37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 18, 2017: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 698, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1896, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3298, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3502, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3611, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3920; recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 33."

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer by Father Mesrop Parsamyan who is the Pastor of the Armenian Church in Bellville. Father Parsamyan is the guest of Representative Hoffman. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Father."

Father Parsamyan: "Almighty Lord and God, life to all nations, help us walk in Your light as we seek Your holy guidance in all our endeavors especially in the deliberations with our Leaders in this noble Body, the Illinois House of Representatives. Today, we are mindful of another April 24, 102 years ago, the beginning of the genocidal, the Armenians and the Ottoman Empire, the far... first genocide among so many that followed in the 20th century. We beseech You, Oh Lord, to bless this land of America and its people, empower them to continue serving Your goodness as they did when they sheltered the remnants of the Armenian Nation. Guide, Oh Lord, our Legislators in their endeavors and mission as they faithfully perform the duties entrusted to them as guardians of public

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

interest and let them to continue successes in their civil service to our beloved State of Illinois that we so proudly call home. Lord, we bow humbly before You to render our praise and gratitude for Your loving kindness and bountiful blessings, Amen."

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

Soto - 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: "Please let the record show that Representatives McAsey and Phelps are excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Representatives Morrison, Stewart and Barb Wheeler."

Speaker Lang: "Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 111 Members present, we do have a quorum. Mr. Pritchard is recognized."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm pleased to welcome two young constituents who are Paging today for us. Down here on the Republican side you'll see Jaden Peck and Hunter Alexander. They're eighth-grade students from Sycamore Middle School and more importantly, their chauffer today is their grandmother, Maureen Josh who is one of the longest-serving circuit clerks in the State of Illinois and some of her staff. So, let us welcome Jaden and Alexander... and Hunter and Maureen."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for being with us today. Mr. Hoffman."

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

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a matter that's very important to me and should be to Members of this Body. On April 24, 1915, more than 1.5 million Armenians were killed in a massive extermination. I would like... I would like to thank a close friend of mine, Mr. Johno Kabbendjian for bringing this to light. Mr. Kabbendjian and Armenians in Illinois and millions across the globe will never forget. 'When from the world my memory fades away that is the time when I indeed shall die' was written by Bedros Tourian, a famous Armenian poet. We must not forget and the world must never forget and we must never let the world forget the loss of the Armenian people. And may their souls lie in peace knowing we are standing with them today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Hoffman. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're returning to the Calendar, the… these are still first priority Bills for some Members. Beginning with Second Readings, House Bill 2738, Representative Ammons. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2738, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Ammons."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

37th Legislative Day

- Ammons: "I ask the adoption of the Floor Amendment, please, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Explain it very briefly, please."
- Ammons: "Basically, the Floor Amendment was a... it was a correction of a strikeout that was done through the LRB process that shouldn't have been stricken out of current law. So, we weren't making any actual changes to that."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Ammons."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."
- Ammons: "This was the same thing. We was just correcting...
 unstriking language out of that... the current visitation
 requirements for the Department of Corrections."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3157, Representative Harper. Out of... Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3157, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, please, Mr. Clerk. The Chair recognizes Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Point of personal privilege, please."

37th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Williams: "I wanted to take a moment to introduce my Page for the day, Leo Aluise. He's joined in the gallery by father Len and Uncle Vince. And Leo's actually in the third grade at St. Ben's Elementary. And he's quite a scholar when it comes to the Presidency and has special expertise in Abraham Lincoln. Welcome, Leo."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Leo, welcome. House Bill 3904, Representative Stratton. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3904, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 768, Mr. Welch. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 768, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. But notes have been requested on the Bill, have not yet been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Recognizes Mr. Welch."
- Welch: "Mr. Speaker, these notes have existed on this Bill since March 29. I would ask that these mo... notes both be found inapplicable and the Bill be moved to Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the notes be held inapplicable. Mr. Andersson."
- Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Andersson: "So, the only basis for your objection to the bills is that you think it's taking too long?"

37th Legislative Day

- Welch: "Well, first of all, the rules say that they're supposed to be back within five days specifically with regard to the fiscal note. And we're at April 24. It's Bill deadline week. These notes have existed since March 29. I be..."
- Andersson: "I'm sorry. I can't... I cannot..."
- Welch: "These notes have existed since March 29, well beyond the five-day deadline to respond to... to put them on file."
- Andersson: "Thank you for that answer. I think that the notes are applicable. They're important; they're relevant. We ought to be able to get those information. I'll personally represent to you. I'll make a call, if it needs to be. But I think that they're relevant and we should oppose the ruling of inapplicable. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. The notes are held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments or Motions are pending."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 398, Mr. Reis. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're now moving to Third Reading Bills. House Bill 1890... 1895, Mr. Cabello. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1895, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1895 adds to the Police Officers Training Act by making this the Officer Greg Lindmark Memorial Law. What we are doing here is adding the words to the curriculum, also, including training and effective recognition and of responses to stress, trauma and post-traumatic stress experienced by police officers. We've got a lot of officers that are having some issues with some of these stress issues. And I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote and answer any questions, if possible."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Deadline week, Members. Record your switches. Mr. Zalewski. Please take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3745, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Out of the record. House Bill 3649, Mr. Crespo. Mr. Crespo. Out of the record. House Bill 375, Representative Fine. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 375, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. HB375 is also known as Sam's Act. And the reason it is named after this young gentleman is had things been different his life may have turned out differently. Sam was a young man who suffered from mental illness and eventually took his own life. What HB375 would do would put eight hours of mental health training into all law

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

enforcement recurring curriculum every three years. So, when a law enforcement officer goes out on a call, they would be know... have a better understanding of what they're encountering. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, it looks like with your Floor Amendment #2 all opposition's been removed. Is that correct?"

Fine: "That's correct."

Andersson: "And the LETSB... the Law Enforcement Standards and Training Board actually supports the Bill, correct?"

Fine: "That's correct."

Andersson: "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? Mr. Andrade. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Conyears-Ervin. For what reason do you rise? The Lady does not wish to speak. House Bill 3691, Representative Gabel. Out of the record. House Bill 3083, Representative Hernandez. Representative Hernandez. Out of the record. House Bill 535, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 535, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

37th Legislative Day

- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 535 is an agreed Bill between the cable TV providers of the state as well as the railroads. It defines how we can ensure that... that there is access so that the railroads are adequately compensated and that the cable T... television and communication association members can provide access so that people can get services."
- 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? Arroyo, Wallace. Please take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2373, Representative Lilly. Representative Lilly. Out of the record. House Bill 2963, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2963, a Bill for an Act concerning corporations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, could I... I have an Amendment to be adopted on that I think is still in Rules. But I... if we could put it back to Second for that?"
- Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be placed on the Order of Second Reading. And take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2619, Mr. Slaughter. Out of the record. House Bill 2453, Representative Stuart. Out of the record. House Bill 2698, Representative Turner. Mr. Turner. Out of the record. House Bill 3036, Mr. Walsh. Mr. Walsh. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk,

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

House Bill 772, Representative Gordon-Booth. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 772, a Bill for an Act concerning safety.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 772 is a piece of legislation that we actually passed out of the… it passed out in the 99th General Assembly unopposed. This legislation deals with the Electronic Products Recycling and Reuse Act. It makes two very small technical changes. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation that would allow CRT glass to be put into landfills as well as it would allow a couple of organizations throughout this state to be able to better deal with the computers, DVD players, printers, DVDs, cell phones and zip drives. It would be able to better… it would allow a couple of those entities that operate in our state to be able to better deal with this particular type of glass and the recycling of that glass. I'm open for any questions. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "It does look like it's very bipartisan and also supported by most groups, but there's one that's shown on our analysis as opposing, the Sustainable Electronics Recycling International. Can you explain what that is and why they oppose you?"

Gordon-Booth: "Yeah. So, this is... this particular entity they're actually working on... working to come to an agreement. I think

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

that they are pretty close to that agreement and they did testify in committee and part of... part of their opposition was... I don't want to say it was without basis, but the idea is to work towards an agreement with this particular organization at this time. But..."

Andersson: "So, are you looking at amending it in the Senate or something to that affect?"

Gordon-Booth: "Potentially, but I don't want to necessarily say that that's what's going to happen. But I definitely think that there is an opening for that for sure."

Andersson: "Very good. Thank you."

Gordon-Booth: "Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3745, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Representative? Will you please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3745, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3745 allows after-school programs to be visible in a high-traffic area, public area of the school. And I ask for a 'yes' vote on House Bill 3745."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "I wasn't quite sure. That was a pretty quick explanation. Could you give me a little bit more on what this does?"

Conyears-Ervin: "It's a pretty quick Bill, I guess, maybe that's why."

Andersson: "Okay."

Conyears-Ervin: "But it allows for after-school programs to be visible. A designated area, designated by the principal of the school for after-school programs to be posted in that area."

Andersson: "So, a bulletin board or something to that effect?"

Conyears-Ervin: "If the principal designates as such, yes."

Andersson: "Is this applicable to all schools?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Yes."

Andersson: "Yes. Charter, non-charter, private, you name it?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Yes."

Andersson: "And what's prohibiting them from doing it right now?"

Conyears-Ervin: "Right now it's optional. It's not necessarily a designated area of the school where we believe it is highly visible. Right now it could be in this area, another area and another area. It's just kind of making it one neutral area, one central area so that parents would know that this is the designated area in case they need to learn of any afterschool programs."

Andersson: "Right. I understand that, but I guess I'm wondering why do we need... why does a State Legislator need to mandate this? Why can't schools do this on their own? Why do we need a law to do this?"

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Conyears-Ervin: "Because this is something that the parents are saying. It's not in a specifically designated area. Now, what this Bill does not do it's not asking the schools to do anything. I don't know if that's what you're taking this Bill as. This is not asking the school to do anything. It's just allowing the programs to post their information."

Andersson: "Thank you very much. Appreciate the answers." Conyears-Ervin: "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? Thapedi, Zalewski. Please take the record. There are 68 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2698, Leader Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2698, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the chamber. House Bill 2698 is an initiative of the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity that authorizes the state's small business credit initiative fund to make loans or equity investments to small businesses and expands the maximum amount of loans issued under the Build Illinois Act. 2698 amends the Build Illinois Act by making the following changes... Well, essentially, it creates... it creates a place in Illinois statute for this federal fund that was created. The Federal Act that was created is set to sunset on March 31, 2017 eliminating the only statute that created the SSBCI Fund.

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

After House Committee Amendment #1 was adopted, it simply creates the fund in Illinois statute that will allow DCEO to continue to utilize the fund and make loans and investments in Illinois businesses. The language used to create the SSBCI Fund was mirrored from the Illinois Capital Revolving Loan Fund. I look for the Body's support. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill... Sorry.

Representative Ives with a question, I think."

Ives: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Where exactly is the money coming from for this?"

Turner: "This was federal money."

Ives: "This is federal money?"

Turner: "Yes."

Ives: "Okay. Just wanted to make sure that everybody understood
 that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on April 14 (sic-24), 2017: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 for House Bill 40, Floor Amendment #3 for House Bill 136, Floor Amendment #4 for House Bill 531, Floor Amendment #2 for House Bill 2754, Floor Amendment #4 for House

37th Legislative Day

- Bill 2963, Floor Amendment #3 for House Bill 3298, Floor Amendment #2 for House Bill 3407, Floor Amendment #2 for House Bill 3601, Floor Amendment #2 for House Bill 3711, Floor Amendment #3 for House Bill 3773 and Floor Amendment #4 for House Bill 3904."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer is recognized."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect I intended to vote 'yes' on House Bill 2698.
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. House Bill 3036, Mr. Walsh. Mr. Walsh. Out of the record. On Second Reading, House Bill 3298, Representative Scherer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3298, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Scherer."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer."
- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is just a technicality that needed to be cleared up. And I'd like to just pass the Amendment and move it on."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. But a fiscal note has been requested and has not yet been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 1896, Mr. Halbrook. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1896, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Halbrook."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to remove Amendment 1 and adopt Amendment 2."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 1 is withdrawn. Is that correct, Sir?" Halbrook: "Correct."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Amendment #1 and proceed."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Halbrook."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Yes. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment 2. What it does, it deals with the accumulation of township funds excluding the township's capital fund that shall not exceed two and a half times the annual expenses of the last three years."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Returning to some Bills on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 243, Representative Flowers.

Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 243, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments... Amendments 2 and 3 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. Fiscal notes have been requested on the Bill and have not yet been filed."

37th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 3601, Representative Greenwood. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3601, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Greenwood."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Greenwood."
- Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment removes the opposition and does not interfere with local control of the dual credit program."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk. Representative, you have a second Amendment, which is in Rules. We'll get back to your Bill. Thank you. House Bill 3486, Mr. Brady. Mr. Brady. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3486, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 1685, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Brady, did I understand you wanted your Bill held on Second? Mr. Clerk, on House Bill

37th Legislative Day

- 3486, please move that back to the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 3084, Mr. Breen. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3084, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3444, Representative Lilly. Representative Lilly. Out... Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3444, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3519, Mr. Butler. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3519, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3769, Representative Mayfield. Out of the record. House Bill 13... Excuse me. House Bill 2377, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2377, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Davidsmeyer."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."
- Davidsmeyer: "I'd like to move forward with adopting Floor Amendment #2 which just alleviates some of the concerns from AFSCME, IFT and a concern from the department."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

37th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 3004, Mr. Riley. Please...
 Out of the record. House Bill 2527, Mr. Sosnowski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2527, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Sosnowski."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."
- Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to remove Amendment #1 and adopt Amendment #2."
- Speaker Lang: "You're withdrawing Amendment #1, Sir? Mr. Clerk, withdraw Amendment #1 and proceed."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Sosnowski."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."
- Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill and has to do with diplomas for adult learners."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. House Bill 2988, Mr. Slaughter. Out of the record. Third Readings on this order of priority. House Bill 389... Excuse me. House Bill 369, Mr. Andrade. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 369, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 369 creates the Bedbug Disclosure to Employees Act requiring employers to notify employees if a person certified under the Structural Pest Control Act has determined the presence of bedbugs at a place of employment. The purpose of the Bill is to try to prevent the spread of bedbugs to one's home. It's very expensive if they do end up at home. And I'm just trying to create a preventive measure. And if there's any... no questions, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Guzzardi, Turner. Please take the record. There are 99 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3780, Mr. Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 30... Sorry, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2723, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2723, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2723 addresses some... some barriers that have a particularly significant impact on human trafficking victims. Illinois is one of only nine states to have such a significant bar on name changes for people with certain felony backgrounds. What House Bill 2723 does is remove those absolute barriers for everything but the existing list of

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

crimes that... that you would think you wouldn't want someone to be able to change their name for, you know, people who have convicted of identity theft, aggravated identity theft, criminal sexual abuse, sexual exploitation of a child, things like that where we definitely wouldn't want them to be able to. But... but folks, with certain backgrounds like human trafficking victims who need to put their past in their past and move on, and in many cases, escape an abuser, do need access to this. This puts the discretion back in the hands of judges. This puts us in line with 29 other states with variations on disclosure. There are opportunities for objection from law enforcement. I know of no objection to the Bill. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "Kelly, you actually just answered it in the last two sen... things. You said no opposition to the Bill?"

Cassidy: "Yes, there is no op... no opposition."

Andersson: "And there is notice to law enforcement, so they have an..."

Cassidy: "Yes. There's an opportunity for the state's attorney to object. And the state's attorney is good with that."

Andersson: "Thank you very much."

Cassidy: "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? Please record yourselves. Arroyo, DeLuca, Nekritz, Turner. Mr. Turner. Mr.

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3909, Representative Conroy. Out of the record. House Bill 3744, Representative Conyears-Ervin. Out of the record. House Bill 1254, Mr. Costello. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1254, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 127... 1254 allows that a school district can be precluded from providing the minimum hours of instruction required for a full day of attendance due to the utilization of the district's facilities by local or county authorities for the purpose of holding a memorial or funeral service in remembrance of a community member. It's limited to two days a calendar year. I ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Andersson: "So, if I understand this correctly, what we're doing is we're saying that holding two days' worth of memorials will not count against the district for purposes of attendance, et cetera. Is that correct?"

Costello: "Correct. For a funeral or a wake."

Andersson: "For a community member, someone of note in the community?"

Costello: "Yes. This actually came about due to the death of a police officer in the Chester area. The gym in Chester was

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

the only place they could house as many people that attended. The Governor was in attendance, numerous fire districts... departments, and police departments from around the country attended."

Andersson: "So, you put... in a situation like that, you put the community in the Hobson's choice of either, costing themselves some da... academic days or not being able to hold this very important event. That's what you're trying to cure. Is that right?"

Costello: "Exactly."

Andersson: "Thank you." Costello: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3120, Mr. Demmer. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3120, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3120 is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Park Districts and allows them to satisfy their notice requirements on prevailing wage by putting a link to the actual prevailing wage schedule on their website. The Bill passed unanimously in committee. And I ask for your support."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Morrison. Please take the record. There are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3820, Mr. Crespo. Mr. Crespo. Out of the record. House Bill 2610, Mr. D'Amico. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2610, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico."

- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Basically, what House Bill 2610 does this is a Bill initiative of the Secretary of State. And it will put in place electronic insurance verification."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Harper. Please take the record. There are 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2684, Mr. Evans. House Bill 2984, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. House Bill 2367, Mr. Ford. Mr. Ford. Out of the record. House Bill 3826, Mr. Fortner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3826, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3826 provides that for those municipalities that have both impact fees and transfer taxes that for new developed

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

property subdivisions that are being assessed an impact fee they cannot also be assessed a transfer tax as far as it relates to the municipal portion. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ammons: "Thank you. Representative, can you just go back a little bit and explain why we were not collecting... would this make a double collection. Is that what you're trying to prevent?"

Fortner: "That's exactly right. Municipalities can provide for an impact fee for new subdivision development and many do. And as part of that collection... now, many of them just have general transfer taxes. Not every municipality applies it to all transfers, some will exempt those that have already been hit with an impact fee, but in some cases, their ordinances don't and this just says, if you've already collected a fee on the impact side, you cannot also, as the municipal portion, collect the part for transfer tax as well."

Ammons: "And do you know what the impact on municipalities who currently do this, what that impact fee is on those municipalities?"

Fortner: "No municipalities testified against this in committee."

Ammons: "Okay. All right. Thank you so much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Andersson: "Representative Fortner, so impact fees are generally negotiated as a matter of contract through an annexation agreement, not exclusively, but most of the time, and they oftentimes cover many different things: the school impact fees, buyer impact fees, fees for roadways. I mean, there's... it can be anything that the parties can agree to. Are you saying that if the municipality charges a transfer tax, which is generally a fairly small amount compared to what I just described, municipalities can no longer charge those impact fees?"

Fortner: "No. It's the other way around."

Andersson: "It's the other way around."

Fortner: "They would... if they have a si... 'cause typically the impact fee would be assessed before the transfer tax. So, that would have already been established at the time... usually at the time of subdivision that the terms of the impact fee would be established... and this would just say if they have already collected an impact fee that when those initial sales from the subdivider take place, they would not be subject to the municipal portion of the transfer tax."

Andersson: "Very good. I have no problem with that, but for a moment I thought you were going the other way around, I would have. Thank you for the answer."

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 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

recognizes Representative Harper. I think you were trying to get a hold of the Chair earlier?"

Harper: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like the record to reflect that I meant to be a 'yes' vote on House Bill 2610."

Speaker Lang: "The record will so reflect. Mr. Yingling."

Yingling: "Yes. I just need the record to reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' on House Bill 2723."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Cavaletto."

Cavaletto: "I wish to... a 'yes' vote on the last Bill."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect that. Thank you, Sir. House Bill 3061, Mr. Guzzardi. 3061, Sir. Out of the record. House Bill 3538, Mr. Halpin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3538, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is the Keep Illinois Business Act. And what it requires is that Illinois businesses that receive taxpayer incentives, especially when they come to this state, must be required to give back those incentives after they make a decision to then leave the state. Illinois has been participating in a race to the bottom. And this Bill will hopefully prevent corporations that aren't interested in investing in Illinois to... to move on and let our taxpayers be preserved. I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "So, it looks like you've... you've enumerated a variety of different programs that would be subject to the Bill. One

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

of which is the Rivers Edge Redevelopment Zone Act. You familiar with that one?"

Halpin: "Yes."

Andersson: "Okay. That one is a tax credit for rehabilitating historic structures in five communities, correct?"

Halpin: "That's correct."

Andersson: "How would that possibly be affected by your Bill?

There's no jobs created by it in the sense of repayment here."

Halpin: "The... the company that receives the credit, if they move jobs out of the state or overseas, will be required to reimburse the state for those taxpayer dollars."

Andersson: "Well, but the whole point of that program is that the developer of the property who invests the money then sells those tax credits. Are you telling me that at that point whomever purchased those tax credits if they moved people around, they're going to lose that tax credit?"

Halpin: "My... my understanding, the way I've drafted this Bill, is the party responsible for those tax credits would be responsible for paying them back. And it'd be my opinion that upon buying those tax credits, the person buying that would be on notice that this law is in effect and would be aware of that and take into consideration with that purchase price."

Andersson: "But again, if your point here is to protect jobs, that has nothing to do with jobs. Let me... let me move on to another point here. So, it appears to me that there's no limit to this. In other words, somebody gets an EDGE tax credit, for example, that EDGE tax credit program has claw-back provisions in it right now. It also has time limits within it. So, let's say, they fulfill all of that; don't lose any

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

jobs, they add jobs. Later on, they add more jobs. Has nothing to do with the tax credit, but it's a business that has added jobs. And now, at some point further yet, they decide to move out of state some portion of that, but they're still complying with the EDGE compliance program. Your Bill, literally, would require them to pay it back even though they've complied with the EDGE tax credit."

- Halpin: "That's correct. I believe that the EDGE tax credit Bill, as it stands, does need more teeth. I believe even DCEO, upon testimony in a subject matter hearing on the EDGE tax credit, indicated they were seeking to increase the claw-back provisions. And this Bill would... will do that and impose stricter penalties on folks that fail to comply."
- Andersson: "So... so, explain to me, so we've got some large corporations in the state as well. A lot of them do benefit and take advantage of these. They could be international companies or certainly interstate companies. So, if they choose to open up a branch in Iowa, suddenly they're going to lose these benefits, correct?"
- Halpin: "If... if the effect is for them to take that taxpayer money, the incentives that they were designed for and to move jobs out of state or move operations out of state, they would be affected."
- Andersson: "Well, that's not actually what your Bill says. What your Bills says is if they move jobs that they lose those tax credits. It doesn't specify the jobs that were created by the incentive. It says if they move any or a part of their business. So, you've got one of these major corporations that decides to move some people. Let's say McDonald's decides to

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

move some of its corporate people from Oak Brook to Michigan. Under the literal terms of your Bill, which is all we have to deal with, they would lose whatever tax credits. Is that correct?"

Halpin: "They would lose any tax credits if they moved jobs out of state, correct."

Andersson: "I appreciate the candor of the answers. I just can't believe them. There's no limit to this. This could happen 20, 30 years after the fact? There's no tying to this penalty to the benefit that was granted. It makes sense to have clawback provisions in Bills. We have... or incentive agreements. We have those. This creates like a super clawback. I would recommend a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler, K.: "Representative, I'm looking at our analysis and I'm going to refer to the previous speaker's question. If you're a company who's received any kind of a tax credit... let's look at Amazon as an example right now... and they have employed thousands of people in the State of Illinois. And those jobs are growing right now and we want to see that continue, right? We want to see that kind of job growth continue. That's correct. We both want to see that, right?"

Halpin: "We want... I want ... I want companies to invest in Illinois and be true to their commitments, yes."

Wheeler, K.: "So, that if... But my que... The way I understand your Bill, if they move one office that they started in Illinois, even while they're still adding jobs, to another state for

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

another purpose. They're consolidating two offices that might do receivables or... or supply chain management or something along those lines. If they move that across the border to another state, they lose every credit they've ever gotten in the past even while they're still ramping up. Why would your Bill want to do that?"

- Halpin: "There are any number of hypotheticals that you can raise.

 The point of this Bill is to ensure that when we give taxpayer funded incentives to companies to come here or to stay here that they follow through on those commitments. And that... that is the point of this Bill."
- Wheeler, K.: "Well... but that's not exactly what the Bill does because in the example I just gave they might be adding thousands of jobs, move 25 people into another office and according to the triggers that you've got listed here, they would lose all their tax credits."

Halpin: "Can I..."

- Wheeler, K.: "Would that be prospective or retrospective? Would they go to pay back all the bills... all the tax credits they already got?"
- Halpin: "And I just have to, I mean, reject the premise not knowing any specifics about what the company's incentives received, where their operations came from, what... I mean, you can't speculate on to what any individual situation's going to be. And it's going to be the DCEO that determines whether or not they've... they've actually moved those jobs overseas and are subject to the claw-back provision."
- Wheeler, K.: "Okay. But that's our job is to understand the repercussions of the Bill. So that's why I'm asking the

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

question. As somebody who's fighting in a jo... in another Bill for tough claw-back provisions that make sense based on the actual credit that was awarded and how it was used, this is going to... way too broad. And this could... this could go on... how many years back can they go for the clawback on this?"

- Halpin: "I reject the contention that this is too broad. We need a broad. Right now, this country is participating in a race to the bottom where states are constantly competing, basically, throwing bags of taxpayer money at the corporations. We need to let the... the country know and let the citizens in Illinois know that we're not playing that game anymore. And we want companies that are interested in being here for our infrastructure, for our workforce, for our educational system and we need to provide that environment for them."
- Wheeler, K.: "I understand, Representative, but the point I'm making is that you're going to take a situation where somebody could be adding jobs and then saying why bother applying in Illinois 'cause that's really not going to be the ultimate effect. I could lose the tax credit by consolidating one office into another place because the effect that technically I am moving part of my business out of this state even though I may be expanding tremendously in other areas. You're going to get the benefit of the tax credit as a whole."
- Halpin: "Yeah. I would just reiterate the position that we need to hold the companies accountable. It's my fervent hope that that companies that are just coming here to take advantage of these tax incentives, then they're going to start looking at what another state has to offer, we need to put an end to

37th Legislative Day

- that. So, I would just... I would stand firm on that. We need to... we need to have a broad law on this."
- Wheeler, K.: "But... but it's so broad it's going to be... make the tax credit process useless because you could never take a small office and consolidate with somewhere else while you're ramping up a huge operation somewhere else in the state. There's no balance. There's no give and take on this."
- Halpin: "I would strongly disagree. I think there are hundreds if not thousands of Illinois businesses that receive these tax credits on a regular basis and they remain true to their roots here in Illinois. They continue to reinvest in Illinois. They continue to hire in Illinois. And I don't think that... I think you're overstating that problem."
- Wheeler, K.: "I'm just looking at the analysis of the Bill based on what it says here. I... I mean, you..."
- Halpin: "And with respect, you know, I don't always trust our analysis and the analyses aren't always a hundred percent. I can tell you that we need this law to protect our Illinois taxpayers from going out of state."
- Wheeler, K.: "With respect, I mean, there's a better way to do this. I... I recommend you pull this out of the record and let's look another way how to accomplish this because this is not going to feed the jobs we're looking to create here because this is going to give companies pause to ever begin the process. Thank you very much. To the Bill. This is not the answer we're looking for in how we're actually going to create Illinois jobs going forward. This is something that's actually going to prevent some companies from looking at

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Illinois as an opportunity using our tax credit system we already have in place. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is on Short Debate.

We're going to go to the two-minute timer. The Chair recognizes Representative Ives for two minutes."

Ives: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, I'll be quite honest with you. I don't ... I don't think that this Bill goes far enough. I think at this point what we need to do is we need to clawback any educational assistance for high school graduates that decide to go to college in another state. I think that anybody who got an Illinois pension and moved to Florida or Arizona or Texas or anywhere else, I think we ought to clawback, you know, some of those pension benefits. I think taxpayers who sat here and raised their kids for a long time then decided to retire somewhere else, maybe we should go ahead and clawback any of those provisions too. I mean, honestly, your Bill just really doesn't go far enough. And I mean, and as a last resort what we really could do is we could erect a border fence and then have gates where we tax people that left the state, just because they didn't decide to stay here and do business. Maybe we ... we just haven't gone far enough down that path. I mean, this Bill is ridiculous, ridiculous. This is the nail in the coffin to anybody who's even looking at coming to Illinois. I can't even believe we're debating this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris for two minutes."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had some questions of the Sponsor and unfortunately, this Bill was put on the two-minute timer, which is... which is

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

really and truly unfortunate. This is a significant Bill. You need to look at this Bill and what the impact is. I applaud the Gentleman's efforts to try to keep jobs here in Illinois and say if a business abuses tax credits, they need to pay those back. The EDGE tax credit... benefit which we offer does provide for a repayment of those tax credits if the provisions are not met, but more particularly, if you look at this Bill, it says as was... as was mentioned earlier, any recipient business that chooses to move all or part of its business operations and the jobs created by its business out of state shall be deemed no longer to qualify for state economic development assistance. You know who one of the biggest supporters and biggest recipients of state... the EDGE job credit is? UPS. UPS. You drive past 294 and you see that facility down there. If they move any of their jobs out of state, are you telling me that UPS is no longer eligible to get benefits in the future? There is no time limit the way I read this. I believe, Representative, the Bill is poorly drafted and would have a truly harmful impact on the State of Illinois. Look, maybe you don't like benefits to be given, but we live in a competitive environment. And when that business says do I go to Illinois or do I go to Georgia or Alabama or some other state, they say, what are the provisions that are in their law? And I'm telling you they're going to look at this and they are going to say wait a minute that is going to cause me not to look at Illinois. There are enough drawbacks already not to look at Illinois. This Bill has a significant impact. I applaud where the Gentleman's going. I

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

believe the Bill is drafted poorly and really needs to be rejected. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Skillicorn for two minutes."

Skillicorn: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Skillicorn: "I'm going to take a little bit different tact. I don't think I want to go to as extreme on what I want to say, but I do want to say that I fundamentally disagree with corporate welfare. And I think it's a shame that we use corporate welfare as a tool to make up for our poor business regulations, rules and laws here in Illinois. So, I will support reforms of the EDGE program. I will support holding businesses accountable, but I also want transformational reforms in the way we treat businesses and how we grow our job and economic environment in Illinois. I do want to echo some of the concerns about the no time limit. That does not seem appropriate. So, if... if the Sponsor would like to work with me, I'm more than happy to ... to meet and figure out a way that we... we rein in EDGE, how we take away some of this corporate welfare, but we also have a structure that works and benefits. So, for ... in this the way this Bill is drafted. I like the intent; I support the intent, but in the actual application of it, I have to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Demmer: "Representative, as many of my colleagues have mentioned,

I appreciate and understand your motivations looking for
accountability when state tax credits are given; however, I

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

think there are some really, really significant issues that come out looking at the actual text of this legislation. So, one question I have... I think this has been talked about a little bit before... if a company receives a tax credit and let's say, chooses to move their accounting department to another state and loo... and we miss out on 20 jobs, but they then bring in a manufacturing facility that adds a hundred jobs. We're not talking anything about net jobs. They actually will lose all their tax credits even for increasing the net number of jobs in the state because they simply move even a single job out of state. Isn't that correct?"

Halpin: "Yes. Again, I don't want to get into specific hypothetical, there can be any number of situations that come up so."

Demmer: "But the very specific point here is that even a single job moved out of state..."

Halpin: "No."

Demmer: "...regardless of how many are added, even a single job moved out of state renders null..."

Halpin: "This..."

Demmer: "...and void all their economic..."

Halpin: "No."

Demmer: "...development incentives?"

Halpin: "This one is going to be administrated by DCEO. They're going to take a look at it. There's a hearing process for employers to challenge the finding."

Demmer: "There's also the..."

Halpin: "And they can make a determination and make..."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Demmer: "There's also the plain text of the... of the law that's written here."

Halpin: "...if I may... to answer your... to answer your question... to
 make a determination whether or not there's going to be the
 clawback."

"So, I understand what you're saying that there's some room for interpretation, but we have to look at the very beginning of this Bill, the actual text of the legislation and it says that any business that moves all or part of its business operations and the jobs created by it. So, nowhere does it recognize net jobs. They could add a thousand jobs, take one away, and lose all the credits they've gotten for ... for time in memorial. There's no time limit on this. I mean, this is a... this is taking a significant change to the way that this operates and really goes far beyond what... what traditional accountability would be towards these incentives. The other issue that was brought up by my colleague was in a case like a River's Edge Development credit. The developer does the redevelopment... the rehabilitation of a building and sells those tax credits. And your response earlier was that whoever purchases those tax credits is now bound by the terms of this even though they have no connection whatsoever to the project that was done here. Is that correct?"

Halpin: "I... I'd end up leaving that up to DCEO to determine the actual inter... But my... you know... you know, as an attorney, my understanding is, if you're purchasing tax credits under a law that you know that could be recouped, then that's certainly an issue."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

"Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This is a... a Demmer: significant Bill. As Representative Harris mentioned, this is a really important Bill for us to watch. We have to understand we're talking about even moving a sinale irrespective of how many other jobs might be added all across the state, a single job would jeopardize these tax credits. It also may ... might make it impossible for a developer who's looking to do... to develop a piece of property under the River's Edge Program or others, might make it impossible for them to find anybody to buy those tax credits. We can't come into this with a hatchet and try to say how can we get accountability by drawing the widest possible net? Let's target this and make sure the incentives go towards what they're supposed to go towards and we have actual recourse, but don't draw this wide net. Mr. Speaker, if this Bill should receive the requisite number of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Mr. Davis for two minutes."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As I've listened to the debate and read about this particular Bill, what strikes me is that unfortunately it seems like once again from that side of the aisle big business is trumping the individual. Because we've seen efforts from that side of the aisle that if an individual who receives public assistance and fails to do something, we take that away from them. So, in this case, if a business gets support from the state and then wants to take jobs out of the state, that's okay. But if an individual who gets public assistance fails to do something, we want to

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

take that away. So, it's amazing how, in this case, that business is more important than the individual. So, why shouldn't, if we give that business support and they take jobs out of the state, why shouldn't we want some of that money back? Why shouldn't we want that back? And I don't understand why that concept seems to be challenging for many of you on the other side of the aisle. It's simple as that. We don't even require businesses that get support from the state... we don't even require them to register their vacancies with the Department of Employment Security. What about that? Would that be a problem as well to help people get jobs from these corporations that get support from us? So, please, I get it. You support business a hundred percent in just about every endeavor, but this is one instance where let's be mindful that if they get support from the state, maybe if they take jobs out of the state, maybe we should be looking to get some of the money back that we've given to them. And I don't understand why that concept is difficult for you to understand. I don't. Please support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman for two..."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of the Gentleman's legislation. Let me just... let me just try and make sense, if it's even possible, of your argument. Okay? We're going to give taxpayers' dollars, money that we ask our taxpayers to pay to a business, those businesses are going to make a promise. Their promise to us and to the people of Illinois is they will create jobs and opportunities. So, let's say that business says, oop, we're lying. We're going to move to

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Indiana; we're going to move to Kentucky. Oh, my goodness, we're going to jump the wall that the President's building and we're moving to Mexico. And we're going to say we're not going to take the money back, our taxpayers' dollars? We're going to let them high-tail it out of here, take our jobs with them and our money with them, too? You, the Party of the stewards of the taxpayers. You, who care about taxpayers can honestly stand up and make excuses why you're voting against this. Why you voting against this? Last week, the excuses that you made about funding senior citizen programs, the excuses you made about funding community colleges and higher education, the excuses you made last week were, oh, it doesn't go far enough. Oh, we didn't have any say in the drafting of this process. Oh, my goodness, there are no structural reforms. Well, what are the excuses this time? Oh, it's misdrafted. Oh, my goodness, the best one I heard is I am against corporate welfare, so let the corporations keep their money. It's insane. These are taxpayers' dollars. If you lie to the state, and you steal our money, we should get it back. I'm voting 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison for two minutes."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield to Representative David Harris."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris for two minutes."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I'll be brief. I do want to follow up though to be very clear about something so we put it into the record, Representative. I wanted to ask this question previously. If indeed a business should lose... under

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

this Bill, should lose its benefit, are they forever... forever precluded from getting economic assistance again?"

Halpin: "DCEO..."

Harris, D.: "That's... that's how I read the Bill and I want to..."

Halpin: "Yeah."

Harris, D.: "...make sure that I understand."

Halpin: "DCEO will make a determination whether this law is going to apply. And they're going to offer the employer an opportunity to... to justify those tax credits and argue their case and have full due process. If... after that process, after the DCEO has already, you know, essentially proven their case, then the employer would have to forfeit those tax incentives and would be barred forward, yes."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So... so, it is a bar forever, a permanent bar, which, Ladies and Gentlemen, again, I believe has a significant, significant impact on the possibility attracting business to the State of Illinois. I strenuously disagree with my distinguished colleagues from the 30th and the 113th District. Let me tell you something, right now, if you get an EDGE tax credit and you leave the state, you don't meet the obligations of the EDGE tax credit, you have to pay the money back. You don't get the tax credit. And DCEO has a really positive record of tracking whether or not the qualifications that got you that tax credit have been met. So, the dollars would have to be paid back or they wouldn't get the tax credit to begin with. And in terms of supporting this, big business as my... my colleague from the 30th District said, I support business, yes, because business supports jobs and it's not just big business. It's all businesses that are

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

eligible and we... we lowered the bar for the tax credits. Let's not raise the bar again and go in the wrong direction. Please vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ammons for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Ammons: "Thank you, Sir. Representative, there's been a lot said.

 Can you... can you takes us back again as to why you are proposing a 'yes' vote for this Bill?"
- Halpin: "I'm proposing a 'yes' vote for this Bill so that we can protect Illinois taxpayers from sending moneys to corporations that don't have a permanent interest here in the State of Illinois and are going to be constantly looking for that better deal whether it's Iowa, Indiana, Wisconsin or even overseas. We need to protect taxpayer dollars especially given the fact that we can't grant a budget and our... and our bill backlog is going through the roof."
- Ammons: "And just one final question. As you were working on this Bill, were there other examples in other states that proposed similar legislation?"
- Halpin: "None... not as specific as this. I have looked at taxpayer incentives in other states though and there's a long track record of projects being funded by taxpayer money that never see that money recouped."
- Ammons: "Thank you. To the Bill, quickly. This Bill is to avoid a couple of things that history has already written a lot of books on. Lots of books are written on this tax scandal, job scandal, corporate and political scandal around tax incentives that ultimately end up costing more per job than

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

anything you ever could have offered in the first place. I'll give you a very quick example in 22 seconds. Bank of America in 1993 established a new corporate headquarters. They were supposed to retain 1,796 jobs as a result of that tax incentive. When they opened that building, they laid off 798 people right after receiving the tax incentive. We can go on and on..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We could go on and on with examples of this. Just simply pick up a book and you will find in the great American scandal all of the examples of these. Thank you so much for bringing this legislation. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bryant for two minutes."

Bryant: "Yield my time, Sir, to Representative Andersson."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson for two minutes."

Andersson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, you don't get it. You don't understand how we could possibly be opposed to this Bill? Well, I don't get your side either honestly because what this Bill does is it penalizes people who comply with their agreements. This is not about fraud. This is not about businesses that didn't comply with the rules that they were established for their credit. This is about businesses that did; they did everything right. And yet, in the future, after they've done that, 'cause there's no time limits whatsoever, what happens, they move a single person out of the State of Illinois, even though they did everything they were supposed to under their agreements, they lose it all. And to the Gentleman's point that there's due process, there's only one

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

question. There's no due process. The only question is, did they choose to move all or a part of its business operations and jobs created by its businesses out of state? If they did, they owe it all back; if they didn't, I guess then they're okay. But that's not due process. That's a simple question. And the problem is, is like I said, this is not for companies that have done something wrong. This is for companies that did it right and now, we're setting up a backdoor penalty. This is like, to your example, Sir, where you're saying that people on public welfare are a cheat or something like that and then are expected to repay it. This is a case where those people did it right. They didn't cheat and yet, now, we're going to add a new layer and say, surprise, surprise, no statute of limitations. Surprise, you owe it back anyway. That's what this Bill is about. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Manley for two minutes."

Manley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Manley: "It got so quiet in here. Representative Halpin, can you...

I'm trying to... coming fresh off of tax season, I'm a tax accountant, where fraud is a big deal and if you commit tax fraud that is forever. There's no statute of limitations on that. So, take me through your Bill. What it sounds like in here is that everybody's worried about the forever thing. I think when you invest, when the taxpayers of Illinois invest, and we're giving money through grants and other things, it's an investment."

Halpin: "Absolutely."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- Manley: "So, take me through your Bill. Tell me why it's a good Bill?"
- Halpin: "It's a good Bill because we want to encourage businesses to do business with Illinois and stay in Illinois. We do not want to encourage the kind of business that's going to come to Illinois just for the sake of these bags of money that we hand out and then start looking for bags of money from someplace else."
- Manley: "When you are in district, and I have heard this repeatedly from my constituents that, you know, we don't want to be unfriendly to businesses. We want businesses here in Illinois, but the problem is, is we invest in them through taxpayer dollars... we invest in them; we want them to invest in the people of Illinois. And when they don't do that, when they take all our hard-earned dollars and then they take our jobs and go somewhere else... there's several in Will County that have done just that... we're left holding the bag."
- Halpin: "Absolutely. And I saw a statistic, I think it was from 2012, where financial incentives like this totaled \$1.5 billion, which is five percent of our state budget. If that money is flowing out of the state, that just makes our job harder. And so, that's why... one of the reasons why this Bill is so important."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Manley: "I want to thank you, Representative Halpin, for this Bill. The people in the 98th District thank you for this. And I encourage everybody to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Breen for two minutes."

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

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Breen: "Thank you. Representative, I just wanted to check. Now, is this... this impacts existing grant moneys, right? So, grants that have already been made. Does this impact existing ones or only ones that we make from the effective date going forward?"

Halpin: "Only from the effective date going forward."

Breen: "Okay. Now, you had mentioned something about there being a standard or what have you that the agency could determine, you know, whether jobs had been taken out of the state. Where in your Bill is that standard laid out besides just Section (a) where it says, if you move all or part of your business operations and jobs created out of state? Where... is there some other standard that I'm missing in your Bill?"

- Halpin: "That is the standard. The department will be responsible for determining whether a company has moved all or part of the jobs out of state."
- Breen: "Okay. And now, I've heard a lot of criticism of big business. I mean, do you consider John Deere to be big business that needs to be punished?"
- Halpin: "I consider John Deere to be a big business, but for... for the lifetime of the company, John Deere has been a good steward of Illinois."
- Breen: "Sure. And, I mean I know they're based in Moline, but I know also now, I mean I was just doing a quick Google search and I saw that they were trying to buy Monsanto's precision planting farm equipment business a couple years ago and I don't know how any of that goes. I haven't been following carefully, but I know they're a pretty good-sized company.

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

And it would seem to me that they're moving their business operations out of state to some extent at any particular time. They're so large and what have you. How would you keep from having John Deere lose all of their state money under your Bill?"

Halpin: "I believe John Deere is going to be a responsible Illinois citizen and keep jobs here in the State of Illinois. If they want to acquire a new business, they're certainly free to do that. I haven't followed this particular story that closely, but it'll be up to them as to decide how they want to... how they want to spend their money."

Breen: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This is yet another of the..."

Speaker Lang: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Breen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is yet another of the Democrat 'burn it down' program for Illinois. As you've heard the Sponsor say, if an Illinois business is growing, if there's a single job generated out of state, they lose all of their assistance even if they've met all of their commitments, all of their promises. This is a terrible Bill. It will send a bad message to the business community and throughout the state. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Welch: "I just have a few questions of the Sponsor, actually.

Representative, been listening to this debate and I'm actually puzzled by some of the comments coming from the other side. So, I just want to ask you a couple of specific questions. What exactly is the purpose of this Bill?"

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- Halpin: "The purpose is to dissuade or deter bad actors, bad businesses from abusing a system of economic incentives by taking taxpayer money and then leaving the state looking for some oth... some other state's taxpayer money. That is the essential purpose of this Bill."
- Welch: "So, is it fair to say that your goal, by keeping businesses in Illinois, will also keep jobs in Illinois?"
- Halpin: "I... I believe it will. There are Illinois businesses that want to do business here are looking for a little assistance in order to make it work. And they are willing to take those incenters... incentives with the condition that they're going to remain here and provide Illinois jobs, provide Illinois taxes and provide Illinois... Illinoisans with a good business partner."
- Welch: "Is it fair to say that your Bill will force companies and their employees who work for those companies to pay taxes in Illinois?"
- Halpin: "They will pay taxes in Illinois, school property taxes, income taxes. Yes, they will."
- Welch: "So, Representative, it's fair to say that you're not trying to burn down Illinois. You're actually trying to lift up Illinois. Is that correct?"
- Halpin: "Yes, I am Representative."
- Welch: "Representative, I want to commend you for filing this Bill and doing the right thing at a time where people are outmigrating and leaving and not going to our colleges. We're trying to keep businesses and their employees and their families here in Illinois. And I just think this is the right

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

thing to do. And I would ask everyone to put politics aside, do the right thing and vote 'yes' for this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Costello: "Representative, if you could... because I've heard a lot said here... I think something that people are concentrating on is the hearing process. So, the hearing process that you have to go through at DCO... DCEO, could you explain that because, to my knowledge, I don't believe DCEO is in the business of putting businesses out of business in the state?"

Halpin: "No. So, DCEO will monitor, you know, the businesses here in the State of Illinois and make a determination if they see that jobs are leaving the state. And I hear a lot of examples about a company moving one job here, Amazon moving one job there. In reality, we all know the stories we're talking about. We're talking about the plant that closes down because they can get a higher tax credit across the border in Indiana. That's what DCEO is going to be looking at. Those are the bad actors that we're trying to get with this. And so, they will offer that business an opportunity, a 45-day opportunity, to request a hearing and have an employer justify whether or not they're moving those jobs out of the state. And then, DCEO will make that determination as to whether or not they have. And I don't think DCEO is... is in the position where it wants to drive business out of Illinois and I don't think they will."

Costello: "Thank you. I think that's very important to note DCEO goes through the entire process. They do an x-ray of the

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

situation. This isn't a situation if 1, 2, 10 jobs leave the state that business is automatically shut down, has to automatically pay the money that they received from the state. There's a process here that must be followed."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halpin to close."

Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to reiterate that the fundamental point of this legislation is to en... is to encourage companies that are in Illinois and companies that want to come to Illinois to do the right thing especially if they want to receive the benefits of taxpayer money in relocating or retaining those businesses. As I mentioned, our economic incentives here in the State of Illinois are approximately \$1.5 billion, 5 percent of our budget. If that money is leaving the state, that would be a... a 25 percent... we could use that money for a 25 percent increase to our human services budget. You could increase our transportation budget by 50 percent. You could increase K through 12 education by 33 percent. And all of these things have the ... if you spend money on those programs, they have the great affect of providing good infrastructure, good workers and a good... a good workforce for businesses who want to come here. That's as much of an economic incentive as giving these companies cash payments or tax credits. So, we need to make a decision as a Legislature whether we want to just hand out bags of money to companies that may not have an interest in staying here or do we want to put that money to a better use, if those companies fail to provide the jobs and retain the jobs that they say they will. I think that money is better spent on through 12 higher education, on K education,

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

infrastructure, energy, the kind of things that will continue to make Illinois a good place for business and for workers long after a company that has taken a tax incentive and then later decides that Wisconsin can... can argue for a better deal. I want to point out one specific example I was reading about recently. There is a.m. Tesla Motor Company is building a plant out in Nevada and for a long time they requested taxpayer incentives and they received them upon the promise of thousands of jobs. And right now, that company they're... they're behind. I'm excited about Tesla; I'm excited about electric cars. But I think it's important that if a company promises jobs they're going to stick to it. They got to stick to that schedule. And right now, there's no quarantee for Nevada tax... taxpayers that they're going to get their money back. I don't want to see that here in Illinois. I want good businesses here in Illinois. And I would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Demmer has asked for a verification of this vote. Accordingly, Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. Staff will retire to the rear of the chamber. Those who are in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And Mr. Demmer, do you persist, Sir? Gentleman withdraws his verification. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3882, Representative Harper. Out of the record. House Bill 3503,

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Representative Mah. Out of the record. House Bill 3163, Representative Manley. Out of the record. House Bill 302, Mr. Martwick. Think it over, Sir. Out of the record. House Bill 2814, Representative Hammond. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2814, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2814 amends the Illinois Public Aid Code and requires that the monthly joint DHS and HFS reports show the pending applications and be specific as to how long they have been pending. In addition, it requires the Auditor General to report every three years to the General Assembly on the performance and compliance of the departments meeting these regulations. Appreciate an 'aye' vote and take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Conyears-Ervin, do you rise on this Bill? Mr. Swanson, do you rise on this Bill? 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? Mah, Scherer, Turner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Conyears-Ervin."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Conyears-Ervin: "I would like to take a moment to say happy birthday to Representative Justin Slaughter, whom I do not

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

even see on the floor at this time. Representative Justin Slaughter, one of my esteemed 100th General Assembly Members, one of whom I am well fond of. And I just wanted to say happy birthday to him and thank Representative Wallace for the wonderful chocolate dessert that she prepared for his birthday today. Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday, Representative. Representative Swanson."
- Swanson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect I was a 'no' vote on 3538."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention, Sir. House Bill 2462, Representative Moeller. Out of the record. House Bill 1273, Representative Mussman. Out of the record. House Bill 657, Mr. Rita. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 657, a Bill for an Act concerning accounting. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 657 is an initiative of the Illinois Public Accountants, the CPAs. It makes some technical changes to how they view out-of-state licenses. It also puts some additional personnel in for the department. It's an agreed Bill. I'd ask for its approval."
- 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? Ammons, Evans, Sims. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 56 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman requests Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2581, Mr. Sauer. Please read the Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2581, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sauer."

Sauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. House Bill 2581 provides that when the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority has built or will build great separations or interchange improvements at intersections that the local highway agency or municipality with jurisdiction shall enter into an agreement with the authority for the ongoing maintenance of the structure. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Chapa LaVia, Evans. Mr. Evans. Please take the record. There are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3167, Representative Stratton. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3167, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stratton."

Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3167 addresses two problems: inadequate wages for child care providers under the Child Care Assistance Program and the difficulty in building and maintaining a pipeline of qualified teachers and child care workers. It authorizes the Department of Human Services to conduct a... an early childhood workforce study to gather

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

the data and make recommendations as to wage... wages. And I request a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Andersson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Andersson: "What's the estimate cost of this, Representative?"

Stratton: "The estimated cost is about approximately \$40 thousand to conduct the study."

Andersson: "And how often would that have to be repeated?"

Stratton: "Well, first of all, initially it will utilize data that the department has already collected. The goal is that every three years there would be an update of the recommendations."

Andersson: "So, every three years we'll be spending \$40 thousand under the Bill? Is that correct?"

Stratton: "Correct."

Andersson: "And..."

Stratton: "I... and..."

Andersson: "Yes."

Stratton: "Let me just clarify."

Andersson: "Sure."

Stratton: "I don't think that this Bill specifically authorizes every three years to conduct the study. We do have to update information and we have to make sure that... So, let me just take a moment just to make sure whether it requires that every three years."

Andersson: "Sure."

Stratton: "So, what will happen is that there will be a study and then recommendations are made. And yes, every three years

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

that would be updated. But I'm sure that they would not have to start from scratch with each study."

Andersson: "Now, my understanding is DHS already conducts a variety of surveys. One is called the Illinois Market Rate Survey. This report presents information on market rates that providers are charging for providing for child care. We have an Illinois Salary and Staffing Survey, which is mandated by statute to conduct a survey of the workforce in licensed child care every two years. And we have the DHS Child Care Annual Report, which also covers some of the simpler... similar information. Why is it that we need this report separate and distinct from the three I just mentioned?"

Stratton: "You're absolutely correct that there are several studies or surveys; however, none of the surveys provide the information that is sought under this particular Bill, which is to make recommendations as to what the wage level should be and making sure that people are in the pipeline of professionalism so that we can maintain the workforce."

Andersson: "It appears to me at least two of them are certainly covering the same area. Wouldn't it make more sense simply to either ask DHS voluntarily or if we had to do it legislatively, roll that into the existing surveys as opposed to creating a fourth yet another expense survey?"

Stratton: "The intent of the Bill is absolutely to make sure that we build upon information that's already being collected. However, the key of this Bill to make sure that we ensure that people don't just cycle in and out of poverty is to make sure that recommendations are made and none of the studies that you referenced allow for that. So, this is a new level.

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- We will certainly incorporate all of the data that's already been collected."
- Andersson: "So, tell me specifically what's missing out of these that's in yours?"
- Stratton: "A couple of things are missing, 1) there's no recommendations on what should... what providers should be paid or the plan to get there. And that's what this particular legislation would allow for."
- Andersson: "But if they have the data, it wouldn't be much of a leap to be able to make a recommendation, correct?"
- Stratton: "All of the studies that you referenced only collect data as it exists right now. The goal of this legislation is to build upon that data to make sure that there's a plan to set forth sort of the funding or the... the ladder that people can go on to as they grow as professionals. And it's also to make recommendations as to what the wages should be, which right now none of those allow for that."
- Andersson: "But I mean, typically, when you do wage and salary studies, what you do is you build off of existing data and that's what we have here. So, it... to me it appears we have the data intrinsically. We don't have future data, of course not, but we'll have the existing data which we monitor and measure to be able to determine what appropriate baseline salaries or wages should be, correct?"
- Stratton: "So, the information that's already collected is certainly relevant and could be incorporated into the workforce study, but it doesn't accomplish one of the key goals of this legislation which is to clearly identify Illinois early childforce... childhood workforce career

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

pathways. So, none of that is included in any of the data that we have and that's something that would be a part of this study. And it also does not tie it to professional development attainment to appropriate compensation levels. So, again, I can only say, reiterate that it would certainly build off of data that we already have, but the need to really create that pipeline is not currently exists."

Andersson: "And... and my understanding is DHS itself is opposed to this, correct?"

Stratton: "Yes, they are."

Andersson: "Okay. Looks to me that they believe the cost of the study would be better spent on child care. I... I sympathize with what you're trying to do. I think it might be a more effective way to roll it into one of these additional studies where you don't have to invent a new one. I resp... I respect what you're doing. I think it could be done in a more efficient, less costly way. But I do thank you for all the answers to the questions."

Stratton: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wallace."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wallace: "To the point that was just made by the previous speaker, you are asking that they go a step further with the data that is already being correct... collected, correct?"

Stratton: "That is correct."

Wallace: "And so, that is probably why the cost is so minimal because there's already some technology in place, there's already a database in place, there are already variables in

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

place that are being examined, but you're saying once we examine these things, how do we extrapolate some other recommendation for the future?"

Stratton: "That's correct."

Wallace: "Okay. And then, finally, the revisitation of it every three years is just to make sure that our data, our pay, any other recommendations are as up to date as possible, correct?" Stratton: "That's correct."

Wallace: "All right. Thank you. To the Bill. I think that this is a piece of legislation that is necessary. We already understand that the individuals who work with our... our youngest and most vulnerable citizens are not quite well compensated. And this will just simply help us make some better recommendations as to how do we pay them to provide for their own families as they take care of our families. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I respect the Representative's idea in this, but I just want to point out with what one of the other Representatives just said. Why DHS is opposed to this Bill. Number 1) they would like to see the money, the 40 or 50 thousand dollars that this would cost, go into child care that we all keep talking about that we want to spend more money on child care. 2) there are three studies already being done right now: the Illinois Market Rate Study, the Illinois Salary and Staffing Survey and the DHS Child Care Annual Report. So, I think those three studies should address the needs of what we were talking about here. So, I would oppose the Bill even though I respect the

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Representative for what she's trying to do. But I think when we're trying to not incur more expenses I would rather see that money go into the child care than to another study when these three other studies are being done already. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Stratton to close."

Stratton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We need qualified teachers and child care workers to nurture and care for our children. Many of those that are providing that care are certain... continuing in a cycle of poverty. I request... respectfully request an 'aye' vote on House Bill 3167, so that we can rectify that situation."

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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Batinick is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Batinick: "A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "Thank you. I hope everybody had a good break. I personally had a good break. It was an especially tough break for my district. Like many of you, I'm sure you received calls from your superintendents who are having difficulty meeting the funding for their schools. I met with several social service providers that are hanging by a thread. Moving on, we had the downgrade of many of our universities over break. I had a school superintendent send me an article about how

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

they're paying more in interest, not because of their credit rating but because of the state's credit rating is bringing down their credit rating essentially. More importantly, I learned of a major manufacturer that decided not to double their operation in my district because of the lack of a budget. That was their number one reason. We need to focus on a budget. I know it's a small gesture. I'm looking for people to join me. We as rank and file have the ability to focus on the budget. I will not be supporting Bills that don't deal with the budget that don't grow the economy and make government more efficient unless it's an immediate public safety concern. I'm looking for Democrats and Republicans to join me on this. We desperately need a budget. We're losing anywhere between 11 to 22 million dollars a day. It's desperately hurting social services. It's hurting our universities. It's hurting our schools. It's hurting our business climate. We're throwing our future in the trash with what we're doing to higher education. So, I just wanted to explain that to everybody. And I would appreciate any support. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I have an announcement for you. Leader Currie in the Chair."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you very much. We're going to continue on with priority Bills on Third Reading. I'm sorry.

Representative Reick, for what reason do you rise?"

Reick: "Point of personal privilege, Ma'am."

Speaker Currie: "State your point."

Reick: "I'm here today with my Page for the day, Cole Hostasa, who's a freshman at Marmion Military Academy in Aurora. He's

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

from Geneva, Illinois. He plays Lacrosse and hockey. He goes to St. Peter's School and probably one of these days he'll be sitting in one of these seats. So, give him and his mother, who is in the balcony, a warm welcome, please. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Welcome. House Bill 3750, Representative Stuart, Katie Stuart. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill..."

Speaker Currie: "Wait, out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 3754, Representative Turner. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3754, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the chamber. House Bill 3754 amends the Unified Code of Corrections to provide that the Cook County Sheriff may establish a county impact incarceration program. Currently, the Code provides that violent offenders should not be allowed to participate in a county impact incarceration program. House Bill 3754 removes this limitation to provide that there is no blanket prohibition against violent offenders entering such a program. I ask for the Body's support."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I really like saying that.

I... I'm happy to have you in the Chair."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you."

Andersson: "Long overdue."

Speaker Currie: "Carry on."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Andersson: "There you go. Just a question of the Sponsor. So, it looks like this is opposed by the Cook County President, in particular. What's the rationale?"

Turner: "Over here."

Andersson: "Thank you, Sir."

Turner: "No problem. The Cook County is... I think that's a... that was in the original opposition. After some discussion with the County's Office, they're not opposed to what we're doing here."

Andersson: "So, are you aware of any opposition at this point?"

Turner: "No, Sir. No opposition that I know of."

Andersson: "Thank... thank you for the clarification."

Turner: "Thank you."

Andersson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Currie: "Thank you. The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 3754. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members still not voting. Vote your switches. There are five that are still not voting. Okay. Mr... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 54 voting 'aye', 59 voting 'no'. And Representative Turner requests Postponed Consideration. And next, we have House Bill 3711, Representative Wallace. Clerk, read the Bill. I believe that we... to take the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment that has been approved by the Rules Committee. Mr. Clerk, please return the Bill to Second Reading."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3711, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Wallace."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Wallace."

Wallace: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Oh my God, I'm so excited. Okay. This Bill... or this Amendment removes or limits some of the language that was there under intimidation. It also makes sure that it clarifies that the Attorney General will sue or take action in the name of the people of the State of Illinois, not on behalf of individuals. And it gives judges the discretion to impose a civil penalty of up to \$25 thousand. I move to... I ask to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Lady's Amendment vote 'yes'...
say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the
Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Are
there any further Amendments, Clerk?"

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

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Next we have House Bill 2977, Representative Welch. Out of the record. How about House Bill 2354, Representative Willis. Out of the record. Then let us try Representative Zalewski. Are you ready on House Bill 2801? Clerk... Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2801, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Rep... Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill changes the taxation treatment of certain motor fuels from a diesel treatment to liquefied natural gas and propane. A lot of large fleeted companies like UPS and others are switching their fleets from diesel to liquefied natural gas. It's a cheaper

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- cleaning... cleaner burning fuel. This... this Bill is reflective of an agreement with the department. It is a green Bill. And it encourages these companies to go to a cleaner burning energy. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Zalewski moves passage of House Bill 2801. Is there discussion? Representative David Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Madam Chair. A quick question of the Sponsor, please?"
- Speaker Currie: "Gentleman will yield."
- Harris, D.: "Representative, what is the current tax on LNG, do you know?"
- Zalewski: "The treat... the tax rate is the same, but the composition of liquefied natural gas is less. It contains less energy. So, therefore, there's the need to make this change, David."
- Harris, D.: "So, effectively, it could be argued this is a tax decrease for those industries that use a lot of LNG?"

Zalewski: "Yes."

- Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you very much. I encourage a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "All in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. 110 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the Bill... Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bennett, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bennett: "Madam Chair, I would like to change my vote from a red vote to a green vote to a 'yes' vote, please, for this last Bill."

Speaker Currie: "The record..."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Bennett: "If you would, please."

Speaker Currie: "...the record will be... will reflect your request."

Bennett: "You're most kind."

Speaker Currie: "All right. We're still on the Order of Third Reading with Member priorities. Representative Andrade on House Bill 780. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 780, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Andrade. Out of the record. House Bill 2800, Representative Flowers on Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2800, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2800 merely allows for a person to be tested... a woman to be tested in her last trimester of pregnancy. And I know of no opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Flowers moves passage of House Bill 2800. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this measure, 111 (sic-112) vote 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having reached the occ... required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Oh, sorry. Take the record, right. All right. Representative Ford, are you ready on House Bill 223? Representative Ford. All right. Clerk... No... yes, no? Clerk... Clerk, please read the Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 223, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you. I was a little... working on something else. So,
 House Bill 223 is a simple Bill to allow for individuals to...
 to wear wristlets if they are Alzheimer's patients in nursing
 homes. Move for the passage of House Bill 223."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Ford moves passage of House Bill 223. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The vote... the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this measure, 109... 110... 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having met the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 311, Representative Greg Harris. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 311, a Bill... House Bill 311, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Harris. Representative Greg Harris."
- Harris, G.: "The other one gets all the attention. But Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Madam Speaker, thank you. House Bill 311 is a piece of legislation that adds additional layers of protection for consumers in the Illinois health insurance market. Those of us, you know, who are in our district offices a lot of the time are getting increasing numbers of constituents come in with concerns is, you know, the health insurance marketplace, both, you know, private and public is

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

getting more complicated and even people who make all the efforts to make the right decisions and research their choices suddenly find themselves with hospitals, doctors or other providers that may not get... that may not be covered in a plan they ultimately own for themselves and their family. So, this is a topic that is affecting so many of us now, so many Illinoisans, I'm very grateful for the opportunity to present this Bill. I want to provide special thanks to folks who have led on this issue along side of me: Leader Chad Hays from Danville, Illinois; also, Representative Jeanne Ives, you know, who has worked on this issue alongside of us for the last year; and Senator Linda Holmes in the Senate. We've also worked very closely with the Illinois State Medical Society, the Illinois Hospital Association, consumer advocacy groups, advocacy groups for the various major disease organizations: cancer, diabetes, epilepsy, Alzheimer's, HIV/AIDS to be sure that consumer perspectives are addressed. And also with the Department of Insurance who has given us, you know, invaluable guidance and we've made many changes. We've also worked with the major insurers in the State of Illinois and have made major changes in this legislation through a series of Amendments at their request. So, very briefly, let me discuss what this Bill does. It does three major things. It provides for standards regarding network adequacy in Illinois for provider networks. It requires both providers and insurers to keep regularly updated information publicly available for folks when they make their decision about choosing either a provider or an insurer. They're sure they are making decisions that will not put them out of network. And then the third

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

thing it does is it equalizes for people who are buying insurance through PPOs that they have the same protections for continuity of care as people who buy insurance through HMOs already have in the State of Illinois. And what that would mean is if you've bought insurance for an insurance plan year, January to December, and in the middle of that plan year your insurer has an expiration with a provider network and suddenly, you know, the hospital that you've signed up for when you bought the insurance comes out of your network you're given 90 days of in-network protection time for continuity of care to allow you to continue treatment for, you know, a serious illness or pregnancy and then move into a new plan and find a new provider. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's a comprehensive Bill. I'm very happy again to Leader Hays and Representative Ives and Representative Ann Williams for their work on this. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Currie: "Is there any discussion? Representative Demmer on House Bill 311."

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

Speaker Currie: "Indicates he will."

Demmer: "Representative Harris, I appreciate your work on this important Bill. Could you talk about the transparency protections that are offered for consumers in this Bill?"

Harris, G.: "Yes. It... it requires both providers, you know, such as doctors, hospitals and you know, pharmacies, you know, other providers of health care, to regularly update the insurers whose coverage they accept with any changes in their status in the network; also, you know, office location, hours,

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

that kind of thing and whether or not they're accepting new patients. And it also requires then the insurers update their websites on a monthly basis so that as people go and do research and choose plans they're sure that their various providers are included."

- Demmer: "Thank you, Representative. What if providers leave the network and they have current patients? Will it be too late for... for that information to help a patient because they won't be looking up their current doctor in an online directory?"
- Harris, G.: "Could you repeat that? It's a little noisy. I couldn't quite hear the question."
- Demmer: "That's all right. I understand. What if providers leave the network and they have current patients?"
- Harris, G.: "This is where the continuity of benefits clause comes in that would allow those patients a 90-day period at the innetwork rate to make a decision whether they wanted to stay with that provider and pay a higher rate or choose another provider and transition over."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Representative. Madam Speaker, to the Bill. This is a positive step in terms of transparency and information being put in the hands of the people who are making decisions on this. People take time to research and understand what kind of insurance options are available to them and this transparency and adequacy measure helps to ensure that they have the right information they need at the time of making decisions. This has been a balanced piece of legislation. I think it takes into account both provider and insurers perspectives and ensures that there are adequate

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

safeguards in place. I appreciate your work on this Bill. And I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Hays."

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

Speaker Currie: "Will."

Hays: "Representative, can you... can you talk to me about why we are looking at network adecy... adequacy standards with this Bill?"

Harris, G.: "The major reason is that the... with all the changes in the insurance marketplace, changes at the federal level, the creation of different kinds of networks that we're seeing, you know, different kinds of offerings, the one thing that is universally agreed on no matter which side of like the federal health care debate you're on or... is that most insurance regulations is left to the individual states, that it is not a national issue. So, therefore, as we, you know, develop stanwards... standards to be sure that there are adequate hospitals, doctors and specialists within a certain travel time of a person's home it comes back to the state. And you know, we're a very large and diverse state and as you and I and others have talked about, you know, what might be an adequate standard for, you know, southern Illinois may be different for central, it may be different for the suburbs and it may be different for the City of Chicago. And the way we've written this Bill at the department's request is to provide the maximum flexibility in enacting those standards by rule."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- Hays: "Thank you. I appreciate that. How's this Bill project...

 protect patients when it comes to access to the doctors from
 the insurance network that they choose?"
- Harris, G.: "Well, the... the purpose of the Bill is to allow people... people are getting more sophisticated in looking for and choosing insurance. You know, people are now going online. They're learning that all plans are not equal. That especially if they have, you know, a family member, a child, you know with this special condition, there are going to be certain doctors that they want to be sure are in network. This legislation requires insurers to keep that information updated so that as people choose health care that meets their particular family's needs, they can have the most, you know, comprehensive and updated information available."
- Hays: "Thank you. To the Bill. I appreciate the work that the Sponsor has done on this Bill. I appreciate how far he has gone to... trying to alleviate some of the questions. I know there's some more work on the Bill possibly to be done in the Senate, but I can tell you as a Legislator from the central part of the state, many of the issues that Representative Harris has articulated here, this afternoon, are very, very prevalent in the geographic area where I live where people routinely travel an hour or more, sometimes much more, to see a specialist or a sub specialist. I appreciate your work on this Bill. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "And a reminder, this Bill is on Short Debate.

 Representative Ives."
- Ives: "Thank you for reminding us at my point in the conversation; however, I will be brief because... and I just want to thank

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Representative Harris for bringing this Bill to its full... the full extent it has. I actually initiated this over a year ago from a provider of health insurance who came to me and said, look, people that I sell the health insurance product to are getting taken advantage of. They look for the premium that they can afford. They look for the... where their doctors are working. They look for a plan that will support everything that they need and then what they find out is that three months in... four months in... six months into the contract year either the provider and the hospitals leave or the insurance companies decide to part from each other. And the person who is least able to handle this is the person who had to pick up a... a plan for themselves 'cause they're self-employed. And so, I brought this Bill forward and since then I understood that now it was a much bigger project than I have the knowledge base for. So, Representative Harris picked it up and has actually taken it to its fruition. So, I appreciate your work on this. This is transparency. This is protecting the consumer who is least able to deal with either the hospital, the doctor, the insurance company parting company. So, I... I urge you to support this. There'll probably be some work done also in the Senate, I'm told. But this is a good measure for consumers. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Reis: "Representative, I want to thank you for your work on this.

And it's been not quite as easy as it sounds to get the Bill to this point. And I still want to talk about one... one item

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

in the Bill that still has some… some questions and that's on the network specialist requirements. Can you talk about where that's at right now? I mean, it hasn't been fixed yet, has it?"

- Harris, G.: "Sure. I think there are two issues, Representative, that we've discussed with the Senate Sponsors and with all the insurers and different groups, the Hospital Association and Medical Society that still are being negotiated and will be hopefully resolved in the Senate. Those are the issues of the hospital base providers, which are emergency docs, neonatologists, anesthesiologists, radiologists pathologists. And you know, it's not just in this Bill. Because of their unique situation as, you know, provider groups who work only for one hospital, there are contracting issues. So, that's always a hard thing to negotiate. That's one of them. The other issue is the 10 percent trigger for material change to be sure that we don't have unintended consequences from setting a certain number that turns out to have a cascading affect. So, those are the two issues going forward."
- Reis: "Okay. And those issues have been issues since really this Bill was introduced. So, I'm a little... I'm hopeful that we can have this fixed over in the Senate. Are you assuring us that the Bill will come back to the House chamber in a different form?"
- Harris, G.: "That is... that is my understanding with the Senate Sponsor and from all those who are advocating around this Bill is that they will work in good faith to send us back a revision."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- Reis: "Okay. And to the Bill. This is important for rural hospitals. There's not a lot of specialists in certain areas south of Champaign or Springfield. Some folks in the committee were kind of ribbing me that I have nine counties and only one county delivers babies. So, I mean, we have real trouble having access to these specialists. The insurance companies are going to have the same problem. It will, as currently drafted, would cause hundreds if not thousands of appeals to be filed to the Department of Insurance each year because the insurance companies just cannot be in compliance on this issue. So, I look forward to having the Bill come back from the Senate hopefully in a perfect form. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Williams. Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you. Great to see you up there, Leader. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Will."

- Williams: "Another concept you... you talked about, Greg, is continuity of care. What happens now if I have a patient who has a serious medical condition and if I have health insurance but my doctor's been dropped from network. What are my options?"
- Harris, G.: "Currently, if you are in a HMO, a health maintenance organization, in Illinois, you have a 90-day period to transition to a new provider while paying in-network rates at your current, you know, hospital, specialist, or doctor. So, what this Bill would do would give the same rights to those who are not in HMOs but are in PPOs, you know, which are current... currently have no protections."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- Williams: "So, is that how House Bill 311 will address this issue?"
- Harris, G.: "Yes. It would give you a 90-day window where you would, if you have a... if you're undergoing ongoing care for a serious medical condition or are in the third trimester of pregnancy, that you would be able to obtain service from your current providers at the in-network rate for 90 days, at which point you could to choose to remain with them at an out-of-network rate or you could move into a different provider situation that is in-network."
- Williams: "Okay. Again, just to reiterate. For women who are pregnant these protections also work for these women if their doctor is no longer in-network?"
- Harris, G.: "That is true, yes."
- Williams: "Okay. So, thank you for that explanation. To the Bill.

 When someone is seriously ill or entering into final weeks of pregnancy, this is a stressful time that can be made even more stressful when a provider is no longer in the network.

 Making sure the patient can continue their care uninterrupted is an important protection to ensure the health of all our constituencies. Thank you."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Harris to close."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you for the comments from both sides of the aisle. I think this is a very important piece of legislation to, you know, protect our constituents and be sure that they have access to affordable quality health care. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Harris has moved passage of House Bill 311. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Voting is

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this measure, there are... One more? Have all voted who wish three times, right. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this measure, there are 110 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having met the Constitutional requirements, is here... is hereby declared passed. Next, still on Third Readings, we're going to Representative Bellock, House Bill 742. Clerk, read..."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 742, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. And so, House Bill 742 was one of the Bills that we did on the CILA issue. And what this Bill does is it provides that the OIG DHS... the DHS OIG shall continue to have jurisdiction over a CILA agency and the individual it serves at the time the agency's license was revoked for up to one year. Remember, there was a problem when a lot of this happened during the time frame that people were taken out of the agencies, so we want their licenses revoked. So, we want the OIG to still oversee that for the time period of one year."

Speaker Currie: "But the Lady's moved passage of House Bill 742.

Is there any discussion? See... There is one, yes.

Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Lady yield?"

Bellock: "Mmm mmm."

Speaker Currie: "She will."

Flowers: "Representative, what... why is this necessary, please?"

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Bellock: "Well, because do you remember when we had the problems with some of the agencies that weren't taking care of the people in their CILAs and some of them were in bad living conditions?"

Flowers: "Right."

Bellock: "So, what they did was, the OIG... the Inspector General took away their license, but some of those people were just... had no one to take care of them. So, this is to make sure that there is oversight that those people will be taken care of for sure for a year until they are placed in a good place for them in an agency with a good license."

Flowers: "So, you're saying that the people that was in the CILA where the investigation took place and we found harm that was done..."

Bellock: "Yes."

Flowers: "...we want to keep them there for a year?"

Bellock: "They don't have to stay in that place. We want the OIG to make sure that they're in a place where there is a license that they can take care of them in a good way."

Flowers: "But is it not the OIG's job anyway? Why do we have to pass this legislation?"

Bellock: "I don't think that... I think the problem was that there wasn't a time period. So, in this legislation we have it that they will do that for a year."

Flowers: "But why only a year? Should there not be the investigation and the follow-up and the inspection of these CILAs?"

Bellock: "Oh, yes. Well, the investigation... the investigation has already been done..."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Flowers: "Yes."

Bellock: "...the CILA's license has been revoked..."

Flowers: "Yes."

Bellock: "...and they want to make sure that where these people are placed after that license is revoked that the OIG will make sure that they know what's going on with those people and that they have been placed in a good place that they, for sure, will be taken care of well."

Flowers: "I guess I'm kind of confused by the... by this Bill, Representative, because that is what exactly we're supposed to be doing. That's the reason why their families place them with us to make sure that they are being taken care of and if something is found to be wrong, the license is supposed to be taken away, that CILA... that particular facility should be closed and the families or I'm sorry... our constituents should be moved to a safer place. And there should be the follow-up to make sure that they are okay."

Bellock: "I agree with you, Representative. And I think that that's why the agency wanted this Bill in place to make sure it was in statute that this would be taken care of because I think when some of those CILAs were closed down, this was not followed and some of those people were... I'm not sure. I don't remember where they were, but they were not in a safe place. And so, this is now put in statute that they... OIG will have jurisdiction over the CILA agency and the individuals that served at the time the agency license was revoked for up to one year after that date that the license was revoked rather than for as long as necessary. That's what we have to begin with."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Flowers: "Well, I'm still trying to figure out why is it that OIG and someone... the Inspector General was not doing their job?

I still would like to know the reason why there was not the follow-up and what if the person that was living in this CILA that's now closed, what if it takes longer than a year? How does your Bill address that, please?"

Bellock: "This Bill just addresses that they will have the oversight over those people specifically for a year because I think what the plan is, is that within that year... hopefully within a short period of time those people will be in a... replaced and re... you know, into a new home, into a new CILA but this is just an extended safety precaution for those people that, you know, for sure that would have to happen within a year. But what we're hoping is that this would happen within the next month or two that they would be placed in a new safe place with a good license that has no problems whatsoever."

Flowers: "Well, as I'm reading your... the executive summary for our analysis. It does state that the Office of the Inspector General with the... within the Department of Human Services shall continue..."

Bellock: "Yes."

Flowers: "...shall continue to have oversight. And that's the part that's confusing to me..."

Bellock: "Oh, I'm so..."

Flowers: "...because the Bill... the analysis says it shall continue.

And so, I'm wondering what is it that this Bill is doing differently other than it shall continue? We shall be

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

responsible for these people as long as they are in our jurisdiction. Am I right?"

Bellock: "Yes. And I think probably what they're saying to the agency is that these people 'shall' have a permanent home within that year because there is no reason... absolutely no reason why these people should not be in a new CILA within a much shorter period of time than a year."

Flowers: "So, are you sure that this Bill is not giving someone an indication or it may be given the inference that after the year, you know, business as usual? Who's going to report on that person and how is the follow-up going to be followed..."

Bellock: "I don't think so, Representative."

Flowers: "...or implemented?"

Bellock: "I think this just strengthens the statute that the OIG specifically will be in charge of those people and that there will be no question that the OIG shall make sure that they are taken care of and that the agency will place them in a new, safe CILA within a much shorter period of time than a year. But this just says they will have the oversight for sure for a year."

Flowers: "Okay. It appears to me that according to our analysis that DHS stated that while OIG is currently... has jurisdiction over the provider, even after the license has been revoked..."

Bellock: "Yes."

Flowers: "...it would be helpful to codify this authority into statute to further ensure that the providers are still accountable to the state and for the responsible transition of the residents."

Bellock: "Yes."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Flowers: "So, basically, you're codifying what's already current law?"

Bellock: "Right."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Currie: "No further discussion, Representative Bellock to close."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And I appreciate the questions. And I don't know of any opposition to the Bill. And I hope that this will make sure that we are taking care of the people that are love... their loved ones and all of us would want them to have a safe and a very healthy environment for them to live in and a good quality of life."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Bellock has moved passage of House Bill 742. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And then we'll go back to Kelly Cassidy on House Bill 2460. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2460, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of the House.

House Bill 2460 is an initiative of the Illinois State Bar

Association. Provides some clarification and cleanup language
on existing law around the advisement to folks in criminal

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

court who, for whom a guilty plea could affect their immigration status. This makes clear that a defendant can file a motion to withdraw the plea within 30 days... within two years now instead of 30 days of their conviction, if it has an impact on their immigration status. There is no opposition to the Bill. Prosecutors and law enforcement are fine with it. And I welcome your questions."

Speaker Currie: "There any discussion? Representative Andersson."

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

Speaker Currie: "She will."

Andersson: "So, I understand the current law to be that there is a required declaration or a required advisement to the defendant. You're not changing that, are you?"

Cassidy: "No. We're not changing that. We're just making clear that there is... that there's recourse available to the defendant if that advisement is not made."

Andersson: "And the time period, I think you said 30 days, but then you corrected it to two years?"

Cassidy: "It's two years now, yes."

Andersson: "So, it is curr... is it currently two years or is it two years in your Bill?"

Cassidy: "It basically, under current law, you only have 30 days to do anything..."

Andersson: "Right."

Cassidy: "...regardless of the issue. This is... so, this creates the standard for this issue because the stakes are so very high."

Andersson: "So, under current law it is 30 days; under your Bill, it would extend that to two years?"

Cassidy: "Yes, it would."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Andersson: "And that would be the time period if they do... if someone discovered that they had not been advised by the court of this specific verbiage, they could move to vacate the conviction?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Andersson: "Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes, they could."

Andersson: "Is there any discretion in the court that's making that determination or is it just a blanket 'get out of jail free card', so to speak?"

Cassidy: "Just a minute. Let me double-check."

Andersson: "Sure."

Cassidy: "The court does have discretion."

Andersson: "And how does that discretion apply? How... what... what standards? What do they do to determine that?"

Cassidy: "Just a minute. It... it doesn't specify. The court... the court is not... it says the court is not required to do so... to allow them to withdraw the plea."

Andersson: "So, in other words, they can determine maybe if they had... maybe the exact language wasn't used, but perhaps something substantially similar?"

Cassidy: "Exactly. Right."

Andersson: "The court would have the discretion to deny the motion to vacate?"

Cassidy: "Exactly."

Andersson: "Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Andersson: "Great. Thank you very much."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Speaker Currie: "No further discussion, the Sponsor has moved for passage of House Bill 2460. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this measure, there are 48 voting 'yes', 63 voting 'no'. And the Sponsor requests Postponed Consideration. Representative Harper, are you ready on House Bill 2369? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2369, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased to bring before you today House Bill 2369 which would simply require public and charter schools to provide reasonable accommodations for their lactating pupils. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all 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? On this... the Clerk please take the record? On this measure, there are 103 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And House Bill 2369, having met the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Okay. Still, on the Order of Third Reading, priority Bills, House Bill 3851, Representative Fortner. Clerk... Representative Fortner. Fortner. Clerk, read... Out of the record. All right, still on Third Readings. House Bill 1273, Representative Mussman. Out of the record. Representative Rita on House Bill 2499. Representative Rita. Clerk, read the Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2499, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is an initiative of the Illinois Tollway Highway Authority. And what it basically does is it allows vehicles over 9 thousand pounds to use red oscillating lights rather than amber."

Speaker Currie: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye'... the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this measure, there are 108 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having met the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Third Readings, House Bill 3691, Representative Gabel. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3691, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Madam Chair. House Bill 3691 will help Illinois families save for college from an early age. Based on the recommendations of a bipartisan task force, it creates a children's savings account program. It builds upon the current Bright Start Program to automatically open a 529 college savings account for every child born in Illinois. CSA programs have a significant impact on a family's life and trajectory. Research has shown that low and moderate income children with even just a little bit of college savings, less than \$500, are three times more likely to go to college and

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

four times more likely to complete college. There are no opponents to this Bill. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Currie: "This Lady has moved passage of House Bill 3691.

Is there any discussion? Representative Andersson."

Andersson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Currie: "She will."

Andersson: "Thank you. Representative, what's the estimated cost of this program?"

Gabel: "Between 9 and 11 million, but this is a public-private partnership. And it also is subject to appropriation. So, this will allow the... the department to... the Treasury to start... start the program and be able to ask for private contributions for it."

Andersson: "They can ask for it, but if they don't get it, it's our responsibility, correct?"

Gabel: "No, it isn't."

Andersson: "It is not?"

Gabel: "No."

Andersson: "We don't have to pay for it if..."

Gabel: "Only if it's appropriated."

Andersson: "Okay. So, if it's appropriated. I also note, our analysis shows that the program would need between 250 thousand and 500 thousand in funds for administration and outreach at a minimum. Is that your understanding as well?"

Gabel: "That's correct. The Treasurer's Office has... has agreed to do this program. They're excited about it."

Andersson: "I do thank you for the answers to the questions."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Pritchard."

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

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Speaker Currie: "She will."

Pritchard: "Representative, would you tell us a little bit more about why this program is necessary? I mean, there are a number of 529 programs and the Bright Start Program is a way we're trying to encourage parents to save for their children's college education."

Gabel: "Well..."

Pritchard: "Why is this necessary?"

Gabel: "So, this program is really aimed towards low and moderate income children. What it does is it... it puts in \$50 initially to an account for them through the State Treasurer. And then, the parents have to open up a separate 529 account and for every dollar they put into that account, they will be matched with the state private-public dollars up to \$150 a year. And I think that just many low and moderate income families don't think that they can save. And this is an encouragement to them to save."

Pritchard: "And what happens though if the student doesn't go on to college? What happens to that savings that... that's in the account?"

Gabel: "That money goes back into the State Treasury."

Pritchard: "The State Treasury or is it divided among other..."

Gabel: "It's divided among other..."

Pritchard: "Students?"

Gabel: "It stays... it stays within that program."

Pritchard: "Correct. And... and is there any research evidence that says if a family starts saving that child is more likely to go on to college?"

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Gabel: "Yes. The child is three times more likely to go to college with between \$50 to \$500 in a savings account and four times more likely to graduate college."

Pritchard: "So, we're encouraging students to go to college, but where are students going to college today?"

Gabel: "Where are they going?"

Pritchard: "Yes."

Gabel: "They're going to... Are you talking about the problems with our colleges in the state?"

Pritchard: "Fifty percent of them are going out of state."

Gabel: "Okay."

Pritchard: "So, is that money then going to follow the student or does that just not get used?"

Gabel: "It does... Let me see. I believe the students can go anywhere
 to college, actually."

Pritchard: "So, the money would follow the students?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Pritchard: "Very good. Well, it's an interesting concept. And if we can encourage more lower income students to go on to college, I think that's a way to break the cycle of... of poverty and encourage students to achieve their dreams. Thank you."

Gabel: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Currie: "She will."

Davidsmeyer: "So, my... my concern on this is if we... if we make this a line item and it's eventually appropriated, where are you going to pull the money from?"

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Gabel: "The what?"

Davidsmeyer: "Where are we going to pull the money from? I guess my point is, how much money right now do we have to fund something like this?"

Gabel: "Yes. We could... we could do this whole program with private funds."

Davidsmeyer: "So, why aren't private individuals doing this?"

Gabel: "Because it's a public-private partnership it's done through the state. It's done through these 529 accounts, which are... which are college savings accounts through the state."

Davidsmeyer: "Why don't we make it legal for private entities to start 529s for every kid in the State of Illinois instead of having the state involved? You know, my... my concern has been all along, I've got a drug treatment facility that officially closed over the weekend because they have an appropriation but there's no money to fund it. So, my concern is for some reason we appropriate this, somebody gets the idea that we can appropriate this and then we have to cut from somewhere else in the budget. So, somebody else is going to lose out."

Gabel: "Well, as I..."

Davidsmeyer: "Just because it's appropriated doesn't mean it's funded."

Gabel: "As I said, this is a public-private partnership. They're expected to raise quite a bit of private dollars for this."

Davidsmeyer: "Who... who's raising the money?"

Gabel: "The Treasurer's Office."

Davidsmeyer: "Once again, I think I'd be much more comfortable if it was just a private partnership where they could open 529s

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

in kid's names rather than having any state funding whatsoever. So, I will be a 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "I think this is a great program. I know it's gotten quite a bit of bipartisan support. It will help our... our young children have a goal and be motivated to go to college. And as we know, it will break the bounds of poverty. So, please vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "The Sponsor has moved passage of House Bill 3691.

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no' vote... vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record.

On this measure, there are 65 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having achieved the appropriate Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 821, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 821, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. This is an initiative of the State Department of Revenue. It is meant to make more efficient the filing of sales tax and 942 forms. There is a... so that they must be filed electronically unless there is a good reason not to do it that way. Mistakes much more often crop up when people file by hand then when they file electronically. I know of no opposition to the measure.

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 821 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 821, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, we'll be moving to Bills on the Order of Second Reading. Please be in your seat and prepared to move your Bill if you so wish. First up, we have House Bill 2898, Representative Crespo. Representative Crespo, would you like to move this Bill to Third Reading? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2898, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2665, Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2665, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 1808, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1808, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2622, Representative Fine. Representative Fine. Mr. Clerk... Out of the record. House Bill 198, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 198, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Guzzardi."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill out of the record. House Bill 2622. Representative Fine, You'd like to move that Bill to Third Reading? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2622, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. Notes have been requested on the Bill and have not yet been filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 2812, Representative Hammond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2812, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3539, Representative Halpin. Out of the record. House Bill 2771, Representative Mitchell. Out of the record. House Bill 3342, Representative Sims. Out of the record. I'm sorry. House Bill 3342, Representative Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3342, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #3

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2987, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Representative, was there a Floor Amendment that you filed on the Bill today? Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 649. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 649, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions." Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 294, offered by Representative Stratton. House Resolution 295, offered by Representative Nekritz. House Resolution 296, offered by Representative Parkhurst. House Resolution 299, offered by Representative Lilly. House Resolution 300, offered by Representative Gabel. House Resolution 302, offered by Representative Barbara Wheeler. House Resolution 303, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 305, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 306, offered by Representative Sente. House Resolution 307, offered by Representative Jesiel. House Resolution 308, offered by Madigan. Speaker House Resolution 309, offered by Representative Jimenez. House Resolution 310, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 312, offered by Representative Meier. House Resolution 313, offered bу Representative Bellock. House Resolution 315, offered by Representative Batinick. House Resolution 317, offered by

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

Representative Bellock. House Resolution 319, offered by Representative Butler. House Resolution 321, offered by Representative Turner. House Resolution 322, offered by Representative Turner. House Resolution 323, offered by Representative Turner. And House Resolution 325, offered by Representative Flowers."

- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committee was canceled for this afternoon. The Energy Committee has been canceled. Meeting immediately after Session is Mass Transit in C-1; Elections & Campaign Finance in D-1; Judiciary Criminal in 413; Human Services in Room 114; Business & Occupational Licenses in Room 115; Counties & Townships in 122. Once again, the Energy Committee has been canceled."
- Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House is adjourned until Tuesday, April 25 at the hour of 11 a.m., Tuesday, April 25 at 11 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 293, offered by
 Representative Hernandez. House Resolution 304, offered by
 Representative Riley. House Resolution 314, offered by
 Representative Lilly. House Resolution 316, offered by
 Representative Barbara Wheeler. House Resolution 326, offered

37th Legislative Day

4/24/2017

by Representative Flowers. These are referred to the Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4031, offered by Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4032, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4033, offered by Representative Batinick, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4034, offered by Representative Breen, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4035, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4036, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 4037, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4038, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 4039, offered by Representative McSweeney, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4040, offered by Representative Hurley, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."