, recharge our engines, come back and be serious about something instead of just constantly playing games and sending an illusion to people that we're all delirious. So, I think that we should go home. And I think that the Governor should come up with a plan; and I think that we all should work together to do the right thing for the people. And if you read the paper today, Illinois is now the state with the highest unemployment; and our non-profits are not being paid; our universities are not being paid, and they're almost very high in employing people in this state. And so, for us to continue to hold non-profits hostage, universities hostage, we're all contributing to unemployment rate in Illinois. And I know everyone here believes that they know how to create jobs ... well, how do we turn our backs on all the jobs that's being lost to the unemployment... to the universities and to the non-profits. So, if you really want to create jobs, if you really care about Illinois's economy, then you would think that the budget that we... or the spending plan that we passed was not really all the alpha and the omega, but it was a start, and it was part one. Where is part two? Where is part three? Let's finish it. And so, let's work together as Democrats and Republicans for the people and let's reemploy the people from the non-profits, from the universities and protect our state and stop playing games. Thank you and happy Memorial Day."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

McDermed: "Imagine this, Ladies and Gentlemen. Imagine this as the leadoff in the news story, the top news story, in your local TV station. Imagine this as the headline on your local newspaper. In an unprecedented, first time this century, move, the Illinois House of Representatives put aside short-term political gain, sat down, rolled their sleeves up, compromised, both sides, until there was blood in the aisles and made a budget. Imagine how that would make you feel. The excitement of that headline, of that leadoff, makes me giddy. Let's do it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of information."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

Andrade: "Has the... has the Governor called a Special Session yet?

Has..."

Speaker Lang: "Your question is, has the Governor called a Special Session?"

Andrade: "I'm just... I'm just wondering if he already called a... a Special Session."

Speaker Lang: "No. I remember 27 under Rod Blagojevich..."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "...but none now."

Andrade: "So, point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Andrade: "Franks, did... did the Governor call... answer? So... you guys already got your Facebook picture. It's already up, but I'm asking... I didn't vote for him, but he is my Governor. So I'm asking my Governor to call out a Special Session. That's what I'm saying. I haven't checked out of my hotel, so if he

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

wants to call a Special Session, so be it. He's your Leader. He's our Governor. Let him call a Special Session if he wants us to be here. I have not checked out, but you know... So, I'm willing to wait until he calls a Special Session. Maybe I'll join Dunkin on... with a... using a sleeping bag in front of the Governor's Office, and let's see. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Martwick: "Thank you. So, I'd like to address my remarks right to all of the media sitting here in the front row and all the people up in the gallery, because I can only assume that the only reason that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle held a... a caucus meeting was that they could go in and figure out exactly how to come out and make a political show on the floor. Okay? They didn't actually do anything substantive. They said let's talk about the order of speakers. Let's figure out exactly how we're going to do this to make a show. See, there's... there's a misconception here, right? And this gets put out all the time. So, I want to address this to you 'cause I think this... this is important. Passing a budget is not carrying a couch up a flight of stairs. Get the job done. Put your shoulder into it. Passing a budget is coming to an agreement. And so, there are these working groups, which is interesting. I hear about all the great progress of these working groups. I hear about it. Well, from you guys, not from anybody else. I hear about it, actually... I heard, actually, all the terms of an agreement from a lobbyist. Real secret guys. Good job. Now, we... I've heard some great comments

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

here and I just want to address something 'cause I thought some of them are great. 'Cause you know what? I keep hearing... we're not lecturing to you, but do what's right. Stop the madness. Speak truth to power. Speak truth to power. You know, I know that from the media... I'm sure up in the gallery you can see this, but here in the media, you probably can't see over to our desks here. We actually have three voting buttons here. We have green; that's 'yes'. We have a red; that's 'no'. And then, very curiously, there's this other button that you get to press and it's yellow. And I don't think that's by mistake. That's called 'present'. You know, living up to your responsibility as elected official, coming down here and making decisions. 'Yes', or 'no', or I don't want to make a decision. I'm going to vote 'present'. That means I'm not for it, I'm not against it because, you know, that would be politically bad for us to do that so we'll just vote yellow just so everyone knows our lack of courage. Speak truth to power. I keep hearing that we have 71 votes, Democrats. You get it done. You've got 71 votes. Couldn't pass a millionaire's tax. Couldn't even get a vote on a progressive income tax because, apparently, there are Members on our side of the aisle who don't do what the Speaker tells them to do. You think any of the people on the other side of the aisle were going to support any of those measures? Even if it... if they come from a poorer community where it would actually benefit their community, would actually raise the taxes, we could actually properly fund education? That would actually give, not a property tax freeze, but maybe actually property tax relief. Imagine that. The biggest issue in the state.

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Would anybody vote for that? No. Why? 'Cause the Governor said don't vote for it. So, let's speak truth to power. Let's pass real structural reforms that will help all of us. See, here's the thing. This is democracy. And I know we forget what that is, but in a democracy in a government, the government has two responsibilities, two. Everything that we do, thousands and thousands of things, can be boiled down into two responsibilities. The first, secure the present day operation of the government so it can operate and meet the needs of its citizens. The second, is propose policy initiatives that you think will make the government run better in the future. That's it. That's all we do. It's pretty simple. So, which policy initiatives will make the government run better in the future? And you know what the answer is? I don't know. You don't know. And they certainly don't know. Why? Because it's the future. Would it be a great thing for our state if we strip away all the power of the unions to operate? I don't know. I don't think so. I don't believe so. I would've vote against that measure. They think it would. In a democracy, what we do is we vote on those issues. But you don't hold up the operation of the government to make one side do something that goes directly against the people who elected them to serve in office. My constituents do not want me to vote for measures that would hurt unions. Why? Because they are either union members; they are friends, family, neighbors of union members, or they are democratic voters who believe in the union movement. So, is it a fair compromise to say, Martwick, before I will even fix the government, before I'll even talk about passing the revenue necessary to balance

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

a budget that I admittedly need, you have to vote against your constituents. That's not democracy. That's extortion. So, here we put on this big show. We're ready to solve the problem, why aren't you. I'm ready to solve the problem. I just don't agree with the way that they're doing it. That doesn't mean I'm not doing my job. I'm standing up for my constituents. I'm proposing ideas that I think would make the government run better in the future. And what I'm willing to do right now, and I've been willing to do for the last 11 months, is vote on revenue that is necessary, admitted by everyone in this chamber. And I dare you, media in the front row, to ask anybody in this chamber if this budget can be balanced without a tax increase. And not a single person, if they're honest, will say yes 'cause we all know it's impossible. It is a mathematical impossibility. So, why don't we just fix the problem? Democracy says fix the budget, propose future initiatives. If your future initiatives don't pass, that's okay. Democracy says there are elections for that. Run somebody against Martwick. Tell 'em... tell 'em he's no good because he supports the unions. And if you win that election, you have your votes and you have your policy agenda. That's the way democracy is supposed to work, but apparently, no Democrats, you don't get to do that. You don't get to participate in democracy. You have to do it under our terms. I'm willing to work. Every Member of this Body is willing to work. We don't need to stand up like a bunch of monkeys to tell you we're ready to work. And you know what? To all of my friends, this is a political show. It's nothing better and it's shameful."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jimenez."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Jimenez: "As one of the newest Members of this chamber, my rank is 117 out of 118. I don't speak many times on this floor, but I believe that we are at a critical moment in this moment. I've spent a lot of my time on your side of the aisle, the Democrat side of the aisle, talking to my colleagues because I know, being a former staff member and working in and around this building as a reporter on staff and now as a Member, is that in order for us in the Minority Party to pass a Bill, we need at least 13 votes... of you guys to vote with us. That's how you get to 60. We can get to 60 on a lot of things. That means 59... or 58 people don't have to vote for some of these things. These are going to be some of the most challenging votes in times that we see. A lot of the issues we're talking about have been talked about for many, many years but we have to get our state on the right track. I didn't enter into this fray, going into the sixth month without a budget, thinking that any vote I take was not going to be a challenging vote. I know I've worked with a lot of you on certain votes that, a lot of my colleagues didn't vote for but I voted for. We can work together. We can do this. I am hopeful that we can do this because I've had conversations with you. I haven't known a lot of you for very long, but I know in your heart that we can do this. So, please work with us. I think we need to stop the name calling. We've got to stop blaming each other for whose fault is this or whose fault is this or this is shameful or this is not shameful. We've got to get beyond

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

that, start working together as we already... it's currently happening. And we can finish this and go back to our districts, my district is right here, but we can do it. And please, please, I beg you to work with us on these issues. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

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

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Demmer: "In a democracy, you put things to a vote. I recently heard that quote. In a democracy, you put things to a vote. We're talking about a question right now of whether this Assembly should continue our work, should convene over the course of the weekend, should take every moment available to us, prior to the expiration of regular Session, to work on a solution. Is that a vote you're willing to take? Should the Legislature remain in Session? Is that a vote that we'd be willing to take? Unfortunately, in the Minority Party, we have no way of calling things for a vote. We have no way of putting forth a measure and setting it on this board without the Concurrence of the Majority Party. So, when we make points of personal privilege, we're trying to raise questions that we believe are important. And by the length of debate this morning, by the length of comments this morning, you think it's an important question too. In a democracy, we put things to a vote. Isn't that a good way to solve this question that we've had so much disagreement and comment on today? To look at this and to call this a political show completely misses the point. We have an established template for successful legislation that has passed through this chamber countless

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

times before, on issues big and small. Successful legislation always, always involves negotiations from both Parties. We have working groups set up on revenue, on spending, on reforms of all kinds. And you don't need to talk to a Leader. You don't need to talk to a member of the media to find out how those groups are going. Look around you. Your colleagues are a part of these groups. Republicans and Democrats have been working in good faith with one another, working in good faith and making progress. I've been a part of the budget group. We had frank, candid discussions about revenue increases, about spending reductions, about how to make those two work together. There's not one solution for that. There wasn't one proposal that was floated. We investigated many options that were available. And we, both Republicans and Democrats from both the House and the Senate, showed up at meeting after meeting after meeting to have those discussions. Ask the Members of those committees. Ask the Members of the working groups who have been meeting over the last several days. Do they think these working groups have been productive? Do they think they are showing up to those meetings in good faith? If not, why show up? What we see is contradictory messages right now. We see rank and file Members, many of you included, many rank and file Members continually show up to do a good job. And then we hear short press statements that say the groups are unproductive. The groups are not persuasive. The groups are not making adequate progress. Those are contradictory statements. We don't need to rely on short reports from the media to tell us how those groups are going. Turn to the person on your left or the person on your right, ask those

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Members, those colleagues, those folks who you trust and who you work with, ask them what has been happening in these working group meetings. We've seen productive discussions. We've seen invitations by the Governor's Office for any Member of the General Assembly to come in for a briefing on the budget. To see what it is... where it is we stand today, what options might be available. We've see continued agreement by Members of this Party, by Members of your Party, continued agreement to work together. We cannot pull the plug on this process. It is the only thing... it is the only thing that will bring us to a solution. And we must use every moment available to us before the expiration of this Session to continue making that progress. To pull the plug... to pull the plug before we have exhausted every option is out of the question."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you to colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have waged a wonderful protest. Wonderful protest. But this protest didn't happen a few months ago when we were trying to pass a budget for Human Services. It didn't happen when the Governor cut, to 50 percent, child care services in the State of Illinois. Never happened before. No protest from the other side. This protest did not happen when Chicago State was on the brink of closing a week before spring break. No protest from the other side. The other side continued to hold the position that in order to get a budget, we needed to give the Governor what the Governor started with in his turnaround agenda and he has to have that in order to get this budget. And here we are down to the eleventh hour and we're going to do a demonstration.

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

We're going to demonstrate because the Speaker is going to adjourn this meeting, and I'm with you. I'm willing to stay. I live down an hour and a half away; I'm willing to stay here as long as it takes. Don't matter to me. But let's not protest just for the public's sensational headlines or the next episode of House of Cards. Let's seriously talk about what's really on the table here. What is the Governor asking us for? What is this big disagreement truly about? It's really about term limits. It's about the billionaire class being able to control the outcomes of the green seats. It's really, truly, truly about what we saw in the Primary and a flooding of money unchecked in election law. That's truly what this is really about. This is really, really about cutting out needed social services to balance the budget on the backs of the poor. That's what this is really about. This is what it's been about from my entire time in the General Assembly and almost two years. That's what we have experienced. So, this stance today could've taken place 10 months ago. We could've all been on one accord and said to the Governor, there are certain things we will not do to the people of Illinois. We will not bring down the wages of the working class. We aren't going to do that. We're not going to deny working mothers, children, graduate students. We're not going to deny them access to child care. Certain things we will not do in this state. And as a matter of fact, some of these things could've been rectified long ago. On May... what was that? Back in the spring, February, we sent over spending plan that you guys disagreed with and I understand that. And the Governor had the authority at that time to bring that into agreement with you, as well

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

as with his administration. He chose not to do that, spiraling us into this abyss that we're in today. So, when the media actually reports this, let's not report it as the Republicans took a stance today on the floor. The Republicans are 11 months late in taking this stance because we've lost those jobs. People have left the state. Not because business taxes are too high. They've actually left because they can't get a job. And many people can't afford to go to school because there's no child care. Remember, there's thousands of people that still don't qualify for child care in the State of Illinois, 40 thousand to be exact. So, if we're going to stand for something, let's actually stand for something. Now, the Governor might be right in calling a Special Session today, and I agree with my colleague next to me that he should call and make the Special Session happen. Because according to us, we... some of us may not want to stay. I'm one that is willing to stay and if you all make the phone call, we are going to stay at the request of our Governor. At this point, it is important to look at the full picture of how we got here and tell the actual story to higher ed as to how we actually got here. That is what we're talking about because the original cut to higher ed was 33 percent. And we back-door cut them unimaginably in the stopgap measure. So, there's so much more to the story than just standing for the next couple of days. We really need to stand for what has happened truly over the 11 months of my short experience in the General Assembly. So, I'm standing with you. Let's call on the Governor to come down here and let's actually have a real Session with the

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Governor, publicly, about what he wants to do at this point in this General Assembly. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Barbara Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you. There's been many of our colleagues who had said if the Governor would call a Special Session, that's how we can get this done. But I want to remind everyone and make sure the record is clear. We were supposed to be in tomorrow. We had a Session day scheduled. We all made arrangements with our family and our plans back home to be here tomorrow. It was regular Session. It was your Leader, our Speaker, who canceled that Session. We stand here today saying we have a Session day tomorrow, we're prepared to stay. We don't need a Special Session. We just need to be in Session when we're scheduled to be in Session. And I have to say, we're ready to compromise, but it sure does make it difficult to work with the other side when we're called a bunch of monkeys. I just want to point that out. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Sullivan: "So, we heard a previous speaker say we don't know if policy initiatives would work and I agree with that statement. But we do know what has happened in the past and we can act on that. You know, we... we've accrued debt, we're losing jobs, we're losing population. Those are all bad things. And so, from our side of the aisle and our Governor, we've said let's

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

change the trajectory of the state and move us forward to grow our economy, you know, through reforms. And you know, I get it. You don't like all of our ideas and that's fine. That's fine. Let's find compromising on these ideas and that's what I think has being trying to happen. But you say you're going against your core constituency. You're going against your core constituency. Yet, the solution is you want us to go against our core constituency. Okay, so let's talk about that. Let me tell you about my core constituency. The millionaire's tax got the least amount of support in the state, in my district. I will tell you I stand ready to work on revenue. I'll quarantee you I'll work with you on revenue against my core constituency. I'm willing to say that publicly for all to see. But are you willing to work on some issues that we would like? And so, I ask you, where does the rubber meet the road? Well, that's the purpose of what we're doing. Where does the rubber meet the road on trying to find compromise? Well, it's not us back in our districts. It's us here, talking amongst each other. If you want to call us the monkeys, then great, we're the monkeys. We should be talking together, down here, not back home. That's the point here. That's the point of our discussion. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, let's not move... let's not lose the good progress these groups have made. Let's stay down here and continue talking. That's why we're standing today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I only have one piece of Twizzlers left. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead, Sir."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Butler: "I don't think anyone in this chamber can say the 87th District, the 99th District, or the 96th District have been greater impacted by this budget impasse than these three districts. We are the home of State Government. We live here. We work here. These are our friends and neighbors. These are our family members. This has gone on far, far, far too long. It needs to end. It needs to end this weekend. So, you ask why should we stay here because nothing can get done. I would say the one thing that we've pointed to over the last 15 months, since I've been in, are one little tiny, shining moment that we've had is that little bit of money we gave to higher education. And you know who got that done? Not people in the working groups. Not the second floor. Not the third floor. Not the wizard. Not anybody else. Mike Fortner got that done on our side. Rita Mayfield got it done on your side. People, rank and file Members, got that done by talking right back here, right behind me, 'cause I saw it happen for three days. That's why we stay here. All of us talk. Just like Sara said, I spent a lot of time over on that side of the aisle, as well. I know how a lot of you think. I think you're as frustrated as I am. I've heard talk about jobs. I've heard talk about child care. I've heard talk about education. I've heard talk about taxes. I care about all those things. I care about all those things and so do all my Republican colleagues. I spent over 14 years working for a gentleman who is known for bipartisanship. I've seen it firsthand. I've worked it firsthand. He was a Republican Member of Congress and then he served as the Secretary of Transportation for President Obama. I know what compromise and working together is all

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

about 'cause I saw it firsthand working for Ray LaHood. The gentleman who spoke at the Governor's prayer breakfast yesterday, that unfortunately few of us attended, and all 118 of us probably should've been there. But Ray said one thing yesterday, a quote that he's used many times. It's a Thomas Jefferson quote. It says, he does most in God's great world who does his best in his own little world. For the 118 of us, this is our own little world right here. We need to stay here. We need to stay here this weekend. We need to stay here until we get this done very honestly. We don't need a Special Session. When we vote to adjourn today, we can vote against adjourning. We don't need a separate branch of government to tell us to stay here. We have the ability to stay here ourselves and I would encourage all of you to do it."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the theater is in order, I figured I'd participate, as well. What I have to say is a couple things. We have been voting on portions of the Governor's plan. I think we all get in agreement that property taxes are too high, and I think that that's something that we can find common ground on, that's not a core belief of any Party. It's a matter of fact. But I do have to question this theater, this sham, for lack of a better word, because we've already heard from Members on our side of the aisle that are in working groups. The working groups are scheduled all weekend long. So... and there are Members of us that will work all weekend long. We... we have things called the Internet, email, and phone. What we are doing by adjourning is saving the taxpayers about \$13 thousand. So, what we're getting is

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

actually good work for less money, which is what I agree on. I think that we have working groups scheduled. We have individuals that will be in town. We have individuals that have obligations out of town, but we are still unequivocally connected and saving taxpayers \$13 thousand. Now, if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to hand the taxpayers of Illinois a bill for \$13 thousand for work we're already going to be doing, I think that's really quite... I'm speechless at that because we have a budget crisis and we should save all the money we can. What we've done right now is waste an hour of time that started with our Republican counterparts so that they could get a picture for their blogs, their Facebook page and be grandstanding on something that know, fundamentally, that we are working, counterparts in the working groups are working, and we are all committed to trying to find a solution. Some methods are ... are different, I guess to say for a better word, and some methods might not be as well received on one side of the aisle as the other side. But I think that, unequivocally, just to stand for a picture similar to a picture that was on Facebook not so long ago, does not and will not ever create an era of trust, collaboration, or to be quite honest, get us where we have to go. I rise today because I believe we have work to do today and I do believe, for the record, there will be work done over the weekend. And I just want to reiterate that we have taken votes on the Governor's agenda. And I want to reiterate that a day this week, I sat and watched 14 Republican Bills be called for a vote and be voted on. And if we want to rewind all the way back in history, when there was

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

a Republican Speaker, and a Republican in the Senate, and a Republican Governor, there's a time when zero Democrat votes, Bills, were ever called in the House. So, to imply that there isn't any kind of working, there are votes. There are important Bills to districts on the Republican side, important Bills on the Democrat side that have been taking for a vote. So, I am in favor of saving the taxpayers \$13 thousand. And I would appreciate the working groups for all their work that they do. I am not a part of them and I also appreciate the Representative behind me in that we need to start bringing these negotiations for full transparency and full openness to the Body as a whole. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant."

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "So, I have had great experience with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and good friendships, great conversations. In fact, three wonderful Ladies whose apartment are right... is right next to my apartment. So we've, you know, sat out on the porch together, things like that. But I will tell you that in the time that I've been here, I hear the word compromise a lot. I've seen it in a lot of instances, but we haven't seen it in a whole lot of instances and... so, the definition of compromises is two people coming together to reach agreement. It isn't throwing something down in front of you 15 minutes before you're supposed to vote on something, and saying here it is, take it or leave it. We

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

have seen that a whole lot of times in the year and a half that we've been here. That to me is not the definition of compromise. Have a... there's a colleague who spoke earlier, who was very kind to my granddaughter when she was here as our Page, let her Page for her. And I heard that colleague mention earlier, the poverty level of her district. Well, I can tell you that one of my counties, the one that I live in, was deemed by a nationally recognized newspaper just last year as having the highest poverty level in the state. So, if you think that I don't care about poverty levels in the state or those who really need help, then... then you're mistaken. And, you know, there are a lot of people on this side of the aisle who care about those same issues that you care about but process means a lot. And how we get to that is evident in many of the Bills that we got passed. I want to applaud Representative Mayfield, who was mentioned earlier. And I know we're not supposed to mention names, but I know that Chicago State was very important to her. And in the spirit of compromise, Chicago State got a much larger percentage than the university that's in my own district. I took that vote and I was happy to get what I wanted, understanding it was a stopgap. But you know, that was... that was worked on in a very bipartisan way, as was the funding for human services. So, clearly, there are things that we can work on, issues that we can come together on. I think another colleague, just a few minutes ago, mistakenly said that businesses left because they couldn't get a job. I think she misspoke because I know that people in my district can't get a job because businesses are tripping over each other to get out of ... of the state. And

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

in southern Illinois, and in deep southern Illinois, we don't... we don't have any jobs. I mean, it's pretty limited what we have there. So, every move that we make here that causes another job to be lost is very significant. So, you know, I'm willing to stay. This wasn't about theater for me. This was about, you know, exercising a willingness to stay. So, I would... I just want to reiterate what has been said up until now. Let's take the things that we've been able to do, at the level of committees, on the level of Bills, and use that moving forward. We don't need to take a day off. We need to stay here. If we continue to work, I certainly will stay here. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to the point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Ives: "So, the other side would like to talk about theater. I'll tell you right now the Academy Award for best picture in science fiction goes to the 500-page budget Bill that was dropped and then voted on within two hours. There you go. Congratulations."

Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 2241, page 9 of the Calendar, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2241, 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. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3149, Mr. Hoffman.
Please read the Bill."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3149, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. 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. Senate Bills-Third Reading, page 5, Senate Bill 2216, Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2882, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2882, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is the adoption of language that was amendatorily vetoed last year. It would increase the amount of coverage for hit and run and... for uninsured vehicles in a contract carrier transportation of employee situation where they're transporting railroad employees back and forth from the end of the line from \$250 thousand per passenger to \$500 thousand per passenger. This would reflect the Governor's Amendatory Veto of last year. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sandack: "Jay, I heard the last part, but I want to make sure it's right. This is identical to the AV from last Session?"

Hoffman: "Yes. We took the Governor's language and put it into a Bill."

Sandack: "Okay. So, he... obviously, the Governor's Office is a proponent. I do see some opponents. Do you know or could you... or at least there appears to be some opponents. Can you hit

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

on what it is the opposition still contends is wrong with the Bill or why they're opposed?"

Hoffman: "I didn't... I don't know... my analysis doesn't show any opponents."

Sandack: "So, was this..."

Hoffman: "The only opponent that would be potentially against it would be the Railroad Association and it's my understanding, they're okay with the Bill."

Sandack: "All right. I show Property Casualty Insurers Association of America and CNA Financial. Is that an earlier run?"

Hoffman: "I didn't know that they were an opponent."

Sandack: "They have not approached you?"

Hoffman: "No. They have not."

Sandack: "Okay. 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 106 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2972, Mr. Davis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2972, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 2972 would allow Members who receive a pension of less than \$100 per month choose to take a refund of their member contributions in lieu of taking the actual pension. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sandack: "So, I have a real brief synopsis, Will. Can you elaborate a little more? So, it gives active participants some option to do what?"

Davis, W.: "Well, currently, the limit is that if you take... if you have a pension of less than \$30 a month..."

Sandack: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...you can choose to take a lump sum or a refund of your contributions versus actually taking the pension."

Sandack: "Right."

Davis, W.: "This raises that limit to \$100."

Sandack: "Okay. And is that because if you have somebody that has a pension of less than 30 a month, is it mostly a case that their contributions are equal to or less than what the pension benefit would be?"

Davis, W.: "I'll say presumably that is indeed the case, but I IMRF supports..."

Sandack: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...what we're attempting to do and I believe they don't fear that there's any substantial cost..."

Sandack: "Financial problem?"

Davis, W.: "...or problematic... problematic in doing it."

Sandack: "Thank you much."

Davis, W.: "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? Cabello. Please

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3007, Representative Hernandez. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3007, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This legislation will make Illinois a leader in the fight to end human trafficking. Senate Bill 3007, it provides survivors of human trafficking with the support they need at the time of maximum vulnerability. And during this time of vulnerability, they are cooperating with law enforcement to go after the perpetrators of the crimes against them. The Bill provides food and cash assistance and medical coverage until the covered person has authorization to work and qualifies for federally funded benefits. The Bill is narrowly tailored to provide protection to those in dire need. The Bill also was amended in the Senate to address all the administration's concerns and DHS and HFS are neutral on the Bill. The Bill has strong bipartisan support and I am grateful there are colleagues from across the aisle cosponsoring this Bill. Please support this legislation and help Illinois lead the fight against human trafficking."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, B.: "Representative, thank you for the work that you've done. And you've alluded to many of the items on the Bill,

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

but there are some concerns that this is a back-door opportunity for undocumented people to obtain state aid and fast-track their pathway to citizenship. Can you tell me who this Bill is intended to help and how we can ensure that the program isn't expanded?"

"Thank you for the question, Representative. The program is intended to help victims of human trafficking. These victims are people who have been brought to the country or lured here under false pretenses by force, by fraud, or coercion for the purpose of being sold for sex and forced labor. Victims must present credible evidence that they are victims of trafficking or other serious crimes. For the population that this Bill covers, the risks and consequences of falsely claiming victim status are severe and serve as a real deterrent. Committing fraud to obtain benefits could permanently bar a person from obtaining any immigration status that would allow them to legally reside here in the United States. Once a person begins that process to file a U visa or a T... what they call a T visa, they are interacting with the Department of Homeland Security and required to work with law enforcement. For someone who is undocumented, the risk of deportation or detention and imprisonment is extremely high."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you for that. While our state struggles financially but we recognize the moral obligation to take care of the poor, how do we answer those who ask, where is the public aid money for un... for the undocumented?"

Hernandez: "So, our state is struggling financially, but we have,

I feel, a moral obligation here. The persons covered by this

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Bill are in a very precarious and vulnerable position who are cooperating with law enforcement in the prosecution of their traffickers. And we are all on their way... they're all on their way to obtaining legal status anyhow. If we want to take those meaningful steps to end trafficking in our state, this is necessary as part of the overall strategy. There is no cost to FY17 because the Bill does... doesn't take in effect until January of 2018."

Wheeler, B.: "Did you say January 2018?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Wheeler, B.: "Thank you. To the Bill. I want to congratulate this General Assembly in their collective work against human trafficking. It's been bipartisan and bicameral, an aggressive attack on all forms of trafficking. This Bill provides health and aid assistance to victims tortured in the profitable industry of trafficking. Most importantly, it provides hope to victims of modern day slavery. Lisa, thank you for continuing your work on this issue, and I'm so proud to support your Bill."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, you took an awful lot of questions in committee about his Bill, didn't you?"

Hernandez: "Yes, I did."

Kay: "And when we were done that day, there was nothing, there was no stone, there was no question, there was absolutely nothing that could not be answered that would tell me or

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

anybody else in this General Assembly this wasn't a perfect Bill. Is that correct?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Kay: "This is a near perfect Bill."

Hernandez: "Thank you."

Kay: "And you have done a marvelous job with this. For people that don't understand, and I think the number's between 8 and 900, we have 8 or 900 victims in Illinois today who were subject of human trafficking and it's horrific. And this is one of the very best things we can do to help those people in that small category, who are devastated through abuse and other torturous activities. So, congratulations on a good piece of work. I support it 100 percent. I appreciate your work that you put behind it. I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you. I want... To the Bill. Or... to the Sponsor. I just wanted to commend you on this fabulous Bill. In my district, in a place which shall remain unknown, is a refuge for minor girls who have been trafficked. And I know this is just one more thing that's going to help this home and the charity that sponsors it to support and turn the lives of these girls around. Thank you for this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. There are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3018, Mr. Unes. Please read the Bill."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3018, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."
- Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 3018, very simply, clarifies how the Secretary of State's Office titles and licenses trucks that are using or have used glider kits. I'm happy to answer any questions. I know of no opponents. And 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 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3063, Mr. Kay. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3063, a Bill for an Act concerning land. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."
- Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 3063 is a pretty simple Bill having to do with land conveyances and authorizes the conveyance of land in Grundy and Madison Counties to... from the Department of Transportation to DNR, as well as Bureau County and Stephenson County, a similar land conveyance. We actually make some money on this deal. 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? Nekritz. Please take the record. 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Brady is recognized."

Brady: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, please help me in welcoming my Page today, Mr. Philip Yu, who is sitting down here in front. Philip, please stand up. He's here with his parents. He'll be an incoming freshman at Central Catholic High school in Bloomington, Illinois. Thank you for coming."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome, Philip. Thanks for joining us today. We appreciate it. Senate Bill 3071, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3071, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "One second, Mr. Speaker. We've got a little bit of multitasking going on today. Mr. Speaker, the Bill changes the custodial requirements of the Illinois State Board of Investment as it relates to the duties of the Illinois State Treasurer. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "I understand the speaker had some logistical issues, but would you mind elaborating on the Bill a little bit?"

Zalewski: "My understanding, Mr. Speaker... Representative, is that the... there's needed clean-up language in the statute to remove the State Treasurer as a custodian when it comes to Illinois State Board of Investment. They wouldn't lose the bonding

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

authority, the need for a surety bond, it would just require that the Treasurer be removed as a custodian."

Sandack: "So, I'm looking through the language and it just removes the State Treasurer in its entirety from this. I mean, is it because there's really nothing for the Treasurer to do and this is old language or is there something better going on in the absence of the Treasurer's involvement as a custodial agent?"

Zalewski: "Yeah. It's the Treasurer's language, Ron."

Sandack: "Well, I figured that. I'm trying to figure out why."

Zalewski: "Say that again, Ron."

Sandack: "I figured the Treasurer wants out of the statute. I want to know why. Why it's a better thing from a policy perspective."

Zalewski: "Well, we've been doing this for the Treasurer for other times when they've served as a custodian. And it seems to me we would want parity in the statutes and we would just... it would make sense if they're serving no role other than ex officio to remove them as a custodian."

Sandack: "That's what I was asking. I was trying to figure out what it is. So they stay as a fiduciary, correct? The Treasurer still has fiduciary responsibilities. It doesn't act in a custodial capacity and has no bonding authority. It doesn't act with respect to bonding... a surety bond."

Zalewski: "Yeah. It's nothing to do with bonding. The surety bond remains in place. I'm sorry if I was inarticulate on that."

Sandack: "Okay. All right."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Has all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Franks for a point of personal privilege."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My switch malfunctioned on House Bill... I'm sorry, Senate Bill 3007. I meant to vote 'aye', but it did not take my vote."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Mr. Kay is recognized."

Kay: "I had the same problems as Representative Franks on 21...
2882. And I'd like to have my vote recorded as 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "And the record will reflect your intentions, Sir. Thank you. Senate Bill 3079, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3079, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3079 is an initiative of the Illinois Manufactured Housing Association who worked in conjunction with the Illinois Department of Public Health on drafting this Bill. And according to the National Manufacturing Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act, the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development will implement a manufactured home installation program in each state that does not have such a program. Senate Bill 3079

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

will permit Illinois to have its own state installation program. I know of no opposition and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Those... Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sandack: "Representative, is your Bill... is there a fee increase with respect to your Bill?"

Sims: "There are... Yes, there is a fee increase included in the Bill. However, what the department has established is... what the department has worked in conjunction with establishing this program, the fees are actually less than if the Federal Government sets the fees."

Sandack: "I guess an important clarification. Thank you."

Sims: "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 64 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Senate Bill 3080, Representative Greg Harris.

Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3080, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is legislation that hopefully will address one of

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

the more common problems that we've seen coming to us recently in our district offices. This would be the situation where folks have been moved into managed care organizations, who are in the Medicaid program and had thought they'd done their due diligence. They found a doctor and a provider and a hospital that they believe accepts their plan based on information displayed on that plan's website, only to later find out that information was not accurate. And then it becomes a problem, you know, who's liable for payment for that care. So, this is an agreement between the Hospital Association, the other providers, the Medicaid health plans and the Department of Healthcare and Family Services that create standards for updating information for people to make informed judgements, to create a set of rules for the payment of disputed charges within an agreed framework and to collect data and metrics so that we can understand how planned payments and claims are being processed in the future. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Leader Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill. I'd like to thank Representative Harris for all his work on this Bill and the Illinois Hospital Association and all the MCOs because this has been a major, major effort in health care in Illinois, the change from fee for service to the MCOs. And in this Bill, you're going to have transparency and metrics so that everybody can work along with the MCOs and the Hospital Association and all the providers to make this transition, which is one of the biggest transitions in the health care system in the State of Illinois, and we want to make sure

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

that everybody, the providers, but especially the clients get good access, good quality care and this is a good way of keeping track of all that. So, thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "I'd like to thank Leader Bellock for all of her cooperation and her kind words. And I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3080 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 107 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3080, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3095, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3095, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is an agreed Bill. It codifies a long-standing Illinois Liquor Control Commission interpretation, thereby prohibiting a non-resident dealer from holding a distributor importing distributor's license while simultaneously prohibiting a distributor importing distributor from holding a non-resident dealer license. The purpose of the legislation is to prevent large conglomerate distributorships or the primary United States importer from shipping product into Illinois from other states. This Bill protects the state's three tier regulatory system, keeps distributors on a level playing

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

field, and keeps the importation of alcoholic liquor into Illinois transparent and accountable to the Illinois Liquor Control Commission. It's supported by the Beer Distributors of Illinois, Anheuser-Busch, Miller, Coors, Diageo. And I know of no opponents to the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3095 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 107 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3095, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3166, Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3166, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is really a very technical Bill. It just simply replaces the word... the term 'landlord' with 'plaintiff' in the Forcible Entry and Detainer Act. We need to do this because not every plaintiff is actually a landlord."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3166 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 107 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3166, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Senate Bill 3106, Representative Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3106, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3106 expands an existing hearsay exception to include previous testimony of statements made by an unavailable victim of sexual assault who has an intellectual disability, a cognitive impairment, or developmental disability. It also defines these impairments. Currently, hearsay is an admissible unless it falls under one... within one of the exceptions... or exemptions provided under Federal Illinois Laws of Rules of Evidence. I know of no opposition. And ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3106 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3106, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3162, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3162, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3162 is an initiative of the Administrative Office of

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

the Illinois Courts. It is an effort to continue the Supreme Court's effort to get e-filing brought into play around the state to modernize our court system. It creates a fee on civil cases only. I want to make sure people hear that, that this is for civil cases only. And given that there was some concern from the court fees task force, we worked very closely with them to ensure that there was a commensurate offset in other fees to ensure that there's no net increase in civil filing fees with this. And I would be happy to take your questions."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not a question but speaking to the Bill. The Representative is quite correct. We have worked closely with the task force, the Fines and Fees Task force that I sit upon as well as Representative Nekritz, to ensure that while this initiative, which is an important access to justice initiative that we don't inadvertently trip up the goals of the task force, which will ultimately be to lower fees. So, I want to thank both the Representative and also the Clerks Association, the Law Libraries, for being willing to work with us on an offset so there's no net increase as a result of this fee; and yet, we're still getting where we need to go on electronic filing. So, I rise in strong support of the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative, on the board it says \$7, my analysis says 9. Can you address the math just so everyone's

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

clear on what is being charged to civil litigants only for electronic filing?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely. Thank you for that because I do understand how important it is to recognize that math matters. There was..."

Sandack: "We say that all the time over here."

Cassidy: "I've heard that. The... I think as it was originally filed in the Senate, it was \$7. And through some back and forth, it became 9."

Sandack: "And that \$9 fee again..."

Cassidy: "Is offset \$9."

Sandack: "To both plaintiffs and defendants in civil litigation to fund a designated program the Supreme Court wishes to have initiated to ease filing system, but at the end of the day it's a wash..."

Cassidy: "Absolutely."

Sandack: "...given what Representatives Nekritz's and Andersson's committee is doing."

Cassidy: "Absolutely, yes. So, the Supreme Court has been working towards this for some time, finding ways to make it possible for... for our counties to get to the place of e-filing. And this is just the next step. They've been at this for quite some time."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt is recognized."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Moffitt: "Representative, I commend you for answering our questions in committee and just take that a little further.

One 'cause you talk about this offset. In other words, some fees that have been there are going to be reduced so that the net won't be an increase. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes, it is."

Moffitt: "And one concern I had was that and, believe the way it's structured, it would not impact, wanted to make sure. We have some fees on certain cases but usually they're other by... they're not civil cases that fund a lot of our emergency services, whether it be for equipment, going to the Small Equipment Grant, going to the Firetruck Loan Fund, and I would not want to see those diminished by anything that we do. It would in no way negatively impact or reduce those, would it? The revenue that's going into those emergency equipment funds?"

Cassidy: "Not at all. The funds that are offset are very court specific and they are not the emergency vehicle funds. They're... they have nothing to do with criminal cases as well, which is..."

Moffitt: "Right."

Cassidy: "...you talked about some traffic cases that fund those emergency vehicles."

Moffitt: "I appreciate that. I think you've done an excellent job and really this is just statutory regulation catching up with technology changes. So, good job. Thank you."

Cassidy: "Absolutely. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "I did notice in the Bill that in coordination with the fee
increases there's also a... supposed to be a diminishing of the
fees on January 1, 2022."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Ives: "Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Ives: "Okay. It just seems in our analysis that it may inconsistent. So, with Committee Amendment #1 the fees were reduced from they're originally introduced."

Cassidy: "That one was tabled."

Ives: "That one was tabled. Okay, so..."

Cassidy: "The only Amendment that was adopted was 3."

Ives: "Okay. And so, are these fees... are they going to... are all the fee increases going away or does some of it remain after January 1, 2022?"

Cassidy: "The task... I think the questions you're asking are more specific to the task force that's going to do larger work around all of the fees. And if I could yield some time to Representative Andersson, he could update on that specific issue, if you'd like."

Ives: "Well, I guess I'm... what I'm most curious about is I thought there was testimony saying that, basically, this was... eventually, that this was actually going to save money. And if it's going to save money, then I'd just like to note whether or not those fees are actually, or at least the fee increase, is really going to go away and if that's in the Bill."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Cassidy: "Well, there is no fee... there's no fee increase at all.

This creates a fund that allows courts to get to an... a place of e-filing. The task force, the larger work of the task force, is to bring about those larger savings to address all the fees that have been in place for a long time and whether... and to look at whether or not they are still pertinent. I think that might be the best way to put it, part of the work you're doing. Correct, Representative Andersson?"

Ives: "Okay."

Cassidy: "Would that be an..."

Ives: "Thank you."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Nekritz is recognized."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize, I was out of the chamber when this Bill was called and then I... I'm sure Representative Andersson spoke to the work of the Statutory Court Fees Task Force, but I would just like to make a couple of things clear. One is, this is only on civil filings but the... And so... and this is an effort for the first time to try to make sure that we are not continually piling on for both... for civil litigants, that we recognize that we have increased these fees to a point where they do impact access to justice. And we have to find ways to either reduce the overall filing fee or at least find an offset, if we think that there's a worthy new fee that should go on. And so we're not ... so we're not reducing impacted access to justice and making it impossible for people to do something as straightforward as getting a divorce. The work of the task force has been really excellent and I... and it's going to be... it's going to be a big

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

lift, ultimately, when we bring some legislation forward. And I'm looking forward to working with Representative Andersson on that because we have impacted our citizens in a way that does diminish their ability to go to court. And if they're a criminal defendant, it's worse yet in what we have done to them. And we've piled on a \$1 here, \$2 there, \$3 here and it's very easy for us to say, oh look, it's only a \$1 and it's someone who committed a crime. I'm not going to worry about that. Well, the criminal justice reform work that we're doing around here should also transfer over to these fees and fines because they are... they have become over-burdensome and unaffordable and we have to do something about it. So, just warning the Body that it's going to be a difficult lift when it comes, but it will be worth the effort along the lines of all the good criminal justice reform work that we're doing around here. Thank you, Representative Cassidy, for bringing this legislation."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ammons."

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

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

Ammons: "Thank you. I read this as a transition fee in order to establish electronic filing systems. Is that right?"

Cassidy: "Yes, absolutely. The efforts up to this point by the Supreme Court to get it done have been challenging because not everybody has the resources to get there. And electronic filing will make access to justice so much better for folks who don't have to travel long distances or deal with, perhaps, hours of offices that are challenging to go get a carbon copy of something."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Ammons: "So, does the... does the \$9 or a \$7, fee reduce the cost of traditional filing, what I would normally have to file in paper? Does that take away that cost?"

Cassidy: "I'm not sure I follow."

Ammons: "What's in the current system? How does the current system work? Is it a traditional..."

Cassidy: "Well, the current system is a paper system where you..."

Ammons: "Right."

Cassidy: "...have to, in some cases, travel hundreds of miles..."

Ammons: "Okay."

Cassidy: "...to file. Or you might have to take a day off work to go get a copy of your court case. And e-filing will modernize the system in such a way that that's no longer required."

Ammons: "And once the system is in place, does this... I think the question was asked, does this fee sunset in some way once you have a system or this is an ongoing fee?"

Cassidy: "This fee does not have a sunset on it, but I... but as the task force works through this... through all of the fees as Representative Nekritz referenced, there will be a larger package that addresses all of the... all the fees whether they're still valid. And this one I would imagine would be... would remain in a portion of their conversation."

Ammons: "So, I'm concerned... one other question about this... because counties have... the Legislature has given authority to counties to raise court fines and fees up to a certain amount in different categories. So, even if this fee is offsetting some portion of what the civil filing is currently, how do we prevent counties from actually adding additional cost in other areas that still raises the cost of the civil filing?"

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Cassidy: "And think that is... you've gotten to the heart of the work of the task force and the follow-up work that will come."

Ammons: "I appreciate it. At this time, I won't support this. I don't like court fines and fees."

Cassidy: "Okay."

Ammons: "I think the counties who taxes already should create systems through the tax base in order to upgrade their systems. So, I'll stay off of this until the task force comes back with their report."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Ammons: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair recognizes Representative Brady."

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

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

Brady: "Representative, a couple of questions for you. When I worked and sponsored legislation dealing with electronic filing of birth and death records of the state, it took us a number of years to get to a certain level raising the money to put... to build the system, if you will. It's my understanding in this situation that there's close to 14 counties throughout the state that already have some e-filing system. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "That sounds accurate."

Brady: "Okay. If that's the case and this, I think, would generate some roughly \$6 million a year. Am I correct with that?"

Cassidy: "I'm going to take your word for it. I don't have that number."

Brady: "Okay. How... do you know how those counties would be treated differently? In other words, if they've already used taxpayer

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

dollars to build their own e-filing system and you're going to do this statewide and raise the money for this, and if my numbers aren't correct, please let me know, but I thought it brought in close to that amount, 6 million a year."

Cassidy: "You're correct. Yes."

- Brady: "Okay. Is there any type of a funding discount break or some type of assistance that would go back to those counties that have already invested the money for the system?"
- Cassidy: "I think that's a very good question. I think another piece of this though is there has to be a centralized system for the electronic filing manager. That's a portion of this as well, for the state to have that centralized system so that those systems can interact with each other. So, that's a portion of it as well. I don't have an exact answer to that. I believe that the work of the court around making sure counties have what they need would address that, though."
- Brady: "Okay. And once the system's up and going, the \$6 million will continue to come in annually, every year. Am I correct with that?"
- Cassidy: "As of right now, but as I addressed earlier and the ongoing work of the task force, I believe that you're probably all correct. There is some upfront cost related, but there will be ongoing cost. And I think that it could be adjusted as we got to a place of stasis."
- Brady: "Once the system's up and going, hopefully, and doing what it was designed to do, envisioned to do what's it's designed to do, what will the needs be, and better yet, who will decide what those needs are and where the money will go that continues to be raised revenue-wise once the system is up

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

and going? What group, organization, the courts? Who decides how we continue to distribute that money for what purposes throughout the system?"

Cassidy: "So, it's the work of the Supreme Court to administer the fund. As we all know, with all of our technology, it has a lifespan. So, perhaps some of those counties that got a jump on us might actually need to be upgraded at this point. Counties that... that are just getting started will then need upgrades moving forward. The statewide system will need upgrades moving forward. Technology is not a static thing, and I do believe that there will be ongoing costs in that way. I believe those early counties are probably already in a position of needing to upgrade."

Brady: "So... so the administration or administrators of the courts will be the one... will be the key holder to where money would go in the future and for the purpose of that money would go once the system is up and running. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Andersson, you're name was used in debate."

Andersson: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually twice. I just wanted to reiterate that the questions that we've been getting this afternoon are great questions, and they are exactly the type of questions that the task force is working on. If we were in a perfect world, I would've asked the Supreme Court actually to wait on this filing fee 'til we got the whole job done. But as Representative Nekritz pointed

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

out, it's going to be a heavy lift. And the reality is, is this fee and the program that it's going to support is really going to advance the question of access to justice in all 102 counties. So, that's why we decided it was more appropriate to move forward. But I can... I can assure you all that when we bring the next piece of this after the task force completes its job, rest assured we're going to be evaluating all the fees to make sure that ultimately, hopefully with your agreement, we'll be able to reduce those fees further. So, to the question of whether or not this will be a cost savings, I believe the answer is absolutely but you're going to have to wait for a little bit more to come. And there will be more. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "Thank you, everyone, for your questions, and to Representatives Nekritz and Andersson for their assistance in getting this done. As we know with a lot of the taskforces we work on, sometimes some things have already been in play... in motion prior to the creation of a task force and that's one of these situations. So, I'm grateful to both of them for recognizing that this can help advance the work of the task force. This was a relatively new experience for me, working on an issue like this. I'm looking forward to getting engaged with the task force and to help with that follow-up, because as Representative Ammons said, that there are some real issues in our criminal justice system around fines and fees that I've had a great deal of interest in. And I think we have an opportunity here to work together to advance throughout the system. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3162 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 84 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3162, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Bellock: "I'd like to ask the Members of the General Assembly to welcome today my Page for the day who's also been over in the Senate in-between, Andrew Florence. And he's from my hometown of Hinsdale and he goes to St. Ignatius High School in the city. And I'd just like to have... his mom and dad are up there with his two sisters viewing everything that's going on today and they've been back and forth. And so, I want to thank all of you. If you'd give him a nice warm welcome. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House chamber. Thank you for being with us. Senate Bill 3163, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3163, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This were to prohibit employers of low-wage workers from requiring them

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

to sign non-compete agreements before hiring. There is no known opposition to the Bill. I'm happy to answer your questions. And I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. Isn't this a law already by way of case law, Representative?"

Currie: "Not... my understanding is that it is not. There apparently was in the... in the district of the Senate Sponsor, there was a sandwich shop which was requiring the low-wage workers to sign non-compete agreements. I believe it went to court. There were no damages because the employer had not actually invoked the contract. But there was an issue in court and I think the Senator thought it was important to codify that this is not an acceptable practice."

Sandack: "No... no argument there. I... but I think it is the law. I think there are certain areas of the law where the... when covenants not to compete, or restrictive covenants are forboden. But I think this is a good Bill and having it codified makes perfect sense. Thank you."

Currie: "Thank you."

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? Wheeler. Please take the record. 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hernandez is recognized."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

Hernandez: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Hernandez: "Speaker, my button seems to be sticking. I meant to vote 'yes' for Senate Bill 3162."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Senate Bill 3354, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3354, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3354 will allow the City of Chicago to move their criminal registration section away from the CPD headquarters. This... currently, the registration is put directly across the street from a school and within a block of a second school and a public library. The number of registrants streaming past these locations is significant. In 2015, CPD completed 16,319 individual registrations and in all, there were 18,895 total contacts in 2015, including turn-aways. The Bill doesn't impose any additional restrictions on registrants. And CPD is committed to ensuring that registrants have sufficient notice prior to the move. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3335, Representative Mussman. Please read the Bill."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3335, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."
- Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3335 will allow EMS personnel to carry and administer epinephrine from a glass vial, an auto-injector, an ampule or a prefilled syringe. Allowing these options will result in cost savings, as most of them cost less than an Epi pen. I'm happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harris. Please take the record. There are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 9 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 321, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 321, a Bill for an Act concerning government. 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. Please read the Bill. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1120, Mr. Franks. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1120, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Page 10 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2787, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2787, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. 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. Senate Bill 2813, Mr. Bradley.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2813, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. 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. Senate Bill 2896, Mr. Andrade.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2896, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. 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. Senate Bill 2920, Representative Tabares. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2920, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. 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. Senate Bill 3047, Mr. Breen. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3047, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

- Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2932, Leader Currie.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2932, 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."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3112, Mr. Walsh. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3112, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3284, Mr. Mitchell.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3284, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Page 6 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2533, Representative Kelly Burke. Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2533, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2533 would allow the director of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District to appoint an administrative services officer. So, we'd take

138th Legislative Day

5/27/2016

this one position out of civil service and allow the director to appoint it and the director would supervise the employee and the board would set the salary. It would allow the director to have some flexibility in hiring that person who's best fitted for the position. I know of..."

- 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? Chapa LaVia. Please take the record. There are 106 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1293, offered by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 1294, offered by Leader Durkin."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, Mr. Clerk, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stands adjourned 'til Sunday, May 29 at the hour of 3 p.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."