Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."

Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Eternal and Almighty God, we thank you for this occasion to gather as your people and to contemplate the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead for this great state. In the midst of the diversity, God, give us the gift of unity. Make us worthy of the mission in which you have called us as citizens of this great State of Illinois. God grant us to live in harmony with one another in mutual respect and love. May you bless and grant to our Governor and all of its Leaders, the spirit of courage, the spirit of justice, prudence, and discernment. Keep them in safety and health. May they lead your people to victories over injustice, poverty, and everything that is harmful to the dignity and sanctity of all human life. May your sovereign hand be upon this state and may it prosper in abundance from North to South. This we pray in the name of your most holy Son's name, Amen."

Speaker Turner: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Connor."

Connor - 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 Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Harris is recognized."
Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Democrat side of the aisle, I would like to report that Representative Conyears-Ervin is excused for today."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Dan Brady is excused today."

Speaker Turner: "With 116 Members present, a quorum is established. Representative Butler is recognized."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans request an immediate caucus."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, do you know how long you guys will be caucusing?"

Butler: "At least five hours. An hour I'm sure will be fine."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. The Republicans will caucus immediately in Room 118. And the House will stand in recess. Members, on page 2 of the Calendar under the Order of Resolutions, we have House Resolution 59, offered by Representative Harris. Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 59 is the adoption of the House Rules that is required before the House of Representatives can proceed in the rest of its functions for this biennium. This is a Resolution that is annually... that is every two years adopted as a new Legislature form. So these would be the rules for the 101st Legislature. However, these rules in substance are of long standing. The... the Body of these rules were initially developed and proposed in 1993 when the Legislature was in Republican Majority control, and these were the rules adopted by the Speaker of the House, then Lee Daniels. They
have been adopted and modified slightly over the years each and every biennium since 1993, and they have served the House well and provided fairness and transparency into our process. There are always room for improvement, and each year we might make some changes and there are a number of changes today to address situations which have come up in the last couple years, which were not contemplated in the rules to streamline things and also to... conform the rules with what have become efficient practice. Yesterday, in the Rules Committee meeting where I presented these, you know, I went through in detail, you know, all of the different changes to the rules, mostly which are administrative in nature. I want to highlight a couple here for you. I'd be happy to discuss them. The first is a change regarding officers of the General Assembly. And if you recall, while we were on stage during our Inauguration, one of our first orders of business as a General Assembly was to elect the officers who serve us, which are the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk, who are always of different parties, and the Doorkeeper. What this change to the rules would do would be to allow for the replacement of the Clerk, the Assistant Clerk, or the Doorkeeper if during mid-Session a vacancy occurs in one of those offices. Currently, there is not a procedure for that in the rules. Similarly, there are updates of a procedure in this rule, what happens if a vacancy occurs for any of a number of reasons in the office of a chair or a cochair? This rule clarifies that the terms of committee assignments are for one Session and for the entire Session. This was a request of the Republican Caucus as are the next two items. One clarifies that committee stipends or a Minority
Spokesperson stipends... if you are eligible for one of those by virtue of being a Committee Chair or a Minority Spokesperson, you know, you do not become eligible a second time should you have two cochairmanships you only are entitled to one stipend. Another clarifies the roles of task force, also again at the request of the Assistant Clerk. There is a rule clarifying the issue... and here we get a little into the weeds, so bear with me... of re-referrals to the Rules Committee existing the legislation. And it says that all Legislative measures pending before the House or Committee automatically are re-referred to the Rules Committee on the 31st consecutive day that the House has not met for Session, unless the deadliner rule is extended. And it also says that pieces of legislation that do not meet the deadlines for consideration, either in committee or on Second or Third Reading notice as stipulated by the Speaker at the beginning of each year, that those are referred back to the Rules Committee. And with them would go all relative... you know, all related Amendments and Motions and such. They also go back to the Rules Committee. There is a change that consolidates the posting requirements and clarifies posting requirements for, you know, all different types of actions that would go in to and out of committees and that is the 3 p.m. posting requirement. This makes it... all the different actions that might be taken before a committee it gives the same notice requirements so there's less confusion. It clarifies how Constitutional Amendments are reported and also how unfavorable Committee Amendments are reported in order to streamline the process and help save legislative time. It more clearly defines floor access for
executive and judicial aides as well as members of the press. It clarifies certain aspects of how committees can behave and what actions they can take in absence of a quorum. It also clarifies how if a Member is a Sponsor of a piece of legislation and sometime during the course of their term that Member should leave the Legislature for, you know, any number of reasons, you know, how that person's legislation is treated and who may pick it up as the Chief Sponsor upon the departure of the other Member. And basically it allows either, you know, depending on if the Sponsor was a Republican or a Democrat, it would allow the Minority Leader or the Speaker to approve the change in sponsorship to the appropriate individuals. There is another change regarding who may offer Committee Amendments and this is an expansion of a current rule. It would allow the chief cosponsor of legislation to offer Amendments. There are changes to the rules regarding note requests. It clarifies that a Motion to deem a note request inapplicable may be made by the principal Sponsor or chief cosponsor at any time and can be adopted by a majority of those voting. And second, this is a change from our current practice, it would say that note requests cannot be filed on a Bill during debate. So a note request could be filed on any Bill as long as it's in order at any other time on second notice, you know, before or after debate but just not during debate. There's clarifications of certificates of recognition, how votes are cast and recorded, clarifications on debate status. On verifications, there is a change that a person must be a 'yes' or 'no' vote to request a verification. You cannot request a verification if you either do not vote
or vote 'present'. So that is the summary of many of the key provisions. Ladies and Gentleman, I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Further discussion, Chair recognizes Representative Batinick."

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

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

Batinick: "Representative... and I believe I heard this the previous two times we had this debate. This is my third time debating this. You mentioned Lee Daniels and that this is sub... subsequently his rules from his debate. And kind of to that, I say, I didn't realize that 21st Century Democrats took their policy ques from 20th Century Republicans. And we sent over some 21st Century ideas on transparency and Member empowerment, which is a lot about what this election was about. I'm just wondering if you have any feedback on those?"

Harris: "We looked at those. I certainly recall receiving them. And the changes that were made are the ones... that we're recommending in this Resolution are the ones that I've just enumerated."

Batinick: "Okay. So would you mind if I went through the fine points? I'm going to go through the fine points. Ladies and Gentleman, this is... this isn’t how we're gonna operate the next couple years. And we all know the way of election that we had. And a lot of it was on empowerment. We made changes in Washington D.C. on many issues. It was about transparency. And we have a lot of lack of transparency. When it came in to my desk... I'm not used to this desk. I put my... pulled my drawer open, and I was happy to see that they transferred everything
over from my old desk to this desk. And one of the ideas I had, and sent a letter to everybody in your caucus, is the idea that we shouldn't have a Floor Amendment and then only have an hour to vote on that Amendment. You know, I have a Bill here that was in my drawer that's this thick. The way our rules operate right now is you can do a gut and replace do a Floor Amendment that's this thick, and within one hour, you're gonna be voting on a piece of legislation that looks like this. I don't think that is empowering of Members. I don't believe that that is transparency. And one of the ideas that our side is offering is to simply say that if there is Floor Amendment we don't act on that the next day. Do you not believe that that would be a better way to run this Body?"

Harris: "I believe, you know, that we will have public posting requirements. We have information available on the internet. Any Member of the public is able to view us live on livestream. They're able to follow along with the Amendments and the Bills as they're filed. And you as... and I know both, Representative, that we tried... as the Speaker establishes the process for the order of Second and Third Readings, committee deadlines, and deadlines for floor action to give adequate time for the process to work with the, you know, maximum amount of time for Members and for the public to respond and be informed. But we also know that as we get close to deadlines, such as our requirement to pass a budget by the end of May 31st, you know, often we do see Floor Amendments as negotiations move forward between the two caucuses in this chamber, the two Caucus in the chamber opposite, and the Office of the Governor downstairs is the five parties that
have to agree on a budget, you know, come to terms. Amendments do get filed. They are large Amendments, and they do have to be studied quickly. And for that, you know, we're both very fortunate, both Republicans on your side and Democrats over here, to have excellent staffs who are prepared to review and analyze and help us understand complex legislation on a short time frame when it's required."

Batinick: "Okay... that's one idea. The solution to that is you could add one day to the Calendar and have a buffer for every Bill to have everything pushed back one day. The idea that anybody, staff can handle this amount of legislation in an hour... and the idea that people can live stream and hear about it back home I don't think the 13 million people in the State of Illinois are sitting at home waiting for a Floor Amendment to filed so they can hurry up and read it before there's a vote, before they can contact their office... that just doesn't work. We'll go ahead... I'm going to go ahead and agree to disagree on that. I just want to make it clear that we... our side of the aisle feels... feels that that is the wrong way to do things. That if you're going to file a large Bill like this, it should take at least a day. I know Nancy Pelosi changed the rules where substantive legislation, 72 hours that’s going to be posted before there's floor action. So our standard is one hour. The Democrats in D.C., their standard is three days. It's quite a difference. Another idea we had was the idea of creating a waiting period of after committee testimony. So right now people come in, they testify. Sometimes committee might have 20 Bills posted. We don’t know which ones are gonna be posted. A lot of your Members aren’t
gonna know which Bills... I'm sorry... which Bills are called... three Bills are called. There's people that testify that are proponents, and then we vote. Do you feel that it's a good practice to vote immediately after taking testimony in committee? Or would it be a better practice to have a delay before we vote?"

Harris: "Well, I got a couple answers for that. So one is for Committee Amendments for... and subjects to be considered in committee, there's a six day poster requirement. So, you know, each of us who are on a committee knows six days in advance what is going to come before us and what... we ought to be what we ought to be studying up on. So there's plenty of advanced notice on, you know, committee action. And when you think about committees is where the bulk of the work happens on Bills, where changes are accepted or denied, where different proposals are aired. That does not happen nearly as often on the floor that would... you know... the system if every single Amendment came directly to the floor. So we try to do our work through committees. And as far as, you know, members of the public testifying, you know, there I actually a pretty strong feeling. You know when people come down here and testify in front of a committee I've chaired, they came down here because they knew what was on the agenda, they've studied it up, they have often driven hours in, you know, sometimes adverse weather conditions because they felt so strongly that they wanted to drive to Springfield and they wanted to show up here in front of their elected Representatives and give their opinion, and tell their stories, and expect us to react. I think if we were going to say, well, we're just going to
delay the vote. We don't want you here as we vote. I think that sends a bad message. You know, when I cast a vote in committee, if there are, you know, strong advocates down here for or against, I want to be sure that, you know, I make my vote and my position known while the people who are here who care deeply about an issue."

Batinick: "So it's not voting in private. They'd be welcome to be there the day that they vote, but here's the problem, sometimes we have somebody testify in committee, they might be testifying for a Bill. And then I go back home at night and I do a little bit of research, and I find out they have a financial incentive for how they testified, and maybe the way they testified wasn't as straight or as good as it can be. The idea that we're going to vote immediately after taking testimony, I mean, even juries deliberate generally on big things than longer than that. The idea that we can't go home, do a little bit of research and that that isn't a better process, I... I just think other states do it. Once again, I believe our side of the aisle thinks that that would be a better process. Lastly, we're going to talk about... about Rules Committee and getting a Bill ejected out of Rules Committee that’s been stuck there. I don't believe since the rules are the way they have been, my... my staff has told me there hasn’t been a Bill ejected from Rules Committee through the process since 2011. Are you aware of that?"

Harris: "I can't remember the history back to 2011."

Batinick: "Okay. Do you recall a Bill ever being ejected through Member management out of Rules Committee?"
Harris: "I remember thousands and thousands of Bills every Session coming out of Rules Committee."

Batinick: "Okay."

Harris: "Thousands after this... I guess we're gonna go back and several hundred more of both Democrats and Republicans will be entered on the Calendar for... consideration in the coming week. I... I can't remember each and every one that came out."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm just referring... I'm referring to the Motion Discharge. The way the rules are now, we need a Supermajority of Members, both the Supermajority of Republicans and the supermajority of Democrats to support discharging a Bill from Rules Committee, correct? That's the way the Rules read now?"

Harris: "Yes, Sir."

Batinick: "And that would be 72 Members. The way the math works out, that's 72 Members. Let's put that in... into real terms. If all 44 Republicans are on a Bill and 44 Democrats are on a Bill, you could have 88 Members. We'll call it a super duper majority. You could have a super duper majority of Members that want a Bill ejected from Rules Committee and it still doesn't meet the threshold that's in this. That's not transparent and that's not Member empowerment."

Harris: "But the Bills are coming out of committee, Representative. There may have been cases... I can think of a couple where a Bill has been held that I'm aware of because it was duplicative of other legislation, where a Bill has been held because there was a drafting error and the Members said there will be a corrected version forthcoming. There may be... as we go further down the road, there may be cases where a similar Bill is further ahead in the Senate than it is in
the House, so the House decides to wait for the Senate version to come along. There may be reasons that rules are heard... and hundreds of Bills are held in Rules Committee. I will say this, and this occurs to me, that are shell Bills... that are shell Bills, you know, shell Bills that have no specific purpose often get held."

Batinick: "Shell Bills have become this with an hours' notice is generally what that is."

Harris: "Shell Bills... you know, some shell Bills get out. Certainly, you know, Rules Committee has provided Leader Durkin, or will provide Leader Durkin as we have every year with shell Bills for use of your caucus. And we similarly provide Speaker Madigan with shell Bills for the use of our caucus."

Batinick: "So... let's be specific here. Actually, we... we debated this as a team. And we talked about the idea should all Bills come out of Rules. I actually advocated against that. I understand there's technical errors, there's duplicative, there's Bills that are bad Bills. However, that's not what we're referring to here, Members. We're referring to a situation where you can have up to 88 Members of this Body that wants a Bill passed, and they don’t have the authority to make that happen within our rules. They haven’t met the threshold, 88 Members. I'm gonna leave it with that. We have plenty of Members on our side of the aisle that would like to talk... talk more about this, but I'm gonna urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
Demmer: "Representative Harris, I appreciate the discussion we had yesterday in committee. I don't want to belabor those points. I think we had a good discussion about some of the more technical aspects of the rules proposal today. What I do want to call the Body's attention to is that, you know, we find ourselves here in January of 2019 following a General Election last November, and Legislatures across the country are doing what we're doing here today. Legislatures across the country are debating and enacting rules that will set the groundwork for how this deliberative Body will function for the next two years. It's happening in state capitols, and it's happening in Washington. And many of those Bodies are taking that opportunity to make changes to their rules that improve transparency or that empower rank-and-file Members instead of vesting that power specifically with Leaders. So given the changes that you've described here today, Representative Harris, which of the changes improve transparency?"
Harris: "I think a lot of the clarification of how different circumstances will be handled, as far as re-referrals, as far as notes, as far as, you know, timing of Amendments all help. Now again, this is a complicated and complex process that largely affects those of us in this room and those who come down to advocate in front of us. As far as transparency to the folks back home, you know, one thing... a previous Speaker mentioned that we're talking about, you know, decades old rules. And I... I think it's worth noting that for decades thousands of pieces of legislation every year have come in
and out of this process since 1993 with, you know, Republicans in charge, with Democrats in charge, with mixed leadership. The processes has worked. Legislation has moved and been adopted and enacted into law and there are small changes each year. But when you have something that’s working, which has worked for decades, and produced good results, I… I'm not sure what the reason is to wholesale… you know, redo it."

Demmer: "I appreciate that answer, but I would note that many people across the State of Illinois don't believe what's happening here is working. And many people believe that increased transparency is a good thing and is a way to, in fact, bring more people to the table to try to improve the conditions for people across the State of Illinois. The changes that we have here today don't improve transparency. What in these changes that we've talked about today would empower rank-and-file Members? Which changes add powers or prerogatives for rank-and-file Members?"

Harris: "Representative, the underlined rules provide, you know, the power for the rank-and-file Members. They have before, and they do now. It explains in detail what our roles are as Members of this Body, what our roles are as Members of the committee, what are the procedures that we should follow to move our legislation through in an orderly and appropriate fashion, and you know, how this is communicated to the public. So I think the foundation of these rules that have served us well for many years offer a good deal of opportunity for Members to… move their legislation, to get it done on time, and to get it done in the most effective manner."

Demmer: "I appreciate that answer, but I would note that many people across the State of Illinois don't believe what's happening here is working. And many people believe that increased transparency is a good thing and is a way to, in fact, bring more people to the table to try to improve the conditions for people across the State of Illinois. The changes that we have here today don't improve transparency. What in these changes that we've talked about today would empower rank-and-file Members? Which changes add powers or prerogatives for rank-and-file Members?"

Harris: "Representative, the underlined rules provide, you know, the power for the rank-and-file Members. They have before, and they do now. It explains in detail what our roles are as Members of this Body, what our roles are as Members of the committee, what are the procedures that we should follow to move our legislation through in an orderly and appropriate fashion, and you know, how this is communicated to the public. So I think the foundation of these rules that have served us well for many years offer a good deal of opportunity for Members to… move their legislation, to get it done on time, and to get it done in the most effective manner."
Demmer: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Resolution. I think what you've heard is the same as it ever was. These changes that are offered today do not improve transparency. The changes that are offered today do not empower rank-and-file Members. These discussions are happening in state capitols and in the United States Capitol about how these Bodies, the Peoples elected Representatives in a House and in a Senate can be more responsive to the needs of their constituents, can be more empowered to offer good ideas that they have, and to follow a legislative process to make those ideas become law. It's not just a Republican or a Democratic issue either. In fact, a Democratic Member of the United States House of Representatives from Illinois, Dan Lipinski, wrote an op-ed in which he talked about the way to end gridlock in Washington D.C. is to change the House rules. He said, 'The House of Representatives, as it was intended to work, is a bottom up process where a Member writes a Bill, gets a Majority of colleagues to support it, at every level before it is sent to the President to become law.' But today the rules are rigged in a way that makes law making largely a top down process. As all of us who are here today are duly elected Members of the peoples' House, of a Body that’s supposed to represent all the people of Illinois, we, today, hold the power as Representatives. We get to choose today how this House will function for the next two years. We get to choose which powers we will hold individually and what we'll give up for the Body, and how the process works. Don't vote for rules today that give up the power that your constituents gave to you. Don't vote for rules today that put the power in one person's hand
at the expense of the 117 Members of this Body. Don't vote for rules today that will close doors as you walk down the path to enacting legislation that you believe in. Don't vote for rules today where tomorrow you'll have to go and ask for some concession back just to get your legislation heard or just to make the issue that you care about a priority. Today, we as Members have the ability to vote for common sense rules. If you don't like the rules that are offered in this Resolution, if you’ve read through them, if you think they're too top heavy, they're too onerous, they silence the voices of people who are elected to be here by their constituents, and if you don't like our House Republican rules, let's go with Robert's Rules of Order. Let's go with an impartial third party. Let's go with what the National Conference of State Legislature would recommend. Let's take independent rules and apply them to this House and let the... will and the voice of the people be heard and not just the voice of Leadership. This is not the end for a debate about House Rules. This is not the end of our debate to try to get things done in a collaborative and bipartisan way, but let's take the opportunity today to say we have time. We have time to get it right. We have time to have impartial rules of the game that everyone of us can follow together, and we have time to make sure that in this the Peoples' House that the voice of all Illinoisans are heard. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Butler."

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
Butler: "Thank you. Leader Harris, congratulations. I have... I would like your attention to Rule 7, which I believe is on page 11 of the Resolution. Concerning the vacancies of the Clerk, something that happened very recently in this Chamber. And specifically I want... I want to ask about the Assistant Clerk position because the Assistant Clerk position is very important to us as the Minority. And as you know, the Minority it's usually the person who is nominated who does not receive the most votes when we first convene, that becomes the Assistant Clerk. And the current Assistant Clerk is a vital part of our team in the House Republican Caucus. So under what is proposed in House Resolution 59... it says here, whenever a vacancy in the Office of Assistant Clerk exists due to resignation, death, removal of disability, or other inability to act, the Speaker may appoint an Acting Assistant Clerk to perform the duties of the Assistant Clerk until a successor is elected by the House. The Acting Assistant Clerk shall not be of the same political party as the Clerk. So there is no... nothing in the rules that allows for interaction with the Minority Leader to pick the Assistant Clerk if there's a vacancy in that position. Is that correct?"

Harris: "It's my understanding, Representative, that in the regular... process of selecting the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk, the language and how that is done is similar and it has always been the practice in appointing the Assistant Clerk for the Speaker to appoint the person designated by the Minority Leader."
Butler: "But that is not in the rules correct? If you'd like to pull the Resolution from the record I'd sure be happy to see that."
Harris: "Oh no, no that’s fine. I just want to be sure I'm giving you a complete and accurate answer. You know, accuracy and transparency take time, Representative. And we want to make sure we're getting them in here."
Butler: "I think we need to take a lot more time on this one then."
Harris: "Okay. So... I just need to clarify the statement I made that the initial election is made during the Inauguration of the House Members. We all vote to elect the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk, but the recommendation for the person who would become the Assistant Clerk is taken, I believe, from the Minority Party."
Butler: "But there's no... there's no requirement for that. The Speaker... the Speaker... if my reading of the rules, the Speaker has the ability to appoint the Assistant Clerk as long as it is a person not of the same party as yours."
Harris: "I believe this is consistent with current rules. It does not change anything..."
Butler: "So it could technically be someone we really don’t want coming into our caucus? For our caucus meetings, which the Assistant Clerk does currently."
Harris: "I think in our practice, we have always followed the wishes of the Minority."
Butler: "Okay. Another question about the timing of the appointment of... of an acting and a new Clerk or Assistant Clerk if there's a vacancy. In reading both the language on
both the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk it says, the acting Clerk shall perform the duties of the Clerk until a successor is elected by the House. There's no... there's no time frame there. There's no... so you can have an acting Clerk for the entire General Assembly, I assume, if that's the case."

Harris: "Well, I think that contemplates we do not know when the vacancy would occur, if it would occur during Session or at what point during Session, if there would be recess, or if it would be sometime in the summer where there'd be many months before the House reconvened in order for that election to be made."

Butler: "But there's nothing in the rules... again, there's no time frame. So it could be the... I mean we could have something in the rules that say within 10 Session days a new... a new Clerk should be voted on by the House or anything."

Harris: "But that would not provide for the occasion of a many month lapse when the position would need to be filled."

Butler: "But you can fill it by the acting Clerk. I'm talking about the election of the Clerk like we did in the 100th General Assembly. There's no... there's no time frame as to when that vote should take place."

Harris: "No, there is no specification on the time of the election."

Butler: "Okay. The last question I have... so is this an admission by the Majority that you did not have the authority to appoint an acting Clerk in the 100th General Assembly despite my dear friend, the Clerk that I voted for there? But is that... is that what I take from the old rules? That you didn't have the ability to appoint an acting Clerk?"
Harris: "Representative, it... the rules did not specifically give the authority, nor did it forbid it. So the rules were silent on this and some other issues."

Butler: "So we went to Robert's Rules of Order?"

Harris: "And if you remember, a lot of these issues were recommended, you know, by the Assistant Clerk on your side. If some of these clarifications of instances that happened that were not foreseen by either side of the aisle as occurring. So I think this is a good faith effort to be sure that as we've identified circumstances that had not been anticipated, but that occurred in the last couple years, that we've addressed those so that there is a clear way in rules to be sure that we proceed correctly and fairly."

Butler: "To the Resolution, and to echo some comments that were made earlier. These rules are not transparent. These are not a new way of doing business. This is the same old way of doing business for the Illinois House of Representatives when it comes to the rules. These are the arcane things that the public does not pay a lot of attention to that actually has tremendous impact on their daily lives as to how they're peoples' House is governed. These are not good rules. These are not significant changes as have been suggested by some of my colleagues. And I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on this Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm gonna speak straight to the Resolution. Against this national backdrop of a move towards decentralizing power to... to take away the establishments ability to control and manipulate duly elected
Representatives and Senators at all levels, there's a change in this Resolution that I would like to read how it currently exists and then read the change. And this is under Rule 4. The Speaker... paragraph 20. It's on page 6 if you're following along at home: To decide, subject to Rule 43 the control and will and the control and will of the Members, all questions relating to the priority of business. So under the old rule, the Speaker had to listen to us, rank-and-file Members, all 117 Members. Under the new set of rules, it reads, to decide, subject to Rule 43, all questions relating to the priority of business. We are ceding all power to one individual. So if you're a new Member... we have 38 new freshman Members... your ability to get a Bill moved forward no longer rests with you, it rests in the power of one man. If you're one of the 44 Members of the Minority Party, we have no ability to move our legislation, other than at the beck and call of one man. If you're... if you're one of the 64 Members of rank-and-file Democrat Members, you have to go cut a deal to get your legislation moved. This is not democracy. This is not how government is supposed to work. This is supposed to be a collaborative effort with power decentralized amongst all of us that were elected to represent the same amount irrespective of our district, whether we're from Chicago, or Cairo, or East St. Louis, or Decatur, or Springfield. We all have a job to do, but yet a 'yes' vote on these rules subjugates our power to one individual. These rules have changed over the years, and this is yet another reiteration of how these already bad rules are being made worse. If you truly want to represent your District, your constituents, vote 'no' on
these rules and let's work together to come up with rules that we all can live with."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Mazzochi."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. To the Resolution. Freshman Members, we are warning you, if you pull up Rule 18(g), all your Bills will go to Rules. Look at the last three lines. Rulings of the Presiding Officer related to the subsection (g) may not be appealed. This subsection may not be suspended. The Constitutional threshold to pass ordinary legislation is a simple Majority. You are now vesting that power in one man who can't be appealed, who can't be suspended. You can have a supermajority in favor of legislation. Can't come to the floor for a vote if the Speaker's Rules Committee says no. No reasons given. No questions asked. That's not transparent. It's not good government. And that's an awesome amount of power that you're surrendering at the start of this term. You should not have to spend the next two years begging the Speaker for a few crumbs to get some of that power that already rightly belongs to you today back. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bennett."

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

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

Bennett: "Thank you. Leader Harris, congratulations also on this new position for you. That's wonderful. If I may just speak more to the Resolution. The rules are very critical, they set the stage for really what we're doing the next two years on what's being done, how we do it, the whole approach. And I think this is a very critical first step of what we're going and do. To me it's about transparency in so many levels and
so many ways. And two things I'd like to suggest, if I may, regarding this. I've been here four years, sitting on the House Floor, been involved in a number of committees, and there's two things I'd like to share that I'm really concerned about. I would like to know ahead of time the Bills that we actually will discuss on the House Floor. We don't really know that. They're coming sometimes very rapid, very quickly, very fast. I'd like to know the Bills that are actually coming on the House Floor on a given day so we can be... better be able to prepare for these as well. But not only the House Floor, but what about the Bills that we hear in committee? We don't always know what's coming ahead of time except we've got this committee... a number of Bills, but we're not sure which ones were going to actually debate and discuss there. If we knew those kinds of things, I think several things would happen. If we were able to know that these will be coming ahead time, this would help our freshman, it would help everyone, it would help us be better prepared for better discussion, for better debate, and better for the people of Illinois in the long run. But again, this goes back to transparency."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bailey."
Bailey: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I stand in opposition of House Resolution 59. As a new Member of the House of Representatives, I stand here today, not only as a Representative of the 109th District, but as a Representative to the entire State of Illinois, each one of you do as well. Today is an important day in the House of Representatives. It's a day that we can choose a different
path that has taken decades. Today, we can end the old phrase, what comes around goes around. That should be long gone. As a Member of the Minority Party, I know full well that we must work together if we want to do what's fair and best for the State of Illinois. What we are proposing today is a break from the past. It's a request to do things differently because today should be and can be a new day for Illinois. We're simply asking for a few reasonable changes to the House Rules in order to make the House more transparent and bipartisan. Improving the House Rules to allow legislation that receives at least five cosponsors from the Majority Party and five cosponsors from the Minority Party, the chance at receiving a hearing in committee, and an up or down vote. That only seems fair and reasonable. And another proposal, extending public notice to the floor and Committee Amendments to one calendar day instead of offering the public and this Legislative Body one hour to review. We've already heard from the floor that accuracy and transparency take time. Ladies and Gentleman of the House, we have the opportunity to change course, and it can start right now. But only if both parties begin to work together today. Remember, this is the peoples' House, not the House of one. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Wheeler."
Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."
Wheeler: "Representative, I have a quick question for you regarding the notes. I'm over here now, Greg."
Harris: "There you are. Okay."
Wheeler: "You had mentioned before, the process now about when we can file notes is changing with this set of rules. Can you walk me through the point in the process at which I cannot file rules as one of the Members on this side of the aisle who frequently does file notes on Bills?"

Harris: "While the Motion is being debated on the floor. While... I'm sorry. While the legislation is being debated on the floor."

Wheeler: "Okay. So if it's on Second Reading, I can still file those notes?"

Harris: "Yes."

Wheeler: "As long as the Bill's not on the board?"

Harris: "Yes."

Wheeler: "Okay, 'cause we read it a little differently. I want to make sure that it wasn't on Second Reading, we could still file notes. Because it's obviously a very short period of time from when a Bill comes out of committee, goes to Perfunctory, and then is on Second Reading."

Harris: "Only during debate would that prohibition exist."

Wheeler: "Perfect. Thank you much. I appreciate the answer. To the Resolution. Ladies and Gentleman, we've heard a little bit about improving transparency and Member empowerment. I'm gonna just substitute that last part for the word inclusiveness 'cause we are all in this together. When rank-and-file Members are excluded from the process, they can't move their legislation, it's not just a Member that is impacted by that. The local Mayors, the social service providers in our districts, and our constituents, they're also excluded from that process. And for the rank-and-file
Members that have been here for the last two General Assemblies, we've not really been included in the budget process, so I kind of lined the two up together. It makes it difficult when we sit down at home, in our district offices and city halls, village board meetings, wherever we're at and we're being asked to move something that's important to our district and we can't get it done 'cause it's locked up in a committee or locked up in Rules. We are making it difficult for those mayors, social service providers, and other constituents to have their voices and their priorities heard. I think we're making a mistake with this. I was really hopeful that with this new General Assembly, new administration, saw many new Members, we'd take the more inclusive approach today. It's disappointing for me that we didn't take this opportunity. I know we can revisit the rules another time in the future. I hope we do that. We can do better, we deserve better, and so do our constituents. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Representative Bourne."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. As has been mentioned, these rules that we are taking up today are crucially important for the way that we will govern ourselves and for the way that we will conduct this legislative process over the next two years. I expect what the boards going to look like at the end of this vote, but I have to say, these rules should not be partisan at all. The rules by which we govern ourselves, they should not be drafted to consolidate power, they should not be drafted to consolidate or strengthen control, and they certainly shouldn't be written up to limit transparency. One of the few tools that we have right now to
know about the true fiscal impact of the decisions that we're making is filing a fiscal note. And I'm glad that my colleague previously brought up the change that's in House Rule 41, but what that change will do is limit the amount of time when we are able to file a fiscal note. If any one of us in this room has concerns during debate about the true costs of the policies that we are debating and ultimately voting on at the end of that debate. This will mean if you're concerned about it, you've got to wait until after the vote on Second Reading if there's an Amendment. And that I think is wrong and we deserve more information than that. It could seriously limit the amount of information we're given before we're asked to make a decision. We, as lawmakers, deserve to know the true impact. The public deserves to know the true impact. And to be completely honest, limiting this is going the wrong direction. There are some states where every Bill that they file and every Bill before they vote on it, there's a fiscal note already there. So they will already know the true financial impact of a Bill before they're making those decisions. We should be moving in the opposite direction of what these rules are moving. These rules should set perimeters and certainty in the process and should empower all of us to make the decisions on our Bills and on Bills that we're voting on in a way that we know what's coming up, as Representative Bennett talked about. The transparency is limited, but also the certainty is. We all deserve certainty in this room to know how we will govern ourselves for the next two years. This process will only change if individual lawmakers choose to make that decision and take back the power that you were
given when you were elected. That will only happen first if we change the rules that govern us. I urge all of you to think about what we can do better in this Body, and that begins with making the rules better. I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. It was just a few short weeks ago, where all Members of the House of Representatives were sworn in over at University of Illinois Springfield. All of us remember the great feelings that we had from the speeches that were made on that day from the Speaker, myself, and the comments that were made also by Governor Pritzker at that time. That this is a new day that we are going to work collaboratively. We will talk, we will get things done in a bipartisan manner. It... the love in that building was just gushing over. Now, we're two weeks after the fact and it seems to me, with these rules, we've erased all of that momentum, and good will, and spirit that we talked about at swearing in. So today we are beginning this biennial tradition of rubber stamping the House Rules that will govern this Body for the next two years. Now I think it's important to remember, and I want to reiterate what Representative Batinick said particularly for those new Members, those new progressive members. I think it's important that you reflect upon what he said, is that today's rules are... which are a 20th century Republicans are providing the foundation for the 21st century Democrats in today's debate. Think about that. We're relying upon Republicans, and I'm the last one here back in 1995 that voted for those things, and that's a long time. And things have changed a lot in this state and in this
country since then. But to use that as a foundation for today's rules is mind boggling, but it's also even worse, it's breathtaking. But it doesn't have to be that way, folks. In my Inauguration speech, I invoke the words of Governor Jim Thompson by urging this Body to not just be a General Assembly, but let's use this opportunity to be a great Assembly. Being great goes beyond just the substance that we debate here every day. It includes the process, and today this is about process in which we govern. Process is important. It should be the shining example of our democracy. Process is what defines this Body. But in this House, the process that you're voting for today is regressive. It works against those we represent and it prevents rank-and-file Members of this Body from having a voice. So for those of you, Republicans and Democrats, who campaign by using the words and phrases like 'transparency', 'independence', 'ending the status quo', and 'fairness', be true to yourself, be true to your constituents. You should not be supporting this Bill. You should tell your Leadership to drop this, work with the Republicans, and incorporate reasonable ideas that we have put forward in our Resolution or also the ones that Mark Batinick recently talked about. Ones that talk about fairness, ones that make sure that each one of us has a fair shot of representing our constituency before committees and also before the House of Representatives. But today, it doesn't work that way. So I implore you to stop rubber stamping these rules and vote 'no' so we can begin a negotiation to bring transparency to this legislative process. Don't believe that we have to get this done today.
We're gonna spend a lot of time together over the next few months, committees won't be running for another week or so. We can do this quickly. And we are prepared to negotiate, make sure that we will be consistent with what we had said, and what I said, and also what the Speaker said, and the Governor said about working in a bipartisan manner, about working together, about talking, and about moving away from the past, particularly over the past four years. I'm afraid today is just a reflection of the past and not the future. Show your independence. Show your fairness in process. As I said earlier, we ultimately will be defined by process. And for those of you who believe in process and believe in fairness, transparency, I'm asking you to reject these rules and tell your Leadership to work with us to get a better product that reflects the State of Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Harris to close."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And yeah, I... I'd like to go through some of the comments that were made previously. Especially for the new Members, you know, to shine a light on yeah... I think, you know, some facts that you'll find useful in understanding what this debate is about because I think there was some things that were not adequately or well represented in some of the remarks. But before I do, I just want to comment on a word that came up in one of the speeches earlier. And that was saying that these rules and the process are rigged, and the word rigged. And I gotta tell you, you know, the words that... now, these are good clickbait words, you know, everything is rigged or corrupt, or crooked, and you... you see these words and sometimes I use them, they got
used before. We really need to stop doing that for run of the mill business because I think that demeans us, and it demeans the image of government in the eyes of the public when everyone says that things that do not go their way are rigged. There's a big difference between not getting the outcome you desire, and the system being rigged. And I think that's very important for us to remember. But then again, in some of the specifics of things, I think the facts show a little bit differently. There was a discussion of, you know, all these Bills that are held in committee and how that is taking away rights of Members and preventing you from serving your constituents. In 2017, of all the thousands, and thousands, and thousands of Bills that went to the Rules Committee, there was one Bill, one Bill that was held in Rules Committee. It was filed before the appropriate deadline. The lawyer is advising me to be absolutely correct. One Bill filed before the appropriate deadline in 2017 it was held in Committee. That was not a Republican Bill, Ladies and Gentleman, that was a Democrat Bill. Mr. Halpin, back here... that was his Bill. One Bill of all the thousands, and thousands, and thousands that were filed on time and before the deadlines, got held in committee. You know, so that is the state of things. I mean a lot of the discussion about this being this endemic problem, and things are held, and your voice isn't being heard, and you're not given a fair shot in the process that just isn't borne out by the facts. You know, the Bills get out of committee, especially this year, being the first year of term, all Bills are supposed to get out of committee and we've already started sending them. There will be a Rules Committee
meeting I think, later this afternoon, in which that process of Democrat and Republican Bills that are filed coming out. Another comment was made that voices are being silenced that members of the public and our constituents don't have an opportunity to adequately see what's going on here. And I think... I just can't agree with that. There is more access and more availability for more people today than there ever has been to follow along with government and monitor each and every aspect of it. And this is due to streaming technology and the internet, where, you know, people cannot only see every Amendment as it's filed, they can watch the debate in committee and on the floor. They can go to the ILGA website in real time, while debates are going on and Amendments are being discussed, and file witness slips from their home, from their office, from their mobile device sitting on the CTA, they can file. From the grocery store, they can file. There's unlimited access to government opportunities for the public to participate today. And, you know, there was also a representation made that you don't know what's coming up on the floor and you... you need time to study the Bills. You know, there are calendars put out of what is on First Reading, what is on Second Reading, what is on Third Reading that are available. And yes, some of these get complicated and some of these have floor debates, but for new Members, pay attention as we begin to go through the work of the General Assembly and you will see that minimum 90 percent, more than 90 percent of the Bills that come to this House Floor are so agreed and so uncontroversial that they go out on unanimous votes with very little debate because the Representative who has brought
that Bill on his or her constituents behalf has done the work, has educated the people about what's in it, people understand what it is, and it's good for our state. And yes, there are a handful of controversial Bills and heater Bills where there's a lot of debate and... and a lot of discussion, but you know, those become very evident to you as they're going on as you follow along. So, lastly, voices are not being silenced here. There is fairness here. You know, the thousands of Bills that come into the Rules Committee, thousands come out. Occasionally there are possibly one, maybe possibly a couple more that don't come out for a reason or another, but... voices are heard and Bills come out. The rules do empower people and they lay out in a very clear and concise way what our individual rights are, but also what our responsibilities are as Members. And I will just point out to everyone right here that, you know, we do have deadlines in this Body and it is incumbent on us to be sure that we don't run into, you know, snags and screw ups, to follow those deadlines, be sure we get out Amendments filed on time, be sure we get to committee on time so that we don't end up in a situation where someone says, oh my goodness, a deadline has just passed and my Bill wasn't heard and now we need to have the Body suspend the rules because, you know, of this situation with my particular piece of legislation. So, you know, all of us not only have rights as Members, but we also have responsibilities. So this... these rules have transparency in a way that, you know, previous generations would never have thought possible for the general public. They are fair to Members, they lay out
our responsibilities and our rights. Ladies and Gentleman, I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 59 be adopted?' 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 73 voting in 'favor', 42 voting 'opposed', and 0 voting 'present', this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. On page 2 of the Calendar, we have House Joint Resolution 19, Leader Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish Leader Durkin hadn't walked out the door. We were going to wish him happy birthday because I believe yesterday was Leader Durkin's birthday. So... House Joint Resolution 19, Ladies and Gentleman, is the Resolution that must be adopted jointly by the House and Senate to convene in Joint Session on February 20th and to invite Governor Pritzker to come and present his budget speech."

Speaker Turner: "Further discussion, Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "To the Resolution... to the Resolution. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is... Representative Harris moves that House Joint Resolution 19 be adopted. All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Leader Harris for an announcement."

Harris: "Members, I believe you will want to hear this announcement, so, you know, please pay attention. Upon
passage of the Adjournment Resolution, and other business to be completed by the House today, tomorrow, and Thursday, because of the dangerous weather conditions, will be cancelled."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."


Speaker Turner: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And
the Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution #22 offered by Representative Harris. Be it RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Tuesday, January 29, 2019, it stands adjourned until Monday, February 04, 2019, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, February 5, 2019, or until the call of the Speaker; and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, January 31, 2019, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, February 05, 2019, or until the call of the President."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stand adjourned until Tuesday, February 5. Tuesday, February 5. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."
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RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption
of this resolution a proposition to add Section 2.5 to Article IV of the Illinois Constitution as follows:

ARTICLE IV

THE LEGISLATURE

SECTION 2.5. TERM LIMITS

A person may not be elected to the office of State Senator or State Representative, or a combination of those offices, for terms totaling more than ten years. No person may be elected or appointed as a State Senator or State Representative if, upon completion of that term of office, he or she will have been a member of the General Assembly for more than ten years. Service before the second Wednesday in January of 2021 shall not be considered in the calculation of a person's service.

SCHEDULE

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act. This is First Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #13."

Clerk Bolin: "First Reading of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #14, offered by Representative Skillicorn.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREBIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend Article IX of the Illinois Constitution by changing Section 3 as follows:

ARTICLE IX
STATE OF ILLINOIS
101st GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

7th Legislative Day 1/29/2019

REVENUE
SECTION 3. LIMITATIONS ON INCOME TAXATION

(a) A tax on or measured by income shall be at a non graduated rate. At any one time there may be no more than one such tax imposed by the State for State purposes on individuals and one such tax so imposed on corporations. In any such tax imposed upon corporations the rate shall not exceed the rate imposed on individuals by more than a ratio of 8 to 5.

(b) Laws imposing taxes on or measured by income may adopt by reference provisions of the laws and regulations of the United States, as they then exist or thereafter may be changed, for the purpose of arriving at the amount of income upon which the tax is imposed.

(c) For the purposes of this Section, a tax on or measured by income does not include retirement income, and there shall be no such tax imposed by the State upon retirement income. "Retirement income" as used in this subsection (c) means income derived from pension or any other retirement plan.

SCHEDULE
This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act. This has been the First Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #14. First Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #15, offered by Representative Spain.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the
electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend Article IV of the Illinois Constitution by changing Sections 2 and 3 as follows:

ARTICLE IV
THE LEGISLATURE

SECTION 2. LEGISLATIVE COMPOSITION

(a) One Senator shall be elected from each Legislative District. Immediately following each decennial redistricting, the General Assembly by law shall divide the Legislative Districts as equally as possible into three groups. Senators from one group shall be elected for terms of four years, four years and two years; Senators from the second group, for terms of four years, two years and four years; and Senators from the third group, for terms of two years, four years and four years. The Legislative Districts in each group shall be distributed substantially equally over the State.

(b) In 1982 and every two years thereafter one Representative shall be elected from each Representative District for a term of two years.

(c) To be eligible to serve as a member of the General Assembly, a person must be a United States citizen, at least 21 years old, and for the two years preceding his election or appointment a resident of the district which he is to represent. In the general election following a redistricting, a candidate for the General Assembly may be elected from any district which contains a part of the district in which he resided at the time of the redistricting and reelected if a
resident of the new district he represents for 18 months prior to reelection.

(d) Within thirty days after a vacancy occurs, it shall be filled by appointment as provided by law. If the vacancy is in a Senatorial office with more than twenty eight months remaining in the term, the appointed Senator shall serve until the next general election, at which time a Senator shall be elected to serve for the remainder of the term. If the vacancy is in a Representative office or in any other Senatorial office, the appointment shall be for the remainder of the term. An appointee to fill a vacancy shall be a member of the same political party as the person he succeeds.

(e) No member of the General Assembly shall receive compensation as a public officer or employee from any other governmental entity for time during which he is in attendance as a member of the General Assembly. No member of the General Assembly during the term for which he was elected or appointed shall be appointed to a public office which shall have been created or the compensation for which shall have been increased by the General Assembly during that term.

SECTION 3. LEGISLATIVE REDISTRICTING

(a) As used in this Section, "consumer price index u" means the index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor or a successor agency that measures the average change in prices of goods and services purchased by all urban consumers, United States city average, all items, 1982 84=100.
(b) Each Legislative District, Representative District, and Congressional District shall, in the following order of priority:

(1) fully comply with the United States Constitution and federal laws, such as the federal Voting Rights Act;

(2) be substantially equal in population;

(3) provide racial minorities and language minorities with the equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice;

(4) provide racial minorities and language minorities who constitute less than a voting age majority of a Legislative District, Representative District, or Congressional District with an opportunity to substantially influence the outcome of an election;

(5) be contiguous;

(6) be compact;

(7) respect, to the extent practical, geographic integrity of units of local government;

(8) respect, to the extent practical, communities sharing common social or economic interests; and

(9) not discriminate against or in favor of any political party or individual.

(c) No later than December 30 of the year that each federal decennial census occurs, the Chief Justice and the most senior Supreme Court Justice who is not elected from the same political party as the Chief Justice shall select sixteen commissioners to form an Independent Redistricting Commission. The commissioners shall reflect the ethnic, gender, and racial demographics of Illinois, fourteen of the
commissioners shall represent, in equal number, the two political parties whose gubernatorial candidates received the greatest number of votes in the last gubernatorial election and two of the commissioners shall represent neither of those parties. The two Justices responsible for selecting the sixteen commissioners shall consider party identification and all campaign contributions in determining a potential commissioner's eligibility. There shall be at least two commissioners from each Judicial District.

(d) A person is ineligible to serve on the Commission if within the previous four calendar years the person or his or her spouse or immediate family member was appointed or elected to a position with the State, federal, or local government; is a State employee; is a lobbyist as defined by law; has an ownership interest in an entity with a State or federal contract; or is appointed or elected to serve a political party. A commissioner is ineligible for a period of ten years to serve in the General Assembly or to be appointed to a position subject to Senate confirmation. Commissioners must file financial disclosure statements and abide by any ethics requirements established by law.

(e) The Commission shall act in public meetings by the affirmative vote of ten commissioners. The Commission shall elect its chairperson and vice chairperson, who shall not be affiliated with the same political party. Each meeting of the Commission shall be open to the public and there must be public notice at least seven days before a meeting. All records of the Commission, including all communications to or from the Commission regarding the work of the Commission,
shall be available for public inspection. The Commission shall adopt rules governing its procedures. The Commission shall be considered a public body subject to the Freedom of Information Act or a successor Act and the Open Meetings Act or a successor Act. Commissioners and staff may not communicate with or receive communications about redistricting matters from anyone outside of a public hearing.

(f) The Commission shall hold at least twenty public hearings throughout the State before adopting a redistricting plan, with a majority occurring before the Commission releases any proposed redistricting plan and at least ten public hearings must occur throughout the State after the release of any proposed redistricting plan. The Commission must provide a meaningful opportunity for racial minorities and language minorities to participate in the public hearings, including, but not limited to, issuing notices in multiple languages and ensuring that translation services are available at all hearings at the Commission's expense or through partnership with outside organizations. These public hearings must be open to all members of the public and must be planned to encourage attendance and participation across the State, including the use of technology that allows for real time, virtual participation and feedback during the hearings. When releasing a proposed redistricting plan, the Commission must also release population data, geographic data, election data, and any other data used to create the plan, when the Commission receives this information. The Commission must also provide terminals for members of the public to access
the data and associated software. During the map drawing process, any member of the public may submit maps for consideration to the Commission. Those submissions are public records that are open to comment. The Commission may not adopt a redistricting plan until the Commission adopts and publishes a report explaining the plan's compliance with the United States Constitution and Illinois Constitution. Before the adoption of a redistricting plan, the Commission shall release to the public the final plan and its associated compliance report. The meeting to vote on adoption of a redistricting plan shall occur no sooner than thirty days after the release of the final plan and its associated compliance report. All proposed and adopted maps and any data used to develop these maps are public records. The Commission shall maintain a website or other similar electronic platform to disseminate information about the Commission, including records of its meetings and hearings, proposed redistricting plans, assessments and reports on plans, and to allow the public to view its meetings and hearings in both live and archived form. The website or electronic platform must allow the public to submit redistricting plans and comments on redistricting plans to the Commission for its consideration.

(g) The Commission shall adopt and file with the Secretary of State a redistricting plan for the Legislative Districts, Representative Districts, and Congressional Districts by August 1 of the year following the federal decennial census. The Commission may adopt separate redistricting plans for the Legislative Districts, the Representative Districts, and the Congressional Districts.
(h) If the Commission fails to adopt and file a redistricting plan by August 1 of the year following a federal decennial census, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the most senior Supreme Court Justice who is not elected from the same political party as the Chief Justice shall appoint, by August 8, a seventeenth member to the Commission. The seventeenth member of the Commission must not be affiliated with either major political party. The seventeen member Commission shall adopt and file with the Secretary of State redistricting plans for the Legislative Districts, Representative Districts, and Congressional Districts by September 1 of the year following the federal decennial census.

(i) Members of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate of $37.50 for each hour the member is engaged in Commission business. For each succeeding Commission, the rate of compensation shall be adjusted in each year of the federal decennial census by the cumulative change in inflation based on the consumer price index or a successor metric. Members of the Commission are eligible for reimbursement of personal expenses incurred in connection with the duties performed pursuant to this act. A member's residence is deemed to be the member's post of duty for purposes of reimbursement of expenses.

(j) Within the first thirty days after the selection of the Independent Redistricting Commission, the Governor shall include in the budget submitted under Section 2 of Article VIII to the General Assembly amounts of funding for the Commission and the Secretary of State that are sufficient to meet the estimated expenses of each of those officers or
entities in implementing the redistricting process required by this Section for a three year period, including, but not limited to, adequate funding for a statewide outreach program to solicit broad public participation in the redistricting process. The Governor shall also make adequate office space available for the operation of the Commission. The Legislature shall make the necessary appropriation in a budget implementation Act, and the appropriation shall be available during the entire 3 year appropriation shall be available during the entire three year period. The appropriation made shall be equal to the greater of $3,000,000 or the amount expended in accordance with this subsection in the immediately preceding redistricting process, as each amount is adjusted by the cumulative change in inflation based on the consumer price index or a successor metric, since the date of the immediately preceding appropriation made in accordance with this subsection. The Legislature may make additional appropriations in any year that it determines that the Commission requires additional funding in order to fulfill its duties. The Commission, with fiscal oversight from the Comptroller or its successor, shall have procurement and contracting authority and may hire staff and consultants, for the purposes of this Section, including legal representation.

(k) A redistricting plan filed with the Secretary of State shall be presumed valid and shall be published promptly by the Secretary of State.

(l) The Supreme Court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over actions concerning the redistricting of the
Congressional, Legislative, and Representative Districts, which shall be initiated in the name of the People of the State by the Attorney General. Each person who resides or is domiciled in the State, or whose executive office or principal place of business is located in the State, may bring an action in court of competent jurisdiction to obtain any of the relief available.

**SCHEDULE**

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act and applies to redistricting beginning in 2021 and to the election of General Assembly members beginning in 2022. This has been the First Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #15. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."