26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Dennis Norton who is with First Baptist Church in Gibson City. Pastor Norton is the guest of Representative Bennett. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Norton."

Pastor Norton: "If you'd bow with me as we pray. Gracious and loving Father, I thank You on behalf of all who gather here today. I thank You for Your many and abundant blessings. We thank You for life itself, for the measure of health we need to fulfill our callings for substance and for friendship. Thank You for the ability to be involved in this useful work. For the honor of bearing the great responsibility that this Assembly has been called upon its' shoulders. We thank You also for the privilege to gather today in freedom. To embrace You or the freedom to reject You. Thank You for loving us even so. We are told, let every soul be subject to the governing authorities for there is no authority except from God and the authority that exist are appointed by God. May those here today understand that it is You who establish those very authorities to promote peace, order, and justice. Therefore, I pray for those who have been duly elected to administer the task that has been set before them for the responsibilities of this great state. In particular for those assembled here today, I ask that You would give... graciously grant them wisdom to govern amidst the conflict, the interest and issues of our times, a sense of welfare and true need of our people, a keen thirst for justice and righteousness,

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

confidence in what is good and appropriate, the ability to work together in harmony even when there is honest disagreement, personal peace in their lives and joy in their task. I pray for the agenda set before them this day. Give them assurance, Lord, we ask on the beloved state that we serve and in Your precious name, Amen."

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

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

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show the Representatives Ammons, Feigenholtz, Jones, McAsey, and Williams are excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Leader Durkin and Representative David Harris for the day."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. We have 109 Members present and do have a quorum. Leader Currie is recognized."

Currie: "Yes, please after a few minutes Representative Soto will be excused for the remainder of the afternoon."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leader. Mr. Turner is recognized."

Turner: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly.

I'd like to introduce to you two of my Pages for today.

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

They're actually my cousins. Devin Johnson and Darius Johnson. So they'll be here to help out. Please welcome them and show them some love. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for being here with us today. Mr. Welch. Nice hat, Sir."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
Speaker Lang: "Go right ahead."

Welch: "Mr. Speaker, today at 3:30, Northwestern University will be making its first appearance ever in the school's history in the NCAA tournament against Vanderbilt. I am asking my colleagues on the floor of the House of Representatives to join me and my friend Willie the Wildcat in rooting on the Northwestern Wildcats and say go cats go. Go cats go. Go cats go. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution 41, offered by Representative Currie.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, March 16, 2017, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, March 21, 2017 at 12:00 o'clock noon, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, March 22, 2017, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Thursday, March 23, 2017, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, March 28, 2017 at 12:00 o'clock noon, or until the call of the Speaker; and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, March 16, 2017, it

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- stands adjourned until Tuesday, March 28, 2017, or until the call of the President."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 210, offered by Representative Lilly. House Resolution 211, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 213, offered by Representative Unes.
- 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. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're moving to Third Readings. Page 12 of the Calendar. The first Bill is House Bill 230, Mr. Thapedi. Out of the record. House Bill 238, Representative Flowers. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 238, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 238, as amended, prevent a facility from entering into a pre-dispute agreement for binding arbitration with a resident, consumer, or their representative. This Bill allows for a facility to enter into a post-dispute agreement for binding arbitration with a resident, their consumer, or a representative. Current law does not prohibit a facility from entering into a pre-dispute or post-dispute agreement

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

for binding arbitration with a resident and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Representative, so, give me... give me the short form on what we're trying... the problem we're trying to correct or avoid."

Flowers: "Well, if a elderly person is about to give up their home and whatever else they may have to relinquish over to this nursing home to move in and then the nursing home, they say that you're going to have to promise us that you're not going to sue."

Andersson: "Instead of going to arbitration?"

Flowers: "Instead of going to arbitration. And so, some people do that because they feel like they really want to be in this place and they do so and then they end up getting hurt. And then they sign... they remember they signed this paper and there's nothing that they can do about it except for go along with the arbitrator that was chosen by the nursing home."

Andersson: "Right."

Flowers: "And so, we're merely saying that if you're going to have it, have it after they sign their papers and move in and if they are comfortable and if they want to sign it so be it.

But don't have it as a condition of signing or even implying that this is what you have to do before you move in."

Andersson: "So, in that context then, if someone is later injured and they want to file a claim, currently, they would probably end up in the arbitration system which is non juried. It's

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

made up of professionals and I think that's probably some of the concern, right?"

Flowers: "Absolutely. And that arbitrator might have a conflict of interest with the nursing home that is paying them."

Andersson: "I would certainly hope not. That they would have rules to deal with that but..."

Flowers: "Right."

Andersson: "But the alternative is if they don't sign that, they still... if they're injured they still have the right to then go to court..."

Flowers: "That's right."

Andersson: "File whatever suit they deem is appropriate, try it, win or lose as the case may be."

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Andersson: "So, we're really shifting venues is what this is doing?"

Flowers: "Absolutely, we're not stopping them from what it is that they want to do but it'll be after the fact."

Andersson: "Okay. And with regard to... I understand from our analysis that there's some sort of ongoing pending federal lawsuit on this. Can you speak to that?"

Flowers: "Yes. Currently there is a lawsuit on the federal level that has not been decided yet and as I told the Illinois Health Care Association, if the lawsuit... if the Federal Government prevails and says well we don't have to do this, the Federal Law would be the Federal Law and Illinois would have to codify with the Federal Law. So either way it go, it's a win-win situation. But if the Federal Law says that... that the nursing homes do not have to enter, or the member do

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

not have to enter into arbitration, we will be prepared for that as well."

Andersson: "So, they're try... they're trying or deciding the exact issue of whether or not these arbitration clauses can be enforced at the federal level?"

Flowers: "Beforehand, yes."

Andersson: "Beforehand."

Flowers: "Yes. Absolutely."

Andersson: "Okay. And then, I understand you've got some support.

It looks like Illinois Health Care Association, Health Care
Council of Illinois, and Long Term Care Support Services are
opposed. Is that your understanding as well?"

Flowers: "Those are proponents."

Andersson: "Proponents? We have those as opponents."

Flowers: "Oh, the Illinois Health Care Association is an opponent and the Illinois Department of Public Health has no position.

And the Alzheimer's Association and the Illinois Chapter of AARP and the Association of Community Mental Health Authority of Illinois, they are proponents."

Andersson: "And have you... I assume you've spoken with the opponents. What's their stated reason for their opposition, if you know?"

Flowers: "Well, they wanted me to wait on the courts to decide.

And I said that we'll just continue on our path and whatever the courts decide we would codify."

Andersson: "So, there is the potential that your Bill, depending on which way the courts decide, your Bill either will be valid or we'll have to undo it."

Flowers: "Absolutely."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Andersson: "Depending."

Flowers: "Yes."

Andersson: "Okay. Thank you for the answers to the questions. To the Bill. I think it's... this is a good example of a policy choice, whether a potential plaintiff in a nursing home injury either gets to elect the court system or the arbitration system but I am concerned about the pre-matureness of the Bill in bringing it forward now when we have the potential that we're just going to have to re-write it later. But I do thank the Lady for the very candid answers."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple comments to the Bill. First of all, arbitration is a well-established practice in the State of Illinois. It's something that we use for a number of different public and private situations. We certainly use arbitration when we deal with public safety employees and their contracts. We use arbitration in any number of other services that you may contract for. So, in my opinion, to basically take away this tool that actually in the end, tends to save folks dollars, especially those who are... who do have a problem, then I think that we're taking away a tool that is well established in legal practice here. And that's not something that we should be Additionally, according to our analysis, arbitration in no way limits the amount of money that you could receive if you did have an issue and you wanted to take it to the legal system to do so. So, this is just not something that we should be doing piecemeal and hazardly and essentially on the fly

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

here. So, I really urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Representative Flowers, are all of the nursing homes still opposed, as they were in committee?"

Flowers: "Pardon me?"

Bellock: "Are all of the nursing homes still opposed as they were in committee?"

Flowers: "When you say all of the nursing homes, I was not..."

Bellock: "I mean, the organ... the associations?"

Flowers: "The Illinois Health Care Association, but the Alzheimer's Association, the Illinois chapter of AARP Association, and the Mental Health Authority of Illinois, they are in support."

Bellock: "Okay. I'm asking about Health Care Council of Illinois, and the Long-term Care Support Services. Are they still opposed?"

Flowers: "I have... I don't have them on my list, so I cannot answer."

Bellock: "Okay. Thank you. So, and there still is the federal lawsuit pending, correct? On this issue?"

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hear. Pardon me, Representative?"

Bellock: "I think there is a federal lawsuit still..."

Flowers: "No, I know there is."

Bellock: "Okay."

Flowers: "There is."

Bellock: "All right. So, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Our position in the committee when we voted was that there is still a

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

pending lawsuit federally right now. And if this Bill goes through, it will probably bring about an Illinois lawsuit with even more attorney's fees. So, we would... we had wanted to hold on this Bill to see if there would be a resolution in the federal realm before we moved on a Bill such as this at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we must hold the noise down in the chamber. I know it's get away day and you're all interested in getting away, but we have a lot of business to conduct today. And we don't want Mr. Welch to miss the Northwestern game. So, if we could keep the noise down in the chamber, it would keep me less tense and I want to acknowledge Mr. Black back there. Hello, Mr. Black. Mr. Demmer is recognized."

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

Demmer: "Representative Flowers, I appreciate the conversation we had in committee about this and I think a couple of my colleagues have already indicated one of the concerns we have with this particular piece of legislation and that's the ongoing issue at the federal level regarding this very issue. In October of last year, the Department of Health and Human Services issued federal rules to prohibit these kind of predispute arbitration agreements but that was quickly met with a legal challenge, an injunction was put in place and the outcome of that legal challenge remains unresolved. So, while the Federal Government is looking at this specific issue that would apply to states across the country, I think you... you acknowledged our hesitation to act today on this Bill. But I

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

also want to ask you about some remarks that you made earlier in... in testimony. You indicated that your Bill would prohibit nursing homes from requiring pre-dispute arbitration agreements as a condition of getting into the facility, is that correct?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Demmer: "But you... you had seemed to indicate that after a resident was in the facility that they could then enter into one of those agreements."

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Demmer: "So, my reading of your Bill contradicts that. I believe that your Bill would prohibit all pre-dispute arbitration agreements regardless of when those were signed and would only allow for post-incident arbitration agreements."

Flowers: "Yes. That's correct. That's correct."

Demmer: "So, not only are you... are you saying that it can't be a condition of... of residency or allowing them in, but that the day they arrive or a week after or a month after they arrive, they can still not enter into a pre-dispute arbitration agreement. They can't sign an agreement before an incident happens."

Flowers: "You... they cannot be forced or alluded to being forced to sign in... to sign a pre-condition before they move in. But..."

Demmer: "Or after they move in. The same document could not be signed after they move in."

Flowers: "Yeah. If they..."

Demmer: "According to your Bill."

Flowers: "No. After they move in they can sign it. You know, it's the same principle with you purchasing a car. You would not

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

purchase a car without test driving it. And, so, the only thing we're asking is to allow these senior citizens, some maybe very well versed and very sure of themselves and they can sign it if they so choose to. But to give the impression that if they do not sign, they will not be able to move in."

Demmer: "But... but your Bill says the... the first line here, a facility must not enter into a pre-dispute arbi... agreement for binding arbitration with any resident or resident's representative. That's one item. Nor require that a resident sign an arbitration agreement as a condition of admission. Those are two separate... two separate cases. One, they must not enter into a pre-dispute agreement and two, they must not require that a resident sign that as a condition of entry. The Bill prohibits both of those."

Flowers: "Okay. According to... according to page 1, line 8, a facility must not enter into a pre-dispute agreement for binding arbitration with any resident or resident's representative nor require that a resident sign an arbitration agreement as a condition of admission to the facility."

Demmer: "Correct. We're looking at the same language and I'm saying that... you're prohibiting two things there. You're prohibiting a pre-dispute agreement and you're prohibiting the requirement that they sign an agreement as a condition of entry."

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Demmer: "Both of those. So, because of the first prohibition, even after the person moves in, even a month or a year later, they still must not enter into a pre-dispute agreement. So,

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

it's not just at the moment of... of admission like you described that. It's both. The moment of admission and after that."

Flowers: "And?"

Demmer: "I'm... I'm clarifying because you suggested that once they moved in they could sign this agreement. That's not true."

Flowers: "Well, no. If they want to, but it should not be part of a..."

Demmer: "No. It... no not if they want to. It says a facility must not enter into an agreement. Period. It's not a... it's not a... a may. They must not.

Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative. Can I take this Bill out of the record?

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative."

Flowers: "Until next week."

Speaker Lang: "The Bill shall be taken from the record. House Bill 348, Mr. McSweeney. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 348, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 348 simply eliminates the mailing requirement for Constitutional Amendments. There still would be a newspaper notice. Also, an online requirement. This will save \$1.3 million a year. I would appreciate a 'yes' 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? Flowers. Conyears. Conyears. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question,

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

there are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 374, Representative Mayfield. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 374, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. This Bill is an initiative of several military individuals in my community. With the ongoing threats that we've had, they've asked to have their license plates changed. Many of them have special designated license plates to show their pride in their arms service. However, they have been advised to take those plates off of their cars because they can now be targeted because of their affiliation with the military. So, we're just asking that their plates be re… replaced at no cost to them. So, we do… the Amendment just basically changes the date that would allow the Secretary of State to get in… have all their paperwork in order to allow this to happen. There is no opposition to the Bill. And I'd like an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

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

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "Today we're joined by Andrew Calise, sitting down front. He's with Russ the… our photographer. He's shadowing him for the day and… and learning what we do around here. So, I wish we'd give him a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Happy to have you here. Thank you. The next Bill is yours, Mr. Davidsmeyer. House Bill 470. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 503, Representative Harper. Out of the record. House Bill 524, Representative Barbara Wheeler. Barbara Wheeler. Out of the record. House Bill 540, Kelly Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 547, Mr. Zalewski. Someone's ready. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 547, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an effort on behalf of local government to change the way in which local emergency road repair procurements have to go to competitive bidding. I know this is... this is a desire among our locals to just be more flexible in the way they do RFPs. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Representative, currently that threshold for no... what amounts to no-bid contracts is 20 thousand, correct?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Andersson: "And we're going to 25?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Andersson: "And when was that most recently increased? Has it been years or recently?"

Zalewski: "It was... we think it was relatively recently, Steve, but we don't have an exact year on that for you."

Andersson: "Okay. And does this apply to all... all the various entities? Is this only municipalities? Is this county? Who... who's covered by this?"

Zalewski: "In municipalities, libraries and library districts."

Andersson: "Municipalities, libraries, library districts?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Andersson: "No one else? Fire protection districts?"

Zalewski: "Not to my knowledge, no, Sir."

Andersson: "Okay. And... and with regard to the reason for the change, what was it?"

Zalewski: "More flexibility. I think local officials feel that with the cost of goods and costs of services rising, they just want to keep this up with the cost of inflation."

Andersson: "And nothing about the Bill prohibits them from seeking like three quotes or something like that, they just don't have to go through the bidding process?"

Zalewski: "Not at all."

Andersson: "Okay. And... and if they're over that threshold, do they still have a waiver provision? A way to not do the bidding process?"

Zalewski: "I believe so, yes, Sir."

Andersson: "By a super majority or something to that effect?"

Zalewski: "Yes, Sir."

Andersson: "Okay. Thank you very much."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes'; 46 voting 'no'; 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 619, Mr. Walsh. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 619, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 619 is an initiative of the Illinois Sheriff's Association. What the Bill does is exempt from expe... inspection, copy and records that would result in harm. Law enforcement records or records of the victim's personal information requested by persons committed into the Department of Corrections or a county jail. So, basically it gives the same FOIA exemptions to county jail that are under current DOC regulations. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "And could we bring the noise level down a little bit?"

Speaker Lang: "I have certainly been trying to do that, Sir."

Andersson: "I know you have."

Speaker Lang: "Let me try again."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Andersson: "Good luck. So, Representative Walsh, I really couldn't hear very well because of the din, so could you briefly reexplain the purpose of the Bill?"

Walsh: "So, the purpose of the Bill is to put under current regulation the DOC exemptions for FOIA requests giving county jails the same exemptions."

Andersson: "Matching up county jails to DOC?"

Walsh: "Exactly. Yes."

Andersson: "And to some degree this is limiting what inmates can request, is that right?"

Walsh: "That is correct."

Andersson: "Is there evidence or circumstances that we can point to that say there really... you know, there's an abuse to the system that's going on?"

Walsh: "There... there are scenarios where multiple requests have been made within the county jail system that has nothing to do with that persons specific case, or... or information... I mean, they're getting information on other inmates, they're requesting information on guards, et cetera, that aren't specifically necess... relevant to whatever case they may have within the system."

Andersson: "And so, it sounds like if they're asking for information about their very own guards, this could also be a public safety issue. Is that correct?"

Walsh: "That is correct."

Andersson: "And I know from experience that processing FOIA requests, especially when they become voluminous can be quite expensive. So, would you also characterize this as a cost saving measure for our agencies?"

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Walsh: "That it would be."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will... sorry.

Representative Stratton is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Stratton: "One question I have is, if there's a public safety issue, my understanding is that if you are in the Cook... in any county jail, you have not been adjudicated and you are a pre-trial detainee and presumed innocent. Is that correct?"

Walsh: "Correct."

Stratton: "So, what is the… I'm… just want to make sure. There's a public safety issue around those that are pre-trial detainees?"

Walsh: "This is... this is specifically dealing with FOIA requests from people that are within the facility. So, there is... they have every right to gather or request information that is pertinent to their case, but it limits on what they can do that doesn't relate to their case. So, if they want to request information on a specific guard that has nothing to do with their case, or people that are within the facility to see if they have some kind of affiliation with something else or information on family members, et cetera, that's limited to the same standards that are currently within DOC."

Stratton: "Okay. Thank you. And to the Bill. I would just say that I do have some concerns about putting the same standards to somebody that has been convicted and/or adjudicated versus someone who is being held as a pre-trial detainee. I think that at that stage, there's still a presumption of innocence

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

and therefore the ability to gather information on a number of issues that may or may not directly relate to the case, but certainly could be something that could be helpful to that person as they... prior to being... having their trial. So, I just wanted to note that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walsh, go ahead and close now if you wish."

Walsh: "Thank you. I'd ask... respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Wallace. Take the record please, Mr. Clerk. There are 98 voting 'yes'; 9 voting 'no'; 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 623, Mr. Fortner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 623, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 623 had its genesis last year when I was the victim of income tax refund identity theft. Under the investigation, one of the things that came to light was a likely contributing factor was the fact that we provide exact to the dollar amounts of state employees pay through the Comptroller's website. This Bill represents agreed language with the Comptroller's Office that simply says that those salaries will be rounded off to the nearest 100 dollars, making it harder to use in that way for that type of identity theft. Happy to answer any questions."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 638, Mr. Cabello. Mr. Cabello. Out of the record. House Bill 656, Representative Gordon-Booth. Representative Gordon-Booth. Out of the record. House Bill 739, Mr. Meier. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 739, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill.

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Meier."

Meier: "Yes. This Bill follows the Chicago Tribune's story about the abuse in CILA's. And it talks about when... when CILA's... we've had bad CILA's before, they have their license revoked. The owners' of those CILA's simply change their name and reapply for a license again. So, this Bill says you cannot reapply. It goes to the owners', board members, or managers for five years. So, by changing your name, you still will not be able to get a license."

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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 786, Mr. Andrade. Please read the Bill.

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- You have an Amendment, Sir. Please put the Bill in the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Clerk and please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 786, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Andrade, has been approved for consideration." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."
- Andrade: "Thank you very much. I move to accept Floor Amendment 1."
- Speaker Lang: "Please tell us briefly what's in the Amendment, Sir."
- Andrade: "Floor Amendment 1 would remove the 'but' provision from House Bill 786, which in turn created a penalty for the Bill. It's... the original intent of the Bill would still stay. And that's just to remove some of the opposition that was in the Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 823, Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 823, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move for passage of House Bill 823. This is a... no opposition and it's agreed. It simply states that the financial institution department will publish the CRA of state banks. I move for the adoption of HB823."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'; 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1809, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1809, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1809 simply says that if a bank wants to create another branch, they no longer have to send a letter to IDFPR 30 days in advance. Working with the Department, they said, if a bank actually has financial issues where they should not be expanding, IDFPR is already working with those... those banks. So, there... there shouldn't be an issue. This just eliminates that letter to IDFPR."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Fine. Sims. Please take the record. There are 85 voting 'yes'; 23 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2367, Mr. Ford. Mr. Ford. Out of the record. House Bill 2371, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2371, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2371 is a sponsor initiative that developed after the reports of Russians hacking State Board Elections systems, WikiLeaks and all the folks that are targeting government systems. This Bill is designed to protect our state computers. It requires every employee to undergo annual cyber security training. We're working very closely with the Department of Technology and Innovation, known as DoIt. If we pass House Bill 2371 today, they will just do it. And get it done and train all of our employees on how to detect phishing scams, prevent spywear infections, preventing identity thefts and other data breaches. I know of no opposition to this Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Representative, obviously the idea, the concept of the Bill is a good one. Do we know what the training is going to comprise? Do we know what level of detail we're actually getting into here?"

Welch: "We are working closely with the department to develop the rules and procedures to determine that."

Andersson: "Do we have any idea what the cost of this is going to be?"

Welch: "You know, I'm not aware of a cost to it."

Andersson: "You're not aware that there is a cost?"

Welch: "I'm not aware..."

Andersson: "Or you're not aware what it will be?"

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Welch: "What it will be."

Andersson: "What it will be. Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Martwick. Mitchell. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2407, Representative Kifowit. Representative Kifowit. Out... oh, here she comes. Ready? Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2407, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We did the Amendment yesterday on this. It's a simple annexation which says that a township can annex property on the other side of a body of water. I ask for your approval."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Representative Kifowit, I think you just said township but you mean municipality, correct?"

Kifowit: "Township, municipality. Correct. Any municipality will
fall under it."

Andersson: "Right. Townships generally don't change the boundaries but municipalities annex all the time, right?"

Kifowit: "Correct. It was a misspoken word."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- Andersson: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you say that. I apologize. So, we're... we're basically saying that if water is a boundary, it doesn't have to be a boundary anymore. And I read your Bill originally, but I'm not familiar with the Amendment. What did the Amendment do to that concept?"
- Kifowit: "The Amendment just conveys ownership. So, it... it just allows for a more contiguous annexation."
- Andersson: "Okay. There's one unique aspect of these annexations that could potentially arise and I want to understand your intent with the Bill. Which is that if you've got... got a city along a river, right, and they want to annex across, it seems fairly logical. But the river is actually a boundary both, you know, north and south. So, let me give an example. That the City of Geneva is physically separated by a river from property in North Aurora. Is there any limitation to the distance, say north and south, that they can annex to because they're not going to be across the river anymore? They'll be down river. But it's still a barrier. What's your intent with that?"
- Kifowit: "The intent is in the annexation agreement and the language within the annexation agreement within the surrounding municipalities and within the adjacent municipalities with regards to the boundaries. So, what..."

Andersson: "So..."

Kifowit: "All we're doing is, is treating a river or treating a body of water like it would be a state highway, like it would be some other barrier. So, the minutia of it would be flushed out in the annexation agreement which has to be agreed upon by the two..."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Andersson: "By the property owner and the..."

Kifowit: "Correct."

Andersson: "...municipality that's raising the issue. Is this addressing a particular issue or is it just a general idea?"

Kifowit: "There's one issue I'm familiar of actually in this area, with Chatham, where they do have a body of water. It's unincorporated on the other side of the body of water and those residents would like to be incorporated in, but they are prohibited to because it's just a body of water separating them."

Andersson: "And this would resolve that problem?"

Kifowit: "Correct."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Kifowit: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Dan Burke. Sims. Please take the record. There are 106 voting 'yes'; 1 voting 'no'; 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2408, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2408, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2408 actually does two things. First, it says IDFPR can send out renewal notices and suspensions via email. It allows them to use technology to insure that people who need re... to renew licenses and... and receive suspensions can receive them via

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- email. It'll allow them to save some money. Not necessarily needing to send things out and send multiple notifications to individuals. The second thing it does, is a cleanup of legislation that we passed and I believe I supported last year. We... we were allowing certain people who had criminal backgrounds to get certain licenses. And what this does, is say, if you're working in the healthcare industry and your conviction was against a patient, they don't have to consider you for licensing. So, I... I would take any questions.
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes'; 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2452, Representative Bellock. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2452, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And House Bill 2452 is again a Bill that we're doing and... to make sure that we have transparency and safety for the residents in the CILA's. And what this Bill does, it amends the CILA Licensure and Certification Act. And it says that all CILA's shall be inspected every two years.
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? DeLuca.

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Harper. Wallace. Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2462, Representative Moeller. Representative Moeller. Out of... out of the record. House Bill 2516, Mr. Andersson. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2516, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This House Bill amends the spousal award under the Probate Act. We're updating the section regarding adult dependent child. Right now that isn't clearly specified. We're creating a minimum amount of five thousand dollars, but should a court determine that a person is a public charge and financially dependent, they can increase that amount to whatever is deemed reasonable. Be happy to answer any questions and 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? Take the record, please. There are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2538, Mr. Riley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2538, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2538 essentially requires CMAP, the regional planning agency

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

for Northeastern Illinois to record and livestream their meetings. I'll answer any questions you may have."

- 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. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2550, Mr. Cavaletto. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2550, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

- Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2550 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code to clarify that monies in Illinois Firefighters Memorial Fund may be used to provide scholarships for any post-secondary education to children and spouses of firefighters killed in the line of duty. 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? Kelly Burke. Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2551, Mr. Cavaletto. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2551, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2551 amends sections of two Acts to clarify that the Office of the State Fire Marshal rather than the General Revenue or Office of the Governor is responsible for payments of reimbursements. 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? Tabares. Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2571, Mr. Butler. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2571, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Butler."

- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2571 is a request from a constituent who askes the Secretary of State to fly a 21 star flag over the State Capitol in honor of and during our state's bicentennial year. Secretary of State's Office is in full support of this initiative, but in discussions with SOS, they believe we need legislation amending the State Flag Display Act to be specific on their ability to fly a 21 star flag instead of the current national flag, the 50 star flag, as noted in the Act. 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? Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2604, Mr. Riley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2604, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members. House Bill 2604 essentially is a initiative by the Secretary of State. It cleans up and updates language in the Notary Public Act. Such things as... essentially saying that if a notary public is not an attorney, they must specify that on their website or any electronic communication. It removes an outdated sunset provision and you know, requires notaries to make sure that they use black ink, such that the information that they notarize is legible and can be copied."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Representative Riley, so, we're raising the fee from one dollar to five dollars?"

Riley: "And they are raising the fee of... of notaries from one dollar to five dollars."

Andersson: "Was that a yes? I couldn't hear."

Riley: "I'm sorry?"

Andersson: "I... I just couldn't hear you. Was that a yes?"

Riley: "Yes. They are raising the notary fee from one dollar to five dollars."

Andersson: "And what's the impetus? Why do we need to raise that fee?"

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Riley: "Well, there's a lot of information, a lot of work that notaries do. The fee was found to be something that... that's been around a long time, that one dollar fee. Most people who use notaries know it's been one dollar for a while. So, all they're trying to do is to make sure that they have the compensation for all the work that they do."

Andersson: "And in committee, we had discussed that there are a lot of times where notaries do their work within the context of their employment. Most, the best example I can think of is law offices. Where they're literally be notarizing 50 documents in a day."

Riley: "Yes."

Andersson: "There's no requirement that they charge anything.

correct?"

Riley: "There's no... I'm sorry. There's no requirement that they what?"

Andersson: "There's no requirement that they charge anything?

They can choose not to charge a fee, correct?"

Riley: "Well... well, yes. You can choose not to... not to charge. It is permissive."

Andersson: "This is a more in the realm of the commercial notary..."

Riley: "Exactly."

Andersson: "...who holds their services out?"

Riley: "That's correct."

Andersson: "Great. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Ives: "Is... are there certain businesses that are required to have a notary on site? Is anybody required to do it?"

Riley: "Well, that's not covered by this particular piece of legislation. I'm... I'm not sure if anybody is particularly required to have one on site. There are certain offices where, you know, certainly it would be good that one was on site. But many of them where documents are produced and need notaries, they are on site. But there's nothing in statute that I know of that requires that."

Ives: "Okay. So, if folks or businesses can independently decide that whether or not they want to provide notary services there... nobody is required by state law to have a notary on site? I mean, a number of places; banks, law firms, township clerks, whoever, they do it out of a... for service, or because it... it facilitates their transactions. Is that correct?"

Riley: "Well, that's true."

Ives: "Okay."

Riley: "Again, it's not a requirement but as you said, a township office, a township clerk, certainly any unit of government that does that kind of business often they will... and it's a good thing, they will have one on site because they are providing a service to the people who come in and need their services. But that's not a requirement."

Ives: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Guzzardi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Guzzardi: "Representative Riley, what are the fees used for?

Forgive my ignorance here."

Riley: "Basically for administration."

Guzzardi: "Do they go to a state fund? Where do the... where do those monies go to?"

Riley: "One second. Not aware of where the fees go to. I am sure that the individual notaries have to you know, send some that money in through the Secretary of State's Office. Again, there... there's overhead. And... and this Bill just deals with making the process that's been around a long time more streamlined. That particular question I am really not sure, but I do know there's a responsibility between notaries, the Secretary of State and... and the counties that that notary are in. They do have those relationships and I'm sure that the fees are distributed you know, amongst those different entities."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Leader Riley. I... I just have some concerns about raising the fees particularly because this is often the only vehicle by which low income people have access to sort of legal type services. So, I have some concerns in that direction, but thank you for your time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Well, thank you, Leader for bringing the Bill. I have some questions about this as well. So, when a person is a notary is that a business of their own or is that something that they have to have between the Secretary of State and themselves?"

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Riley: "Well, they have to be certified by the Secretary of State.

A business? A business of their own? That's really hard to define. You know the kind of things that notaries do. I'm not really sure how much money that they would make. I would look at it as really providing a service than a business as such."

Ford: "So, when... when you become a notary public you are qualified through the Secretary of State?"

Riley: "That's true."

Ford: "And the Secretary of State tells you how much you can charge?"

Riley: "Well, that's what this..."

Ford: "I mean, I know that's what it's saying, but I'm asking is that the case? They tell them that they can only charge..."

Riley: "All right. So, your question is... repeat your question again. I'm sorry, Representative Ford."

Ford: "So, does the Secretary of State tell people what they can charge for the act of notarizing a document?"

Riley: "Well, again, just like in this piece of legislation, you know, the charge is going from one to five dollars. It's my understanding that they could charge for other services that... that they may provide an amount higher than that."

Ford: "So, if you go into a currency exchange and want to get a document notarized, the currency exchange could charge whatever? This is a question that I really need to know for myself and constituents. So, they can only charge you a certain amount and if they charge you more than the law allows, that's against the rules?"

Riley: "Yeah. You can't charge more than what the law allows."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Ford: "And does this mean per document, per paper, or is this per act?"

Riley: "Per... well, per act. Per... per notary act. Which could encompass you know, a lot of different things, notarization or other services."

Ford: "So, I think we do petitions. And we may have thousands and thousands of petitions that have to be notarized. One petition sheet would constitute one act or is it the whole set?"

Riley: "Your whole set of petitions. That would be per sheet.

Which is why maybe somebody needs to be a notary in that... in that particular campaign. But yeah, per sheet."

Ford: "Okay. Thank you."

Riley: "If you took them to a commercial notary."

Ford: "All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley to close."

Riley: "Thank you so much. We need to have more notaries in the state. I request 'aye' votes."

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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 37 voting 'yes'; 65 voting 'no'; 1 voting 'present'. And the Bill fails. House Bill 2643, Mr. Davis. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2643, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2643 simply adds to the definition of pedestrian with a disability, a person who may require the use of a mobility device, service

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

animal, or white cane to travel on walking, running, or bicycle paths. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

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? Kelly Burke. Evans. Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2661, Representative Sente. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2661, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you. This Bill is an initiative from my local public safety director. The Bill does two things. It defines a police dog and it amends the EMS Act to allow a paramedic or EMT to transport an injured police dog in the line of duty to a veterinarian clinic if there are no por... persons requiring medical attention. Happy to take questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, Representative, is this currently prohibited or not done?"

Sente: "That was something I discussed in LRB. We think it actually is allowed. I wanted to codify it in law. It does happen today and so, we wanted to be sure that we were very crystal clear in the language. The language however, is

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

permissive. So, each individual municipality can make that decision for themselves."

Andersson: "And the… and obviously I support the idea of treating our servi… our patrol dogs, our K-9 units if they need it.

What happens though if there is an emergency relating to a human?"

Sente: "And... and the Bill specifically says that humans take precedence over a K-9 officer."

Andersson: "And, not being disrespectful to dogs, I love dogs, but they are kind of hairy and furry and all that. Are there methodologies... do they have to clean out the ambulance after this happens?"

Sente: "Absolutely. It... they fol... it follows their current protocol. Right now, they would... the ambulance would be entirely cleaned out for whoever, animal or person, is in the... is in the ambulance. Often times, when... during current practice, when an ambulance is picking up a dog, they have donated from their local animal rights group, they have specific masks for the dogs. But masks also are disposable piece. So, there's a cleaning, there's a different piece for dogs. And, so, it's a very sanitary condition."

Andersson: "All right. Thank you for the answers."

Sente: Thanks."

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? Moeller. Nekritz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2704, Mr. Wehrli. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2704, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of CMS. It provides a certain payroll certifications must be made by the agency head. This Bill's in response to an internal compliance audit repeat finding. Happy to answer any questions and respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Stuart. Katie Stuart. Please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2725, Mr. Demmer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2725, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2725 is an initiative of the Department of Natural Resources. It just cuts out a middle man in some funding they have that's dedicated to recreational trails. We adopted Committee Amendment #1 which an agreement between IDOT and DNR. I know of no opposition and ask for your support."

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

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Guzzardi. Please take the record. There are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2733, Mr. Beiser. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2733, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a initiative of the Illinois Emergency Management Agency. And it abolishes the Hazardous Materials Advisory Board. The duties assigned to this board are the same as those... are the responsibilities of the State Emergency Response Commission. So, that's why they're asking that this be eliminated. And they have not met in many, many years. I've checked with both the Sierra Club and the Environmental Council this morning and they're okay with this. I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote. Answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Representative, we talked about this yesterday. Our notes had a hold on second, but it sounded like that was perhaps a misunderstanding and that IEMA was going to bring an Amendment but now they're not. Is that correct?"

Beiser: "Exactly. That's why I think we referred... the Environmental Council may have contacted you, or Sierra Club, to verify that that was the case."

Andersson: "And they did. So, I just thank you for that courtesy."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

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

Andersson: "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? Burke. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes'; 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Brady. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Brady: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Brady: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know, we're all family here or at least extended family and as families do when a family member falls on difficult times, they reach out and help. Such is the case with our extended family member Linda Loyd, who has been the Assistant Mail Clerk over in the Stratton Building for the last 38 years. Linda is battling cancer for the fourth time. Presently at Memorial Medical Center, on life support and hospice. First and foremost, we're asking for your thoughts and your prayers on behalf of Linda. And secondly, if you stop by the mail room on the second floor the Ladies are there to take donations to try to help Linda and her family. So, if you could keep her in your thoughts and prayers and if you could someone else to stop by the mail room, we'd appreciate it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Brady. House Bill 2740, Mr. Welch.

Please read the Bill."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2740, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill.

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2740 is an initiative of the Illinois Community College Board. It basically implements recommendations from a task force that was led by ICCB on the issue of adult education. And it gives simply, the ICCB Board the same authority that it gives regional superintendent of schools to grant alter... alternative methods of credentially and hopefully more folks will get their GED's and be able to go on and be successful in life. I ask for approval of House Bill 2740."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, this is alternate methods of credentialing high school equivalency. So, is this a different form of like GED?"

Welch: "It's GED. It's also allowing them to allow like foreign credits. You know..."

Andersson: "How to get to the... how to meet your criteria."

Welch: "Correct."

Andersson: "Okay. So, we're just adding some flexibility and the ultimate decision on that is made by the Illinois Community College Board or the community colleges themselves?"

Welch: "Well, ICCB will empower the local community colleges."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

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

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2782, Representative Jimenez. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2782, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jimenez."

Jimenez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2782 would transfer the Employment and Economic Opportunity for Persons with Disabilities Task Force from the Department of Employment Security to the Department of Human Services. The agencies just felt that this was a better spot for this particular task force. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ford. Please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2794, Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2794, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move for the passage of House Bill 2794. It simply requires that all school districts, including the Chicago Public Schools to notify qualified students in grades 11 and 12 of dual

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

enrollment and dual credit opportunities at public community colleges. I move for the passage of House Bill 2794."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, we're just providing a notice, if you will, to these 11th and 12th graders that there are opportunities for these dual credit enrollment programs with community colleges, things like that?"

Ford: "Yes."

Andersson: "Do you anticipate any costs or impact to that?"

Ford: "There was... it never came up. No opposition. I don't expect any..."

Andersson: "So, nominal."

Ford: "None. That's the best answer."

Andersson: "We'll go with nominal not none. All right. Thank you very much."

Ford: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Representative Ford, are... so obviously we're doing this Bill because guidance counselors, principals, other administrators aren't informing 11th and 12th graders of dual credit opportunities. Is that the case?"

Ford: "I would say that we would encourage them to do it more. I wouldn't say what people are not automatically doing, but I think that it could be encouraged more so that students are aware that they can take college courses while in high school."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Ives: "But this Bill requires them to do it. So, what's the enforcement mechanism, which... what's the penalty if they don't? What... what else is going on here?"

Ford: "It's a... it's a strong encouragement. There is no penalty if they don't do it, but I think that we will do everything we can to work with the school districts to make them aware that the community colleges have dual enrollment opportunities and other opportunities for students to take dual credit while they're in high school. I think it will put students in Illinois at an advantage if they can go into the universities or colleges already taking... have taken college courses if they're ready."

Ives: "I... I don't think anybody's denying that, the dual credit is important. I just... I just am concerned because you are adding another requirement to schools and you're inferring the fact that these guidance counselors, school principals, other administrators, people that are looking out for kids for these opportunities are not doing their job. And, so, I'd just... from that stand point I... I don't understand the gen... the reason for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford to close."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the passage of 2794."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote
'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who
wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please
record yourselves. Chapa LaVia. Mah. Mitchell. Rita. Please
take the record. There are 85 voting 'yes'; 23 voting 'no'.
And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2966, Mr. Andrade. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2966, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Chairman, Members. Speaker, I mean. House Bill 2966 is an initiative of IMRF. It provides two technical changes to the IMRF article to the Pension Code. House Bill 2966 updates the qualifications such are for the IMRF board of trustees to insure that the board candidates are vested, regardless of the tier that they participate in. Additionally, House Bill 2966 corrects incorrect terminology referenced in a specific statute and this will clear up any clarification for the terminology change. Current law states that accelerated payment is inapplicable if the increase is to salary rather to reported earnings. And the IMRF statute does not recognize salary. So, if there's no questions, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson. Yes, the Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, it appears from my analysis that what is being required is to serve on the board, the IMRF board, you have to be vested. Is that correct?"

Andrade: "That is correct. One hopes that that was the original intent of the board when they originally passed the eight years. Tier one required eight years of... in order to be vest... vested. Tier two now requires ten years. And so, IMRF is requesting updating that."

Andersson: "But I... I want to understand the reasoning behind requiring vesting. Because what if you have someone who is

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

not vested or not fully vested and yet they're a great expert at finances and investment? I would imagine they're as motivated as a vested person to see those fund revenues go up. Why are we limiting the pool of potential applicants?"

Andrade: "That... for that they could... if that person is not, there's other position that he may hold as a consultant or as additional help, but not as an initial board member."

Andersson: "I... I'm sorry. I didn't understand that. Could you say that again?"

Andrade: "That if another member would like to participate, this would require him first to be a vested member. For a member that's not vested..."

Andersson: "Right."

Andrade: "...he could probably... he could participate at a different level of participation and not at... as a direct member of the board."

Andersson: "Right."

Andrade: "So, we wouldn't lose his qualifications or his expertise."

Andersson: "Well, but at the same time, I mean, the board is the one who is ultimately going to make these investment decisions, right?"

Andrade: "Yes. But they... but they all the boards also have actuaries and have other people that they hire to help them with their decisions. So, it's not an uncommon practice that they would have other people. But one hopes that this... that they're... since they're adversely affected, they would more make wisely a decision."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- Andersson: "But I... but again, I think that people who are not fully vested, hope to be vested at some point. And why wouldn't we want to encourage those people who hope to be vested if they have the expertise, why are we limiting them? I don't... I still don't get the reasoning behind limiting the pool."
- Andrade: "We're trying to follow the original intent that the IMRF originally had when they passed the..."
- Andersson: "And if the intent, if I could understand the... the difference why it's good to limit the pool of otherwise qualified candidates, I'd love to hear it. But if the intent is simply well we wanted to do it this way, that's not much of a reason. So, I still want to understand why it is that we are limiting a pool that otherwise might qualify, might do a great job."
- Andrade: "There... the only thing I can tell you is that if someone is adversely affected, they would probably have more interest to make sure that the fund is properly funded."
- Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I get what the Sponsor's trying to do, but it just seems to me a very artificial delineation of who can serve and who can't. I have no doubt that those younger employees who haven't quite vested yet but look forward to it, they may have excellent knowledge, resources and ability to serve. I think this is just an arbitrary, artificial restriction on who can be chosen. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill. Representative Andersson, you weren't in committee, but some

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

of the issues that you just raised were some of the issues that we brought up in committee and so that's why we're asking for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Martwick: "Thank you. So, Representative Andrade, the Bill that you have removes the actual year requirement and says that in order to be a trustee on the board of the IMRF, you must be vested. It just changes a... a number and turns it to 'vested'. Is that correct?"

Andrade: "That is correct."

Martwick: "And so, the number that was created was created during tier 1 when members would vest at eight years. Is that correct?"

Andrade: "That is correct."

Martwick: "And now under tier two, members vest at ten years?"

Andrade: "That is correct."

Martwick: "So, you have tier one and tier two and it's... since the original intent of the legislation was to require that board members were vested, you are just making a technical change to follow that original legislative intent. Is that right?"

Andrade: "That is correct."

Martwick: "Okay. So, in your Bill here, if... if we were to vote 'no' on this Bill, the number eight years of service would still be required, right?"

Andrade: "That is correct."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Martwick: "So, when they talk about people who are not vested being able to serve or limiting your pool, if we don't pass your Bill, will that suddenly allow people who only have two years of service to be able to serve on the board?"

Andrade: "No. It would still be required."

Martwick: "How about... how about people with four years of service.

Will they be able to serve on the board?"

Andrade: "No."

Martwick: "Six years of service?"

Andrade: "No."

Martwick: "And if they're tier two, even seven years of service and they won't be able to serve on the board. Is that correct?"

Andrade: "That is correct."

Martwick: "Okay. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. This Bill is a technical Bill. And my only suggestion to you is this, if you think that the board of trustees would be better served to be inclusive of people who are not vested and you wish to change the legislative intent, this is not the vehicle to make that statement. This is a technical cleanup of a Bill to make it consistent and so that it complies with the original legislative intent. It's really simple. If you want to change that legiv... legislative intent, vote another... write another Bill. Don't... this Bill deserves an 'aye' vote and I encourage everyone to vote on it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson for an announcement. No announcement. Mr. Wehrli is recognized."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, many of our municipalities may have finance directors that are new to

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

their role, maybe they came from the private sector and they're going to eventually be vested in IMRF, but they will not be for either... well, if they're tier two for ten years. So, what this Bill does in essence, it prohibits them from serving. From using their expertise on the IMRF board for no other reason that they're not vested, that they don't have ten years of experience in the IMRF system. To me, this Bill is a... is short sighted. It doesn't let people use their expertise in a manner that would be beneficial to all of us. So, I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson, now for an announcement."

Andersson: "Now for an announcement. Please excuse Representative Parkhurst for the remainder of the day."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Davidsmeyer is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "Yield. Really quick. Just want to clarify one thing. So, for tier one, you're vested at eight years? So, at eight years you can serve on the IMRF board?"

Andrade: "That is correct."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, tier two, you're vested at ten years.

What does the law currently say with regards to that?"

Andrade: "So, currently you have to be eight years. If you're seven years, you can't serve. No matter if you're tier one or tier two."

Davidsmeyer: "So, currently whether you're in tier one or tier two, it's eight years?"

Andrade: "Eight years."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, this changes it from eight years for everybody to eight years for tier one and ten years for tier two?"
- Andrade: "Well, this changes it for everyone regardless what tier you're in. You have to basically be vested. It doesn't say the number of years. Now, indirectly that's ten years if... if you're a tier two. If you're a tier one, it's eight years. So, what this changes is that you must be vested. It does not change the number of years. So, regardless if this Bill doesn't pass, someone at seven years and a halves, seven years and 364 days cannot serve."
- Davidsmeyer: "And... and that's not my... that's not the argument I'm making. I'm just saying somebody who has eight years, whether they're vested or not vested, has the same about of experience whether they're in tier one or tier two. So, I guess I don't understand why we're limiting the pool."
- Andrade: "I wouldn't say limiting the pool. I would say that they are changing the law to what their original intent was. Now, if you don't like their original intent, then we should change the law to different (unintelligible). Their... their... they... this is for them. IMRF for them is a technical change. For them it's not a change of thought, change of qualifications. What they are... due to the change it was a... when they changing when tier two was created, they had a update their current statute which requires that for their intent is that someone should be... when the board passed it, they should be vested."

Davidsmeyer: "So, having everybody on the same standard of eight years, I mean, eight years what is what the current law says

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

right? Eight years. It doesn't say vested. It says eight years."

Andrade: "Currently it says vested? Currently it says vested."

Davidsmeyer: "So, then why, what are we doing here if it doesn't change that?"

Andrade: "It said vested and eight years. Is that what it says?

For tier one, it says eight years and vested. So..."

Davidsmeyer: "So there's..."

Andrade: "...So, when they created the original intent, if my assistant is correct, the original intent was eight years and vested and the reason why it's eight years and the reason why it's eight years is because at that time tier one was eight years to be vested."

Davidsmeyer: "So, so, we're basically just eliminating the words, eight years? We're just saying vested?"

Andrade: "Correct."

Davidsmeyer: "Which..."

Andrade: "Yes. So, that... so, now we even have more clarification that the original intent was to be vested. And now we're eliminating just the eight years."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, I'm... I'm being told that current law does not make any reference to vested. It may allude to it, but it doesn't specifically say vested. I'm just... I'm just saying, you're... you're limiting somebody's ability who spent the last eight years investing in this. Obviously they've got a major contribution towards it. They want it to do well. Why are you saying you have to wait two more years to serve on the IMRF board?"

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Andrade: "So, if someone... some people can be at... at eight years can do it because they're tier one."

Davidsmeyer: "I get it. Yeah. Why... why being in tier two should you have to wait two extra years to serve on the board?"

Andrade: "Why should... why should people at tier two had to wait ten years to be vested? Why couldn't we vest them at eight?"

Davidsmeyer: "Because people didn't make pension payments and made extra promises."

Andrade: "Right. So... so, clearly eight years was not enough.

Clearly eight years of experience was not enough because they

messed up. So, clearly we should do ten years."

Davidsmeyer: "It has nothing to do with their experience. It has to do with the ability to pension program to pay."

Andrade: "I mean clearly, so, I think, I mean, so you just..."

Davidsmeyer: "I think you're misunderstanding that."

Andrade: "Thank you very much for point that out."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm not arguing that."

Andrade: "I thank you for pointing it out that the eight years was clearly not enough for experience."

Davidsmeyer: "This... this has nothing to do with..."

Andrade: "Ten years should have been more because..."

Davidsmeyer: "...that. It has something to do with serving on the board. My question is their ability to serve on the board is no different whether they're in tier one or tier two?"

Andrade: "And... it's an initiative of IMRF. It's clearly, you said that eight years wasn't enough. So, now this should be adversely affected and it should be vested. And remember..."

Davidsmeyer: "It's eight years is enough for tier one to serve on the board and make..."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- Andrade: "And you just said they didn't plan it correctly so they probably... they weren't experienced enough so we should make... should be eventually ten years."
- Davidsmeyer: "So, if eight years isn't enough for tier one, they why don't we move everybody to ten years?"
- Andrade: "Because ten years is going to be... tier one will be eventually eliminated because... tier two will be just left. So, they're thinking ahead. We got a good board thinking ahead."
- Davidsmeyer: "I... I don't think... I don't think you're understanding..."
- Andrade: "January 1."
- Davidsmeyer: "...what I'm saying. They're ability... the system's ability to pay a pension is different that the... an individuals ability to serve on the pension board. They're two completely different ideas. So, you're comparing two different things."
- Andrade: "I would believe that the person on the board made that decision of where to invest."
- Davidsmeyer: "I think that if an individual can be elected to it, and I'm not saying that they should be able to do it at seven and a half or six or whatever. They probably should be able to if they're part of the system, but I'm just saying..."
- Andrade: "Am I allowed to move the previous question?"
- Davidsmeyer: "...And you can continue to yell at me but I'm saying, their ability to serve and make proper decisions for the overall benefit of the pension system, if they put eight years in, they're going to keep putting years in. they're going to make sure they get vested. I guarantee that. I mean, any intelligent person is going to..."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- Andrade: "In every... in every profession, there's always years of experience, even for a plumber, for a firefighter. There's six years apprenticeship, there's residency for a doctor, there's eight years' experience plus three years of surgical practice in order to be... there's years of experience. The IMRF feels that for their experience..."
- Davidsmeyer: "They feel that two more years of putting money into a fund makes them a better director of their fund? They're not getting any extra experience directing the fund. They're just putting it in longer. So, I... at the end of the day, I don't think it makes a huge amount of different. But I don't know why they would want to limit their pool. I would think they would to allow as many people who are qualified to do it and if their peers who are also investing in that program believe that they have the ability to do it, then they should be allowed to be elected to do it."
- Andrade: "As you said, in the long run you don't feel there's much of a difference, but maybe there's a back story that I don't know. Is someone running for the IMRF board that only has eight years?"

Davidsmeyer: "Well..."

- Andrade: "If so, enlighten me because maybe then I don't want to be used as a tool to limit someone to run."
- Davidsmeyer: "What would you say... what would you say if I said, and I do not believe this, but if you... if you were to bring a rule forward that says if you were born after 1995, you have to wait 'til your 20 to vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer. Can we bring our remarks to a close, Sir?"

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Davidsmeyer: "I... I'm just trying to make my point. I don't know

if he's understanding what I'm... what I'm saying."

Speaker Lang: "Well, you've made it to the rest of us."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Can you conclude your remarks?"

Davidsmeyer: "Well, I appreciate your understanding Mr. Speaker.

And I just wanted to give an example of what this basically is. So, thank you Representative Andrade and I wish you luck."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

"Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. Let me tell you why and answer what I think are many of the comments that we've heard. Let's talk about the public policy of what it means to serve on a board such as the IMRF Board. This is a board of trustees whose job is to look after the best interest. By the way, if you look at our other pension funds, the state pension funds, you have to be vested to serve on those boards because vested members have a material interest in the performance of the fund. Even in electoral politics, of which we are all participants, look at local elections. You wouldn't want to have someone who is a trustee of a township not live within the township borders because those who live within the borders have a material interest in the performance of that township and how those tax dollars are spent. This is no different. You don't want to say well just because someone has served eight years and maybe has chosen not to take a pension at all, that they would somehow be looking out for the funds best interest. This is a common sense cleanup of what was clearly an oversight when

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

the original tier two Bill was passed in 2010. I'm surprised it's taken seven years to bring this Bill forward. It should have been noted long ago. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Batinick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Batinick: "Just a quick, clarification question. You keep talking about the original legislative intent. Where are you drawing that from?"

Andrade: "From IMRF."

Batinick: "So, they... do you know where they're getting it from? So, someone just told you that this was the legislative intent originally?"

Andrade: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okav."

Andrade: "IMRF brought that up."

Batinick: "My concern is that obviously there's no tier two people eligible for the board. It's probably a pretty good idea to get them in the mix relatively soon. But thank you for clarifying that for me."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade to close."

Andrade: "So, Mr. Speaker, Members, the one thing... IMRF is by far the best funded pension system out there. Clearly, in the past, everyone else has not done a great job and... to do that. So, I respectfully request that we follow IMRF's intention and request... I request an 'aye' vote because they're clearly the best funded. And, so, at least, clearly should know that they know what they're doing. So, I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Burke. Please take the record. There are 79 voting 'yes'; 27 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2973, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2973, a Bill for an Act concerning military affairs. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Hi there, Speaker. The Bill is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Veteran's Affairs. Department feels that the Veteran's Advisory Council and the Discharge Service Members Task Force are redundant and should be consolidated as a way to increase productivity. I'll take any questions. It's a pretty simple Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Arroyo. Nekritz. Please take the record. There are 107 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2976, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2976, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2976 is a Bill... I got this great idea from Representative Will Davis who has led the way on creating these diversity reporting programs. What

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

this will do is require institutions of higher education, private institutions of high education to report voluntarily on their supplier diversity program. I am not aware of any oppositions. The universities are on board with it. I ask for approval."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Andersson. The Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "You're making a short cut now you know. I guess so.

Thank you for the Sponsor yielding. So, my question is, this is an annual report on voluntary supplier diversity programs, but it's a report. Does that mean that the requirement for the diversity program already exists and we just don't have a report or are we creating a volunteer... a voluntary supplier diversity program?"

Welch: "Well, actually it's both because..."

Andersson: "Both."

Welch: "...it already exists for the public universities. It already exists for the public universities?"

Andersson: "Okay."

Welch: "It does not exist for the privates and that's why we...
this Bill only addresses private institutions."

Andersson: "So, the system's already in place for publics. We're expanding it to private universities."

Welch: "That is correct."

Andersson: "Do we have any idea the cost implications to the private universities for this?"

Welch: "We do not."

Andersson: "We do not. And do we know what it costs our public universities?"

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Welch: "I don't have those figures, no."

Andersson: "Okay. And I... it was kind of loud. Did you say that there was any opposition to your Bill?"

Welch: "There's no opposition."

Andersson: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Help me out here, Members. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 92 voting 'yes'; 12 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3002, Mr. Cavaletto. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3002, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill creates an Infectious Disease Testing Act that provides an individual shall be required to submit and informed consent shall not be required to test... to detect an infectious disease upon the request of a health care provider, employee of the health facility or a PHRM, EMR, EMT, EMT-1 and AEMT, paramedic, firefighter or law enforcement officer who accidentally or in the line of duty, comes into direct skin or mucus membrane contact with a bodily... blood or bodily fluids. If that individual, that is of the nature that may transmit an infectious disease as determined by a physician and his or her medical judgement and defines the terms effectively

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

- please. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. I'll accept any questions."
- 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 105 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3017, Mr. McAuliffe. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3017, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3017 is an initiative of the Department of Veteran Affairs. Amends the Flag Display Act to let any state or federal entity, agency, or person holding information may notify the Governor of the death by hostile fire of any Illinois resident member of the United States Armed Forces.
- Be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Conyears-Ervin. Please take the record. There are 107 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3018, Mr. McAuliffe. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3018, a Bill for an Act concerning the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Third Reading of this House Bill."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3018's cleanup language for the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Eliminates references to Illinois Veteran's Commission and... which was the predecessor agency of the Department of Veterans' Affairs and has other technical changes. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Evans.

Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3061, Mr. Guzzardi. Out of the record.

House Bill 3106, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3106, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3106 is an initiative of the Supreme Court... the initiative is the Illinois Supreme Court. They wish to allow for their marshal's to have police powers in order to merge, consolidate and streamline their security detail. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote.

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Slaughter. Stratton. Stratton. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes'; 3 voting 'no'. And this Bill,

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3010 (Sic-House Bill 3110), Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3110, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This provides a departments that deal with social service contracts, outside agencies will give those contractors notice if there is a problem with state funding that means they will have to cancel the contract earlier. The Members of the General Assembly will also receive notice if we are looking at that kind of fiscal emergency. I know of no opposition to the Bill. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support.

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Andersson: "Representative Currie, so, if I recall correctly, we had a Bill similar to this in the 99^{th} ? Governor vetoed it."

Currie: "Indeed. Yes. The Governor Amendatorily Vetoed it. But in our revue it exceeded his authority amendatorily to veto. In addition, it was not in very good shape. So, this... this Bill before you is focused on the same issue. Making sure that social service contractors don't suddenly find themselves unable to meet payroll, unable to close out shop if there is a serious problem with state funding. It gives them the notice they need, but it does so in a way that is... is helpful to them and clear to the state administrators."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Andersson: "So... so, is this language identical to the previous iteration of this or have we..."

Currie: "No. No... the language...

Andersson: "Have we... have you addressed the... do you believe..."

Currie: "This language is responsive to the Governor's Amendments, but it isn't identical to it. We worked with the Department of Human Services and the other state agencies to craft legislation that would be respectful of their authority, but also responsive to the social service providers who don't want to find themselves in another Good Friday massacre."

Andersson: "Certainly. And again, the bottom line is it provides in any contract that it can be 30... it can be terminated, suspended, or reduced on 30 days' notice by either party. Right? Correct?"

Currie: "Nothing... nothing about that. Nothing about for cause.

None of that changes. It's only a question if there is a... an

emergency with respect to state funding that everybody gets

some kind of notice."

Andersson: "Very good. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We supported this Bill in committee. This was in reaction to what happened on that Good Friday and this allows the social service agencies more notice. Thank you."

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

Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3165, Representative Stratton. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3165, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stratton."

Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3165 codifies restorative justice being part of the training for all personnel at the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice to continue the trajectory of being more restorative and less punitive for the youth in its care. There's no opposition to the Bill. The Department of Juvenile Justice worked with me on the language for the Amendment and they are now in support. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

Andersson: "Sorry. I think I just heard... Oh. Pardon me. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "I think I just heard the last statement. You've resolved all outstanding issues. No one is opposed to your Bill at this point?"

Stratton: "That is correct."

Andersson: "Do we know as far as the program, is this sort of program in place already? And we're just... what are we doing?"

Stratton: "Yes. Under the current administration, they are currently offering training around restorative justice. This merely codifies that so that as we continue through the department, regardless of the administration, there will be

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

a focus on restorative rather than punitive approaches for youth."

Andersson: "So, it would be fair to say then that the costs are already being expended so what you're creating here is revenue neutral, if you will?"

Stratton: "Absolutely."

Andersson: "Thank you."

Stratton: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor... excuse me. Chair recognizes Leader Currie for an announcement."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Kelly Cassidy is excused for the remainder of the day."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leader. 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? Ford. Please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3179, Representative Greenwood. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3179, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill.

Speaker Lang: "Representative Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3179 is an initiative of the Treasurer's Office. And it modifies the term 'qualified expenses' within the Illinois State Treasurers Bright Start 529 College Savings Program for the purposes of including expenses for special needs services. This measure is to allow families to save early on

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

and offset additional costs and expenses for their special needs students by including special needs services to the list of qualified expenses for the Bright Start 529 College Program. There is no opposition and I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Representative Greenwood, this is your first Bill, right?"

Greenwood: "Yes."

Andersson: "So, welcoming and positive, right?"

Greenwood: "Yes."

Andersson: "Yes. So, it looks like... it looks like what you're doing is really expanding the... the qualified expenses so that people with special needs can use it for things that might not otherwise qualify right now?"

Greenwood: "That's correct."

Andersson: "And also, computer equipment that's maybe not purely the computer equipment, but still necessary for the functioning of the student in school?"

Greenwood: "That's correct."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Greenwood: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Davis, W.: "Representative, are you familiar with the Criminal Justice Information Authority?"

Greenwood: "No."

Davis, W.: "No? That's all I needed to know. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "She would like not to, but she will."

Ford: "You know, I just want to say welcome to the floor and if you continue to present Bills, will you continue to use your southern hospitality in your voice?"

Greenwood: "Thank you."

Ford: "It's so... it's so warm."

Greenwood: "Thank you."

Ford: "Thank you."

Greenwood: "Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Severin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Severin: "Are you nervous?"

Greenwood: "A little."

Severin: "Just wanted to know."

Speaker Lang: "We're going to let you close on your first Bill,
Representative."

Greenwood: "Thank you. And I appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's first 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? Katie Stuart. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill,

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations, Representative. House Bill 3282, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Out of the record. Mr. Phillips is recognized. For what reason do you stand, Sir?"

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Phillips: "I'd like to introduce some special guests in the balcony up here to... to right behind me. This Pastor from the Maranatha Church in Mattoon, Illinois, he is a special friend. He does a great job and him and his daughter here, Danny and Katie Haifley from Mattoon, Illinois. I'd just like to give you a special, warm welcome. You'll see him around the Capitol. He's trying to do God's work everywhere he goes and... and we just appreciate him being here. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Thanks for being here. Hope you're enjoying your day. Mr. Andersson is recognized."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representative Charlie Meier for the remainder of the afternoon."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. House Bill 3385, Representative Ives. Representative Ives. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3385, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. HB3385 just brings the Freedom of Information Act information into line between one part of the statute and another. It essentially says that it will be a... a public official or employees of the public body that may act as a freedom of information officer. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "I don't think it's her first Bill, but she'll yield."

Andersson: "Thank you for that. Representative Ives, I just want to clarify one thing. And by the way, I support your Bill but during the committee discussion one issue came up with regard to professional services. Nothing in your Bill prohibits these entities from seeking guidance from their contractual attorneys', right?"

Ives: "They can seek guidance from contractual attorneys'. Just contractual attorneys' cannot be the official FOIA officer."

Andersson: "Perfect. 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? Lilly. Please take the record. There are 102 voting 'yes'; 3 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3399, Mr. Sosnowski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3399, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on behalf of House Bill 3399. This amends the Wildlife Code to allow those who want to hunt with a crossbow during the bow and arrow season for coyote hunting. So, they would be able to hunt with both at that time. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Hays: "Representative, is this your first Bill?"

Sosnowski: "On the (unintelligible) yes it is."

Hays: "I wondered if maybe we could combine that with your colleague in front of you there and make it like the crossbow roadkill Bill. And just make it kind of an omnibus deal and push it all through at once?"

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? Sims. Stratton. Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes'; 27 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3490, Mr. Brady. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3490, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3490 seeks to make a change in the Nursing Education Scholarship Law. It simply seeks to expand from the present six higher education institutions that are presently eligible to more of our higher education institutions that have nursing programs. In particular, the law presently just limits the available nursing scholars to only institutions that the Department of Finance and Professional Regulation, it's statutorily authorized to approve. This would expand it into the other nursing programs to help students, in particular in advanced nursing, doctorate, Master of Science and Doctorate Nursing Degrees.

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

I'd be happy to answer any questions and I ask for 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? Kelly Burke. Conroy. Nekritz. Please take the record. There are 105 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3542, Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3542, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

- Wallace: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that adds to the rights of our youth in care. If you recall last General Assembly we became one of a few states to add a list of rights for our youth in care. This amends it to state that if an individual is going to be placed in some type of facility that it is the least restricted facility based upon their need. And that it is the most family life setting. I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Greenwood. Nekritz. Please take the record. There are 105 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3899, Representative Jimenez. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3899, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jimenez."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Jimenez: Bill 3899 amends the Illinois Procurement Code pertaining to the use of not for profit agencies for persons with significant disabilities. It does a couple of things. It updates statutory language to reflect current respectful disability language and terminology. It also provides that the State Use Committee will review all pricing submitted and may approve an agreement for supplies or services where pricing submitted is fair and reasonable. It empowers that same committee to establish criteria which must be met by a for profit agency for persons with significant disabilities and insures fair, transparent, and appropriate selection of sub... sub-contractors. And it updates the uses strategic plan for every three years instead of every five. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Greenwood. Scherer. Sims. Sims. Please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3920, Representative Wallace. Representative Wallace. We only have one Representative Wallace. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3920..."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 656, Representative Gordon-Booth. Please read the Bill."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 656, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before us this afternoon I have House Bill 656. This is legislation that has no opposition. Just to talk a little bit about the merits of the Bill. When school districts in Illinois hire a teacher with their state or local money, they pay point 58 percent of that teacher's salary to TRS. But when school districts in Illinois hire a teacher with federal funds, they pay not just that point... less than a half of a percent. They don't pay the normal costs of seven percent, but they pay the full fray of the unfunded liability rate of 38.5 percent. If we don't pass this legislation out of both chambers and put this Bill on the Governor's desk, that... that fee will go up to 44.6 percent. This effects, not just low income districts but it effects every school district in the nation, excuse me, every school district in the state. But it absolutely has a disproportionate impact on low income school districts. Illinois is the only state in the country that specifically diverts these dollars to pay down the pension liability. I'm happy that there's bi-partisan support on this issue and I'm open for any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "Thank you, Representative or Leader Booth for bringing this forward. How long have you been working to make sure that children who are living in poverty or those who are from

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

low income families actually have the most money necessary for their school funding? And for direct instruction?"

Gordon-Booth: "Since before I was elected to the General Assembly."

Wallace: "And so, that is how long?"

Gordon-Booth: "At least a decade."

"That is awesome. Thank you for your tenacity on this Wallace: issue. This is a particularly important Bill for districts Just Rockford Public Schools. last superintendent was here to talk about this. Outside of the City of Chicago, Rockford Public Schools actually received the second largest number of dollars for the poverty block grants. We have a large number of students who are living in poverty and we already know that funding for education for students who are in neighborhood schools that are surrounded by low income areas is already less than it should be. About 27 percent less money is going to those particular schools when you look at the direct instruction. So, this is just an amazing way to make sure that the federal money that is intended to get to the neediest, most vulnerable students and those who have the most educational needs, that these dollars get directly to them and they're not just spent on just extracurricular things like work books and work sheets, but actual educators to help them go through the work books and work sheets. So, thank you Leader Booth for bringing this Bill. I hope that everyone here will support this bi-partisan effort."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I commend Leader Gordon-Booth for bringing this legislation. I know you've worked on it many years, over the past several General Assemblies. And I'm glad we have a chance to vote on it here today. As was mentioned previously, this is a great Bill because it makes sure that dollars can be used for teachers in classrooms to have direct contact with children. We're not prioritizing supplies and equipment over that human contact. This Bill makes sure that those dollars can be used in the best way possible and I encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Just really briefly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to... to add to what was mentioned by Representative Wallace. And you know, many of our school districts now are starting to really look at this and they're going to be making decisions that simply buy materials and equipment and those things that they may not necessarily need just because of the high cost of the deduction that's taken out of these funds. So, I really encourage the Members to support this. Thank you for the Sponsor for bringing this forward. These dollars we want to put into the classrooms in the form of teachers, teacher assistance. Those... those folks are definitely helping the students on a one on one basis. So, thanks again for bringing this initiative forward."

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? Burke. Dan Burke. Please take the record. There are 105 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 230, Mr. Thapedi. Mr. Thapedi. Out of the record. Chair recognizes Mr. Zalewski for a motion."

- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I move to waive the posting requirements so the Revenue & Finance Committee can meet next week on Tuesday at 10 a.m. for subject matter on revenue forecast."
- Speaker Lang: "Is there leave? Leave is granted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, March 21 at the hour of Noon. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned. Go Northwestern."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2017: do pass as amended Short Debate House Bill 291, House Bill 618; recommends be Floor Amendment #2 to adopted is House Bill 2377. Representative Riley, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action on March 15, 2017: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2568, House Bill 2895, House Bill 3234, House Bill 3744; do pass Standard Debate House Bill 3216, House Bill 3539; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 136, House Resolutions 127. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action on March 15, 2017: do amended Short Debate is House Bill 2752. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

on March 15, 2017: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2699, House Bill 3785; do pass Standard Debate House Bill 2764; do pass as amended Short Debate House Bill 2482; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 124. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy reports the following committee action taken on March 15, 2017: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3635. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action March 15, 2017: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1776, House Bill 2394, House Bill 3255, House Bill 3447; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 95. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on International Trade & Commerce reports the following committee action on March 15, 2017: recommends be adopted House Joint Resolution 34, House Resolution 164, House Resolution 165. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2017: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 819, House Bill 2428, House Bill 2813, House Bill 2964, House Bill 3163, House Bill 3538; do pass as amended Short Debate House Bill 821. Representative Andrade, Chairperson from the Committee on Cybersecurity, Data Analytics, & IT reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2017: recommends be adopted as amended is House Joint Resolution 25. Representative Walsh, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2017: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 3150; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2423. Representative Mussman, Chairperson from the

26th Legislative Day

3/16/2017

Committee on Special Needs Services reports the following committee action taken on March 16, 2017: recommends be adopted House Resolution 131. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 212, offered by Representative Butler, is referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned.